

The Power of Words

A Study of Serbian Strategic Narratives about the Srebrenica Massacre and Bosniaks' Responses to Them

01-11-2017

Aalborg University

Mirela Demo

Development and International Relations

Pages: 67 (160.500 keystrokes)

Abstract

This paper seeks to explore Serbian strategic narratives about the atrocity in Srebrenica that happened in 1995, and how these narratives are received from Bosniaks. The Srebrenica massacre still affects the regional affairs; hence it is the focus of this project. The data consists of verbal statements collected from June 8, 2015 to July 11, 2017. The presidents of Serbia, Aleksandar Vučić, and the president of Republic of Srpska, Milorad Dodik, are as of the day of writing still presidents. Their narratives have therefore been chosen, as they both are prominent public figures with political power. This paper can therefore contribute in understanding, why Serbs and Bosniaks have conflicting views about the massacre, and where exactly the major problem lies in establishing a common understanding of the massacre. The narratives will be analysed through the framework that Miskimmon, O'Loughlin and Roselle have laid out.

The two theories that are used to analyse Serbian strategic narratives are denial theory and maternal thinking. Specifically, Stanley Cohen's denial theory and Sabrina Ramet's denial syndrome are used to explain, which types of denial can be seen in Vučić and Dodik's verbal statements. Denial theory explains that both Dodik and Vučić deny the interpretation of the massacre, while Dodik also denied the massacre literally. Concerning Sara Ruddick's maternal thinking, the theory has highlighted that one of the reasons, why Serbs and Bosniaks cannot come to agreement regarding Srebrenica, is that the two Serbian presidents prioritise perseverance more than general social acceptability. This therefore creates distrust among the Bosniak informants, who do not believe in the Serbian narratives, even when the Serbian presidents are trying to improve the reconciliation process between the different ethnicities.

Table of Contents

Abstract	1
Foreword.....	3
Introduction	4
Ethnic Conceptualisations	5
Methodology.....	6
Problem Formulation and Research Questions	6
ICTY's View on the Srebrenica Massacre	8
Theories	12
Denial Theory.....	12
Maternal Thinking.....	17
Methodology.....	26
Reflections about the Collection of Verbal Statements.....	26
Theoretical Reflections.....	27
Strategic Narratives	29
Interviewing.....	37
Analysis	42
Analysis of Vučić's Strategic Narratives.....	42
Analysis of Dodik's Strategic Narratives	50
Analysis of Bosniaks' Responses to Serbian Strategic Narratives	56
Conclusion.....	63
Bibliography	65
Appendix 1: Interview Guide	70
Appendix 2: Transcription of Interview with Adis.....	81
Appendix 2: Transcription of Interview with Nihad	93
Appendix 3: Transcription of Interview with Sara	104
Appendix 4: Transcription of Interview Esma	114
Appendix 5: Transcription of Interview with Ibrahim	128

Foreword

I am happy that this project has now finally been finalised, and I wish to thank the various persons who have helped me through with it. I want to express my gratitude to the informants, who found some time in their busy schedules to participate in an interview, and to my friends and my family for their support. You know who you are. Finally, I also wish to especially thank my grandma and mother, who kept encouraging and supporting my thesis writing.

Introduction

This paper seeks to analyse Serbian politicians' strategic narratives, following the framework by Miskimmon, O'Loughlin and Roselle (2013), and how these are received by Bosniaks, as the two ethnic groups, Serbians and Bosniaks, fought against each other in the late 20th century. The focus is mostly on the politicians, Milorad Dodik and Aleksandar Vučić, and their narratives about the mass killings that took place in Srebrenica during the war. As of the date of writing, Milorad Dodik is president of Republic Srpska in Bosnia-Herzegovina, while Aleksandar Vučić is president of Serbia. As they are public figures with strong political powers, their narratives are worth researching.

Both the governments of Serbia and Republic Srpska have been investing in Srebrenica, but nevertheless most Serbs and Serbian political leaders deny that a genocide was committed by the Serbs in Srebrenica (DR 2015), even though it is known as the worst brutality committed by humans in Europe since the Second World War. In July 1995, the Bosnian-Serbian army conquered Srebrenica, which was at the time protected by UN Dutch soldiers, as it was supposed to be a safe zone (Traynor 2010). Instead at least 7000 boys and men disappeared in the next few days, assumed to have been murdered. The atrocity has been labelled as genocide and ethnic cleansing by two international courthouses, yet as mentioned many Serbs still refuse to label it as genocide (DR 2015). The town is now strongly associated with violence and death, even outside the borders of Bosnia-Herzegovina (Narayan 2016). July 11 is now the Srebrenica Memorial Day in Bosnia, but the day is also marked in EU member countries in memory of the victims of the Srebrenica genocide (IFIMES 2009). It also occasionally gets mentioned in the media, when new fears of future cruelties emerge, for instance in December 2016 where Bashar al-Assad's forces took control of Aleppo in Syria, and there was a risk that a war crime similar to the one in Srebrenica could occur (Brennan 2016; Narayan 2016; Thykier 2016).

The development of Serbian policy towards Srebrenica intrigued me to do an analysis of Dodik's and Vučić's strategic narratives about Srebrenica from June 2015 to July 2017 to understand, how they use strategic narratives to create a shared understanding of the history in Srebrenica. My focus is on contemporary politics, therefore I decided that I wanted to analyse the narratives from June 8, 2015 (where Dodik publicly claimed he was not going to Srebrenica) until July 11, 2017 (when the annual Srebrenica Memorial Day takes place). I claim that the Srebrenica massacre is part of the difficulties that delay the peacebuilding development, as the previous US ambassador to Bosnia-

Hercegovina, Richard Kauzlarich, and the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of Bosnia-Hercegovina, Denis Zvizdić, both claim that Srebrenica is still a wound in Bosnia-Hercegovina that needs to heal before the relations between Serbs and Bosniaks can improve significantly (Ruble 2014; N1 Sarajevo 2017). As a result, this paper has a particular focus on Srebrenica.

Ethnic Conceptualisations

Jelena Obradović-Wochnik (2013) writes that the general public in Serbia is often referred to as ‘Serbians’ or ‘Serbs’ and they are frequently generalised as a homogenous and silent group in regards to their opinions about their former warfare against Bosniaks. However, she demonstrates in her article, *The ‘Silent Dilemma’ of Transitional Justice: Silencing and Coming to Terms with the Past in Serbia*, that Serbs have different political and ideological views concerning Bosnia, therefore when the terms ‘Serbian’ or ‘Serbs’ are used in this paper, it is important to bear in mind that these views do not represent every single individual that is ethnically Serbian (Obradović-Wochnik 2013). The only reason why these expressions are used in the project is due to the lack of alternatives. As a result, the reader is reminded to be careful of not generalising the whole ethnic group (or any other ethnicities for that matter).

Accordingly, the Serbian politicians in my problem formulation are representing populations in Serbia and in Republic of Srpska, which is located in Bosnia. Aleksandar Vučić is currently the president of Serbia who used to be the prime minister. Milorad Dodik is the president of Republic of Srpska in Bosnia-Hercegovina, an autonomous region in Bosnia with a plurality of people with a Serbian origin. In total there are two (almost) separate entities in Bosnia, Republic of Srpska and Federation of Bosnia, which is governed by Bosniaks and Croats. Each of these three ethnicities has their own president, meaning there are three ruling presidents in Bosnia-Hercegovina at the same time (Nardelli , Dzidic and Jukic 2014).

Furthermore, I would also like to clarify my use of Bosnian and Bosniak. Originally, Bosniak described all Bosnians with different religions, however after the Yugoslavian war in the 1990’ies, many Muslim Bosnians started using the term Bosniak specifically to refer to themselves and other Muslim Bosnians, as this term has a stronger historical connection to the regions, Bosnia and Hercegovina, than the term Bosnian (Minority Rights Group International 2008). Hence in this paper, the word Bosniak will refer to the ethnic group of people who are also primarily Muslim, while Bosnian will refer to people in Bosnia-Hercegovina, regardless of their ethnicity. For

instance, in the previous section I wrote that the Bosnian-Serbian army occupied Srebrenica, meaning the Serbian army from Republic Srpska, Bosnia-Hercegovina, and not the Serbian army from the country Serbia.

Methodology

Methodologically, the purpose is to analyse the strategic narratives by using the study of communicative action, a framework for analysing strategic narratives offered by Miskimmon, O'Loughlin and Roselle (2013). It is described as a narrative analysis which focuses on actors' rational argumentation to create of a shared collective understanding, and which is one of the four analyses on the spectrum of persuasion – ranging from very thin rationalist analyses to very thick poststructural analyses of strategic narratives (Miskimmon, O'Loughlin and Roselle 2013).

The data consists of politicians' verbal statements such as speeches and interviews. These data will then be analysed using Sabrina Ramet's concept, the denial syndrome, which is based on Stanley Cohen's book, *States of Denial*. (Ramet 2008). Ramet (2008) focuses on one of the three forms of denial – which she names as the denial syndrome – to explain denial among Serbs and the political culture in Serbia and the following consequences of denial of war crimes. In addition, Cohen's (2001) own general theory about denial will also be used in the analysis.

Furthermore, the analysis will include Sara Ruddick's (1989) theory about maternal thinking as a means to achieve and improve peace processes, as this perspective on Serbian political narratives can put attention on these narratives' possible impact on the peacebuilding procedure in the post-conflict region. The methods, data and theory will be further described in the methodology chapter.

Also, Miskimmon, O'Loughlin and Roselle (2013) argue for the importance of also analysing the public's reactions to strategic narratives, as this is important to understand, how the public perceives these narratives, and what their understanding is of the political system. Therefore people that have a relation to Republic of Srpska have been chosen as informants, and their reactions and understandings of Vučić's and Dodik's strategic narratives will also be analysed.

Problem Formulation and Research Questions

As the atrocity in Srebrenica is still strongly remembered and talked about today, my project focus is therefore on the narratives about Srebrenica, and as mentioned the attention is on Serbian politicians. I have chosen to focus on two politicians, Aleksandar Vučić and Milorad Dodik, who

are also currently presidents, representing Serbs in both Bosnia and Serbia, since I wanted to analyse the broader Serbian narratives. As my project is centred on how narratives about atrocities can affect a post-conflict society's transition to stability, my focus is thus not on narratives among minorities, as these are more likely to have a lesser effect on national or international peacebuilding practices than collective narratives. Moreover, I am interested in the contemporary strategic narratives from April 16, 2015, where Dodik visited Srebrenica and talked about the past and need for economic progress in the town, until the next (as of current writing) annual Srebrenica Memorial Day on July 11, 2017. This leads me to my problem formulation, which is as follows:

How do Serbian politicians, Aleksandar Vučić and Milorad Dodik, strategically narrate about the Srebrenica massacre from June 8, 2015 – July 11, 2017, and how are these narratives received by Bosniaks from Republic Srpska?

In order to satisfactorily answer the problem formulation, some research questions have to be answered first:

1. *What happened in Srebrenica in 1995 according to the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia?*
2. *What shared understanding of the mass killing in Srebrenica is Aleksandar Vučić trying to create from June 2015 to July 2017?*
 - 2a. *What language and expressions does Aleksandar Vučić use to describe the Srebrenica massacre?*
 - 2b. *What rational claims has Aleksandar Vučić's been making about the mass killing in Srebrenica?*
3. *What shared understanding of the mass killing in Srebrenica is Milorad Dodik trying to create from June 2015 to July 2017?*
 - 2a. *What language and expressions does Milorad Dodik use to describe the Srebrenica massacre?*
 - 2b. *What rational claims has Milorad Dodik been making about the mass killing in Srebrenica?*
4. *What opinions do Bosniaks from Republic of Srpska have about the Srebrenica massacre?*
5. *How do Bosniaks from Republic of Srpska react to Serbian politicians' strategic narratives about the Srebrenica massacre?*
 - 5a. *How do Bosniaks react to Aleksandar Vučić's statements about the atrocity in Srebrenica?*
 - 5b. *How do Bosniaks react to Milorad Dodik's statements about the atrocity in Srebrenica?*

These sub questions demand descriptions of the Srebrenica massacre in 1995 from the view of the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY), formed by the United Nations to handle war crimes during the Yugoslavian War (United Nations International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia n.d.) and from Vučić's and Dodik's perspective, as the focus is on their rational claims and expressions about the Srebrenica mass killings from June 8, 2015 to July 11, 2017. These strategic narratives will then be analysed using the theories of denial and maternal thinking, but Bosniaks reactions to the statements made by the two politicians will also be analysed. Furthermore, the answer for the first research question (what happened in Srebrenica in 1995 according to ICTY?) will be described next, while the rest of the questions will be looked into in the analysis.

ICTY's View on the Srebrenica Massacre

Since the Srebrenica massacre is a sensitive topic and there are different understandings of the happening, this paper will therefore be based on the ICTY's view on the atrocity, as the ICTY has based their interpretation of the crime on evidence.

The International Criminal Tribunal for former Yugoslavia (ICTY) has since 1993 been exploring different types of evidence to find out what happened during the war in former Yugoslavia to see, if any war crimes took place and if so, who should be convicted for them (Outreach 2005). They have also focused on the mass killings in Srebrenica and published different documents online to inform about the ongoing lawsuits against alleged war criminals and the final judgements of trials. A department of ICTY, *Outreach*, has been producing articles for a journal that is published by the Serbian War Crimes Prosecutor's Office, however the ICTY warns that these articles do not necessarily represent their own view on an issue (ICTY n.d. b). Yet one of the articles, *Facts about Srebrenica*, from Outreach (2005) describes the ICTY's conclusions about the Srebrenica massacre, and since the focus of the article is exactly that, the article therefore in this case does represent the Tribunal's standpoint on the happening in Srebrenica. Besides, the statements made in the article are also consistent with ICTY's own standpoint on their website (see ICTY n.d. c).

In the article, Outreach (2005) describe some of the Serbian beliefs of mass killings in Srebrenica: that the actual number of people killed is around 2000, that the people killed were soldiers and not civilians, that it was a passionate revenge for the Serbs who were murdered around Srebrenica or that what happened cannot be classified as genocide. Therefore, the ICTY has looked through

different types of evidence to discover, if the Serbian army that participated in the killing of Bosniaks in Srebrenica intended to perform genocide against the victims. Among the evidence were transcriptions and linguistic analyses of intercepted conversations between Serbian military officials, forensic analyses of bones, soil analysis of gravesites, aerial photographs, demographic analyses of people and victims' and perpetrators' testimonies. All these have been used as evidence to ascertain what really happened in Srebrenica, and the proof tells the same story (Outreach 2005).

According to Outreach (2005), the dialogues among Serbs were sometimes intercepted by Bosnian Intelligence officers, as the Serbian army occasionally relied on less secure lines to receive signals from their colleagues, when they had problems with using their safest communication procedure. Intelligence officers from Bosnia would then record these conversations and make transcriptions of them, however only some of the transcriptions that were presented to the tribunal were accepted, as not all of the recordings could be sustained by other evidence. Yet, the transcriptions that could be proven to be true showed that the Serbian army captured and killed thousands of people from Srebrenica. These recordings show that about 7000-8000 people, mostly male, were killed in Srebrenica in July 1995. In fact, one recording shows that the Serbian army had trouble with killing them all, as they lacked resources and soldiers to murder the rest (about 3,500 victims) quickly – which is way more than just the 2000 victims that some Serbs believe were killed in total in Srebrenica. Even testimonies from perpetrators that confessed being responsible for the massacre in Srebrenica claim that the Serbian army could kill about 1000 victims in one day, and that no one followed the Geneva Conventions at the time. Also, forensic analyses of gravesites concluded in 2001 that 2028 people had been killed, but at the time experts still needed to go through 18 more gravesites, so 2028 is only the minimal number of victims. On the basis of this evidence, the ICTY concluded that there were at least 7000 people killed in Srebrenica (Outreach 2005).

Furthermore, Outreach (2005) also describes that the gravesites revealed that some of the victims were handicapped and that many had been blindfolded and tied, when they were killed. A perpetrator also described all the victims, except for one, as wearing civil clothes. Hence the Tribunal believes that the victims were not combatants that were ready to fight against the Serbs. Regarding the notion that the victims were killed out of revenge seems unlikely, as the evidence also demonstrates that the mass killing involved great planning. Outreach (2005) reasons that it is difficult to find enough soldiers and enough ammunition to kill thousands of people, transfer the corpses to gravesites (demanding lots of fuel resources, vehicles and secure gravesites), dig big

enough graves (demanding great machinery), bury the corpses, then dig the bodies up again to mutilate the bodies and to get rid of evidence, and finally to transfer the bodies elsewhere, where they were reburied (which soil analyses have proven). This is not something that happened in the spur of moment caused by an emotional reaction to news that Serbs had been killed around Srebrenica by some soldiers: *“During a state of war mobilizing such resources cannot be done at the whim of a few crazy soldiers. It needs to be ordered and authorized by commanders at high-levels”* (Outreach 2005: 6).

Based on the evidence mentioned above, the Tribunal concluded that the Serbian beliefs on the subject of the Srebrenica massacre cannot be held true; there were more than 2000 victims (more precisely between 7000 – 8000), the majority were civilians and not combatants, and it was not a compassionate revenge performed by some soldiers, as it involved great planning and multitudes of resources. Regarding the final belief that what happened cannot be classified as genocide, it is important to understand, how the ICTY views genocide, and that their definition of genocide is based on international standards (Outreach 2005), i.e. the United Nations’ definition of genocide in the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (1948). According to the Tribunal, genocide involves:

“any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such:

- (a) killing members of the group;
- (b) causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group;
- (c) deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole in part;
- (d) imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group;
- (e) forcibly transferring children of the group to another group” (Outreach 2005: 7)

Based on this definition of genocide, the ICTY has researched whether or not the Serbian army that was responsible for the Srebrenica massacre intended to eliminate the whole or a part of Bosnian Muslims in Srebrenica, and if they performed any of the above mentioned means to inflict harm on them. The Trial Chamber concluded in the trial against General Radislav Krstić, one of the individuals held responsible for the mass killings in Srebrenica, that it was an act of genocide. Krstić’s defense argued that killing at least 7,000 people is not an act of genocide against the Bosniaks, which consist of 1,4 millions of people, or against the 40,000 Bosniaks in Srebrenica. Furthermore, the defense argued that if the Serbian army intended to destroy Bosniaks as a group, they would have killed the women, children and elderly in Srebrenica, as well as the Bosniaks in Žepa (Outreach 2005). These arguments were disregarded, as the Trial Chamber claimed that the

Serbs could not have been unaware of the fact “*that killing two or three generations of men would have a lasting and devastating impact on the survival of the Bosnian Muslim community from Srebrenica*” (Outreach 2005: 8), and that forcibly transferring the women, children and elderly somewhere else would have a negative impact on the survival of Bosniaks in Srebrenica, as they would eventually disappear from the city. Additionally, the Trial Chamber also argued that it was an act of genocide, because the Serbs also ruined the main mosque and homes belonging to Bosniaks with the intention of having the Bosnian Muslims disappear from Srebrenica physically. The ICTY has thus defined the killings in Srebrenica in July 1995 as genocide due to the fact that extensive evidence overlaps with ICTY’s and UN’s definition of genocide (Outreach 2005).

Theories

This section offers an overview of denial theory and maternal thinking, which are the two theories that will be used in the analysis later. First denial theory will be explained, which will be supplemented with Ramet's denial syndrome, which specifically focuses on Serbian denial.

Denial Theory

This section will offer an insight into denial theory based on Stanley Cohen's book, *States of Denial*, in which he clarifies between different types of denials, what is being denied and how individuals, societies and countries deny suffering and atrocities. Sabrina Ramet (2007) develops the concept of the denial syndrome – based on Cohen's denial paradox – in her article, *The denial syndrome and its consequences: Serbian political culture since 2000*. She analyses Serbia's political history before and during the 1990's with a focus on Serbian security practices and the public's response to them, which she uses to explain the Serbia's political culture from 2000-2007. I will describe these theories in the following with the purpose of shedding light on the different types of denial to be able to explain Serbia's standpoint on the Srebrenica massacre.

The Denial Paradox

Cohen (2001) differentiates in his book, between honest denial, straightforward lying and a third type of denial which is a combination of these. Honest denial can easily be overcome with the help of counter-evidence and reason, yet in the case of atrocities causal relations and legal evidence may be difficult to establish in the midst of governments' oppositional claims and interpretations. If governments are deliberately trying to conceal the truth, it can be even more difficult to prove what happened. Usually, if a government cannot find the evidence to support their statements, the statements are perceived to be lies. The combination of honest and deliberate denial is what Cohen (2001) characterises as the denial paradox or what Ramet (2007) defines as the denial syndrome.

Cohen (2001) explains that in order for people to deny something, they must also know what it is they are denying, but sometimes this denial does not seem to be entirely deliberate or conscious, as people can deny something to hide the truth from themselves in order to protect themselves. But how can you hide the truth from yourself, when you already know it? This is what Cohen (2001) focuses on in his book, and what he calls the denial paradox. From this perspective knowing becomes an ambiguous concept, as “*We are vaguely aware of choosing not to look at the facts, but not quite conscious of just what it is we are evading. We know, but at the same time we don't* [Sic]

know” (Cohen 2001: 5). At a national level, this type of denial can be found in repressive and colonial regimes where people can feel pressured to ignore discrimination and misery, but in democratic countries people are more likely to overlook the visible injustice (homeless people on the streets, corpses on TV channels etc.) out of cultural habit. Furthermore, the denial paradox can be compared to Jean Paul Sartre’s concept of bad faith, “a form of denial that the mind *knowingly* directs towards itself” (Cohen 2001: 6, italics in original). Bad faith is the conception of people pretending to be unaware of their current freedom and choices, in order to avoid taking any decision at the moment and risking the consequences of their choices. Since people are ultimately free to behave in any way at any time, the very act of people believing in their limited or lack of choices means that they ironically use their freedom to deny themselves their liberty (Burton 2012).

Cohen (2001) also demonstrates how denial can take place at different levels; personal (denial among individuals), official (public denial at a national level) and cultural denial (neither fully personal nor official). The latter being an unwritten agreement among people about what should not be believed in or not talked about, even if they have freedom of speech. This is different from official denial, as repressive regimes can deny people the freedom to express their opinions publicly, while democratic states can try to affect people’s opinions in various ways. The different methods that countries use to deny something will be further described below, where Cohen’s (2001) three conceptualisations of *what* is being denied – literal denial, interpretive denial and implicatory denial – will be explained.

Literal denial is the denial of something happening or of something being true, and this type of denial can be honest, deliberate or it can fall under the denial paradox. There are different ways that states can deny facts which can depend on what type of government is in place. Repressive states can control the media and the information flow, therefore oppositional claims in the country are difficult to uphold, as the state can blatantly deny that something happened while separating its population from any outside criticism. Democratic states do not have this possibility, therefore they can instead claim that this statement is not true, as it is illegal, and hence it did not happen or say that something happened a long time ago, and there is now too much uncertainty to claim what happened, as the evidence is lost or people’s memory is now perceived to be too unreliable. They can also challenge the victims’ or witnesses’ reliability and objectivity for example by emphasising their political interest, hidden agendas and biases. These are just examples, as the methods of literal denial are various, but it has become harder to deny facts due to “*Increased human rights*

monitoring, the spread of international reporting and advances in information technology..." (Cohen 2001: 104)

Interpretive denial, on the other hand, is not based on denial of facts, but instead the interpretation is denied and another interpretation is offered. Interpretive denial can consist of four different methods; euphemism, legalism, denial of responsibility and isolation. Euphemism includes rephrasing other's interpretation of what happened by using other expressions to minimize the impression of the violence, e.g. claiming that something was not a war crime, but just regular warfare. Legalism focuses on the language and expressions in laws and conventions, as it questions if something can be classified as illegal or not. States can also deny the responsibility of an event by arguing that what happened was done by people not associated with the government, or if states do accept the responsibility, they can deny the statement that it was a systematic act – instead it was an isolated event and not something that occurs frequently in the country.

Finally, implicatory denial upholds the indication that what happened is not worthy or relevant for people to intervene and stop it. Sometimes it can be rational for people to stay away from doing anything, as there is literally nothing that they can do to prevent something from happening or interference is risky, but this is not what Cohen (2001) describes as implicatory denial. Instead he concentrates on people's lack of interest in stopping something, when people do have the resources to do something without risking anything. "[Implicatory denial] *is not a refusal to acknowledge reality, but a denial of its significance or implications*" (Cohen 2001: 8). Countries may try to justify their acts based on necessity and security (if we did not do it, something worse would have happened to us) or by focusing on the values expressed in the international human rights and claim that these values are not universal, and therefore they cannot be expected to be followed by all countries. States may also use history to represent themselves as the 'real' or the 'original' victim instead, if the conflict has caused suffering to both sides over time, and the last attack is hence justified, as it was a defence against the 'real' perpetrator. In this case, "... *all justifications such as necessity and blaming the victim are forms of contextualization. Governments always accuse their critics of not knowing, understanding or mentioning the context in which the violations took place*" (Cohen 2001: 111). Likewise, countries can also focus on advantageous comparisons to improve others' perception of their acts and continue denying the impact of what happened; states can compare their acts with their enemy's to show that their enemy's acts are worse than their own,

states can compare their critics' condemnation of their acts and of their enemies to highlight the biased opinions their criticsers have, or states can focus on their criticsers' past offenses.

The Denial Syndrome

The denial syndrome is, as mentioned above, a mix of honesty and lies, where people are denying themselves the truth, and the result of this psychological mechanism is something that people honestly believe in, as they still seem to be unaware of the truth. This type of denial can result with the offenders demanding victims to make up for the offenses, even though the victims are innocent. It should be noted that the denial syndrome is based on Serbia's culture, however each country has its own unique conditions from which the denial syndrome emerges from, therefore the denial syndrome can be and is present in other countries, but it differs and is dependent upon the context that it emerges from (Ramet 2007).

Ramet (2007) explains that Serbian societies suffer from the denial syndrome, which has developed over time. Before and during the wars from 1991-95 and 1998-99 Serbs were subjected to a propaganda which had the intention of creating and increasing:

“... dysphoric rumination (the tendency to reinterpret events from the past in a negative way), exaggerated perceptions of conspiracy, sinister attribution error (attributing sinister intentions to others), and hypervigilant social information processing, in such a way as to produce in Serbian society patterns of thought, speaking, and behavior with marked neurotic and/or psychotic characteristics” (Ramet 2007: 42-43).

Consequently, many Serbs began justifying Serbian warfare, as they had started to victimise themselves and therefore perceived Serbian warfare as self-defence. As Ramet (2007: 43) phrases it: “*To be a Serb was, in the Milošević era, to be a victim*”. Meanwhile the Serbs were also mostly unaware of the criticism directed at Serbian warfare, as foreign media, journals and regimes viewed Serbian warfare as very aggressive. This point is important to accentuate, as this can develop into a population becoming ashamed afterwards, once the population realises the wrongdoings of its nation. This even accounts for the people, who did not actively participate in any military acts, yet these feelings of shame can be triggered, if one has a strong identification with their country. Shame can be caused by different factors such as guilt or anger, and it can be acknowledged or repressed. There are different reactions to shame (whether repressed or acknowledged), and one of them can be blaming the leaders for the military misconducts. However, shame can be such a strong feeling

that this may not be seen as an adequate response to what was done, and therefore it can be too late to simply blame the leaders. If one fails with dealing with their feelings of shame, there is a danger of falling into psychopathy. In this case, three different responses can occur: rigid conformity, amorality and denial (Ramet 2007).

Ramet (2007) describes rigid conformity as the behaviour that people emit in order to follow whatever mainstream thinking and behaviour is, just to be able to fit in. Amorality is characterised as behaviour and thinking where individuals reject or ignore norms, which some studies show there is a significant level of in Serbia. Finally, the third response, denial, is different from repression, as it includes knowledge of events or interpretations to some extent. Moreover, it is different from biased interpretation, as “*Denial involves a refusal to confront facts and evidence and an insistence, against reason, on an alternative script, in support of which myths and alleged conspiracies may be summoned as evidence*” (Ramet 2007: 44). Denial has both manifest as well as latent functions. The manifest functions are pleasing people’s egos and putting the blame on others, while the latent functions are increasing suspicion of others, which makes the world seem threatening, increased self-victimisation, defiance against others and ‘bad faith’. These latent effects develop over time, when one population in denial puts the blame on another, and the others have to ‘import’ the responsibility of an event and the shame following from that. However, this is unwanted by the others, therefore they do not necessarily import the shame. As a result, this increases the self-victimisation of the population in denial, making them more likely to defy others’ demands and believe in conspiracies, and this can then lead to Sartre’s bad faith (Ramet 2007). In relation to the denial syndrome, this means that people can deny themselves the choice to not be in denial and thus believe that being in denial is the only choice available for them. According to Ramet (2007: 54) the Serbian habitual denial tendencies “... will require at least a generation before they can begin to subside”.

Maternal Thinking

This section will explain Sara Ruddick's theory about maternal thinking in which she views motherhood as a practice and a philosophy that can be applied to and improve security practices, as the demands of maternal thinking can shed light upon the weaknesses of security practices and discourses. Sara Ruddick published her book, *Maternal Thinking: Toward a Politics of Peace*, in 1989, hence her theory was based on the security practices and mothering during the Cold War. However, Carol Cohn wrote in 2013 her article, "*Maternal Thinking*" and the concept of "vulnerability" in security paradigms, policies and practices, where she uses the theory to also analyse modern security practices and discourses. This suggests the still importance of maternal thinking and with it its critique of national and international security.

Before any further descriptions about maternal thinking is offered, it is important to emphasise a few arguments of Ruddick's theory. First, neither Ruddick (1989) nor Cohn (2013) believe that you can just take maternal thinking from its context and directly place it in another context, such as national security. Instead maternal thinking, as "*a mode of thought*" (Cohn 2013: 47), can be used in security practices as an alternative resource, but international, national or human security should not be seen as an integrated part of maternal thinking that is always available to be used in security issues. Secondly, maternal thinking should not be considered as only available to females who have birthed children, as the term 'mother' in this theory is not a person with a specific sex, sexuality, gender identity or even a person who is the biological parent of a child. Also, mothers are not a homogenous group with specific backgrounds, personality traits, desires, needs etc. A mother is merely an individual who accepts the responsibility of taking care of at least one child's demands of perseverance and nurturance, while they are trying to meet the social demands of mothering (Ruddick 1989; Cohn 2013). However, some researchers have raised concerns, whether all mothers worldwide share the same view on parenthood across time, place, class and so forth. According to Cohn, this is irrelevant, as she states instead that:

"What is critical here is that all practices, including mothering, give rise to distinctive ways of knowing, forms of reason, and criteria for truth which are tested against the goals of that practice. And that Ruddick's description of the thinking arising from what she identifies as maternal practice can serve as a useful heuristic when we examine the forms of thinking found in other social practices" (2013: 48).

In other words, Ruddick's theory is not about mothers or people, but about the distinctive knowledge that comes from mothering, and this knowledge, as a heuristic tool, can be used to critically analyse security policies and practices and hereafter offer alternative procedures to the study of security, as Cohn (2013) has demonstrated in her article.

Maternal Thinking as a Practice

The quote above also portrays that Ruddick's (1989) theory is based on practicalism, which claims that truth is the knowledge achieved after testing it out against relevant practices, however there is no truth resulting from different practices that can be held against another and claim that it is superior to another truth. If a practice has been validated after testing it out, then it is as true as any other valid practice, regardless if this practice comes from the same field or not. Just like all practices, mothering demands the use of certain methods (and not others), and it follows specific social rules, because meaning and thought is established in a social context. This entails that mothers *think* and test out which means to use to raise children, while they try to live up to social expectations of parental care. They do not rely on their emotions or coincidences, when taking care of children. Though some mothers may and some mothers who usually do not rely on this can still sometimes let their feelings take over, however according to Ruddick (1989) mothers are mostly reflective about their maternal practices and mothering in general. Even if they should let themselves get swayed by their feelings, they can still later regret it, when they begin to think back about what they did. However, this should not be interpreted, as if mothers are more likely to get swayed by their emotional states, as any person, regardless if they are mothers or not, can experience this. As mothers are reflective about mothering most of the time, practices and truths derived from mothering are equal to practices and truths from other areas. Truth should be seen as relative to each practice, and self-criticism is in most practices evident. Nonetheless, interpractice criticism is also promising, as it also fosters change according to Ruddick (1989). Yet just like no truth is superior to another, so is no criticism. *"To criticize is to act on one's practical commitments, not to stand above them. Maternal thinking is one discipline among others, capable of criticizing and being criticised"* (Ruddick 1989: 27).

Another point found in practicalism is that no thought is free from its social background, meaning that a person cannot think and view things from a neutral perspective that is not tainted by their socialisation (Ruddick 1989). Therefore thoughts, although they are shaped in an individual's head, are already tainted by each person's language, background and social milieu: *"Thinking itself is*

often a solitary activity ... Yet the language of solitary thinking is necessarily public in the sense that it is governed by public criteria of meaning and truth". (Ruddick 1989: 15). If thinking ought to have any sense, its meaning must be accepted and shared by others. Truth and meaning must be tested against a goal, but they must also be agreed upon and shared among people. Mothers are therefore bound by the social demands that constitute maternal thinking, as they need to raise their children to be socially acknowledged in a society later. This point leads me to the next section, which focuses partly on the social demands mothers have to fulfil.

The Three Demands of Maternal Thinking

Ruddick (1989) describes three basic aspects of maternal thinking: preservation, growth and social acceptability. Preservation refers to a child's demand for survival, and hence mothers need to offer relevant protection at different times and places. As a human species, children have a prolonged biological vulnerability and thus demand more protective attention from adults. If mothers do not try to protect children from dangers, they are not doing maternal work. In order for a mother to protect a child from a threatening situation, they need to acknowledge the child's vulnerability and find it important to protect it. Therefore "*Maternal practice begins with a double vision – seeing the fact of biological vulnerability as socially significant and as demanding care*" (Ruddick 1989: 18). Growth is, on the other hand, focused on the emotional and intellectual aspect of children's demands. As a child gets older, it will need to learn how to cope with its own feelings, but also with other people. It will also develop cognitively, meaning a child will develop naturally, but as they grow they also develop in their own unique way, and therefore each child, according to Ruddick (1989), demands nurturance of its developing emotions and intellectuality. Finally, social acceptability is the demand that a mother's society puts on her, as people desire that parents raise their children with characteristics that are socially desired. Not all communities have the same social demands, but nonetheless they all have a demand that children should be raised to be socially acceptable. Children cannot be let to act according their nature alone; mothers need to take control of their children's nature, also referred to as 'training'. It is important to note that these demands are not necessarily universal, and one can define mothering with different features, but Ruddick (1989) claims that her depiction of a child accounts for all children.

The three demands of maternal thinking can create problems for mothers, as they typically have less power than their companions. A mother's group is defined as "*the set of people with whom she identifies to the degree that she would count failure to meet their criteria of acceptability as her*

failure” (Ruddick 1989: 21). Ruddick (1989) states that mothers do have some influence on the group – like all members of the group – however since mothers are mostly female, they may not possess the same level of power, as males typically do, since in many parts of the world females are typically still discriminated against due to their sex or gender. Mothers are hence more likely to experience a higher level of disagreement with their ideals or suggestions for change. Furthermore, when mothers need to train their children, it may become difficult for them, as the different demands can be in conflict with each other. Sometimes following the social demands can lead to the neglecting of a child’s demands or vice versa. Consequently, most mothers are reflective about their maternal work, as they need to figure out which method would be best in specific scenarios or invent an appropriate method. Is this method or training necessary, or will it cause more harm than good to the child? Is it an overreaction? How do I change the method, so that it can fulfil all three demands of mothering? However, social rules are in most societies dominated by Fathers or nonmothers, and mothers must therefore raise children to follow the general society’s rules, while they at the same time are undermining their own values and power in front of the children. Fathers have traditionally been involved with meeting a child’s demands for material support and to defend both children and mothers from external dangers, but not with a child’s care that maternal work includes. Moreover, Fathers have often legal power of children, and *“They are supposed to represent the “world” – its language, culture, work, and rule – and to be the arbiters of the child’s acceptability in the world they represent”* (Ruddick 1989: 42). In other words, Fathers have typically dealt with the society’s demands for child care rather than children’s demands.

Furthermore, Ruddick (1989) describes scrutinising, which is the maternal watchful glaze that is always on a lookout for dangers, but at the same time mothers cannot do this all the time, as they cannot let themselves get influenced by fear. They still need to be coolheaded and sensible, when they identify something that could be potentially dangerous. They use their rationality to further evaluate, if the threat is probable enough for them to react upon it, or if they should just let their children be and quietly watch over them from afar. In this regard, mothers need to be humble and realise that they cannot control everything, since *“To give birth is to create a life that cannot be kept safe, whose unfolding cannot be controlled and whose eventual death is certain”* (Ruddick 1989: 72). Of course, control is essential, when taking care of children, but it also crucial to not let oneself become obsessed with ultimate control, which is impossible to achieve, hence mothers should not give up hope of being able to protect their children. Just as mothers need to be able to differentiate between realistically dangerous situations and less dangerous situations, but without letting them

get fanatical about control, mothers also need to learn to recognise their children's emotions and behaviour correctly and respond to it with appropriate measures: when is their behaviour natural, albeit not necessarily desirable? When should mothers correct their children's behaviour, and when should they just let them be? Both mothers and children are subjected to change over time, but mothers need to learn which changes are natural and be open-minded about them. Even if the changing behaviour in a child is not necessarily welcome, it should not always be controlled. Because mothers need to be able to both scrutinise and differentiate between changes, yet still remain humble, Ruddick (1989) reasons that mothers think more 'concretely' about problems and dilemmas rather than in 'abstract' terms. Though abstraction has its own benefits and is necessary in its own way, it is defined as the thinking that tends to simplify problems and accept the given scenario. Concrete thinking is instead defined as challenging, as it characterised by being thought-provoking towards assumed generalisations and always on the lookout for different perspectives of a singular problem: *"To look and then speak concretely is to relish complexity, to tolerate ambiguity, to multiply options rather than accepting the terms of a problem"* (Ruddick 1989: 93). Ruddick (1989) asserts that militarist thinking is typically characterised by abstract thinking, and therefore maternal thinking can assist in security issues. After having explained the demands of mothering, we can now focus on the connection between security practices and maternal thinking, which will be described in the following.

The Aims Gap of Security Practices

Since the theory of maternal thinking is inspired by practicalism it is important to mention one more argument in practicalism, and that is the importance of the aim of a practice. Practicalism claims that the goal of a practice is so important that without the goal there would be no action in the first place. Also, the aim of a practice is also what distinguishes different acts from each other (Ruddick 1989). So where is the relation between mothering and national security, as they seem to have two different aims? In practicalism, maternal thinking would not be found valid in any other context than where it originates from, unless if the other context has the same aim. Maternal thinking comes from practices that focus on taking care of others, while knowledge from security practices stems from practices that focus on taking care of oneself, even if it means having to hurt others. Why use knowledge that has been tested and found valid in one context, and then use that thinking in a different context where practices have a different aim? Cohn (2013) argues that the reason for why it is logical from a practicalist perspective to use maternal thinking in security issues is that the aims

of national security practices can be questioned. Are the aims achieved, or is it possible that the practices serve another goal?

Cohn (2013) argues for the use of Ruddick's theory of maternal thinking in security practices, as it explores how discourses in national security take for granted specific suppositions regarding vulnerability and safety, which then as a result have now become naturalized in security discourses. Cohn's analysis demonstrates that when countries take measures to increase national security, they do so while believing that they can control future possible threats and that their country will not perish one day. Maternal thinking is based on contrasting assumptions, and therefore we can ask ourselves, what can we learn about security practices and policies, if we accept the proposition of limited control and certain death of a country? In her article, Cohn (2013) focuses mostly on vulnerability and compares who is perceived as vulnerable in maternal thinking and in national security. In maternal thinking it is the human child, the mother's other, but security practices reveal that human vulnerability is barely ever recognised. Instead the attention is on the weakness of weapons, which human bodies are also perceived as. The 'other' in international security is the enemy, which is not necessarily viewed as vulnerable, but if they are, their weakness is to be exploited. Cohn (2013) therefore suggests that it is beneficial for countries to admit their own weaknesses, as mothers do according to Ruddick's theory, and this has not made mothers any more discouraged than before. Instead mothers have developed their own way of thinking about mothering, resulting in developing new methods for parenting and always thinking about which one is most appropriate in a specific situation. Thus countries that accept the impossibility of achieving complete control can also use some of the methods familiar to mothers, like scrutinising, or end up with developing their own. The scrutinising glaze is present in, for instance, American security practices, but without metaphysical humility. Thus American security practices have irrationally been guided by fears of the worst-case scenario, as the question of how likely a threat is to happen has been ignored. Moreover, focusing on worst-case scenarios also blocks out the opportunity to use more empathetic means to increase a nation's security. On other words, security discourses have been influenced by abstract thinking rather than concrete thinking. Cohn further notes that:

“Critically, maternal thinking about control not only sees its limits but also, and perhaps even more importantly for thinking about state security, incorporates an awareness of the damages (to self and other) created by the attempt to control that which cannot be

controlled or to make invulnerable that which simply can never be made perfectly safe” (2013: 57).

The quest for ultimate control can have consequences for oneself. In fact, Cohn (2013) claims that security practices are counterproductive and that the obtained safety from national security is merely an illusion, as security practices have had a weakness of too often being blind to the multiple factors that affect a country’s safety. One example are nuclear weapons, which have been produced due to countries’ requests to be stronger than others, however the obtainment of nuclear weapons has instead made these countries more vulnerable than ever before. When a country invests in being militarily stronger than others, other countries will desire to match the same level of strength, and thus the country becomes more vulnerable than before the advancement of strength, as other countries now have improved in military power too and can, in case of war, employ even greater damage to the country. The longing for military superiority has now led to a world where several countries are in control of nuclear power, which most likely and hopefully will never be used, as these weapons are simply too great to actually use in warfare. According to Cohn (2013), nuclear power is now mostly a source of political power, and not of military power or safety. This example shows how security practices can be counterproductive, but also how fragile countries’ control over future possible threats have become or is becoming. Maternal thinking instead rejects the idea of complete control and anticipates eventual death, but even so it does not let these fears influence its current decision making process, which countries’ decisions regarding national security have been swayed by. Maternal thinking used in security practices could lead to new alternative and more rational ways of preparing for realistic and probable dangers (Cohn 2013). Finally, since the focus of this paper are strategic narratives, the next section will focus on maternal narratives and the virtues that mothers have to follow in order to tell useful and credible stories.

Maternal Narratives

Both politicians and mothers tell stories that they can stand by, however Ruddick (1989) argues that politicians’ stories are often over edited which ruins the usefulness of a story. The usefulness of a story consists of children and mothers being able to find a shared understanding of their past and accept it. This also helps children to adapt and create their own life stories. However, according to Ruddick (1989) maternal narratives should contain three concepts: realism, compassion and delight. Therefore mothers should not try to tell story that are joyful to the extent that they become unbelievable and fake, as even children ask for stories that are believable by involving information

about the negative parts of life. “*When falsely cheerful, overedited stories, are taken to heart, they make for false selves. [...] Children cannot rely on stories if, because of secretiveness or denial, they are riddled with inconsistencies and silly cheeriness*” (Ruddick 1989: 98-99). The mother needs to be received as an honest being, and this can be achieved by even informing about the memories that one is less proud of. However, because children are not capable of understanding everything, if they are too young, it is therefore important for mothers to know what information to share and what to withhold. Since children may not get told all of the details of an event, they can easily distort the story, as they can see through its contradictions. Children thus also need to be able to trust the mother’s good will and her honesty. Children’s trust in a mother’s narratives can be increased, if the stories embrace both their “*anger, their mutual or separate failure, their regret, loss and shame*” (Ruddick 1989: 99). Negative emotions should not be ignored or denied, as children need to remember these stories realistically, but also to be able to forgive (Ruddick 1989).

Compassion, as the second element of Ruddick’s (1989) descriptions of good maternal narratives, refers to a narrator’s compassion with the actors of the story and their (moral) troubles. This means that the mother is actively searching for solutions to the actor’s problems, and not just standing by. Furthermore, an actor’s faults are perceived as human traits and not imperfections that are inherently theirs. Therefore mothers’ stories include a sympathetic understanding and forgiveness of actor’s mistakes, as mothers tell stories that highlight that she or he is always on the child’s side, even if the child’s behaviour is intimidating to themselves. Maternal narratives need to include an array of emotions, but also a mother’s sympathy and compassion towards their children, even when they are in the wrong. This leads to the third concept of maternal narratives; delight in the form of a mother being delighted about their children’s success. Ruddick (1989) writes that mothers are obviously more easily delighted about a child’s accomplishments, if that child is unusually more restricted from achieving success compared to ordinary children. Yet when the average child accomplishes something, mothers can forget to be thrilled by it. When children are young, it can be difficult to recognise what or when one should be proud of a child, as children can sometimes accomplish or be excited by something that adults may not perceive as special. For instance, if a child shows off its collection of rocks or magic tricks, adults are required to be curious, patient and imaginative in order to appreciate it. As children grow older, their peculiar tastes may become weird to a mother, but differentiations of a mother’s and a child’s perspective of morality can also put a stop to a mother’s delightedness (Ruddick 1989).

Ruddick (1989) argues that many mothers can probably recognise these three parts or virtues of maternal narratives, but without possessing them. These virtues are also a struggle, as mothers, for example, can be tempted to tell untrue stories with the intention of keeping secrets, punishing or manipulating their children. Though mothers should be able to identify these three features, it can take a longer period of time for them to realise this, and they may only identify some parts of the three virtues.

Methodology

This chapter will describe in depth the method used in the analysis and the methodological choices made. First, the empirical and theoretical choices will be explained and later the method behind the analysis of strategic narratives.

Reflections about the Collection of Verbal Statements

The data used in the project has been gathered from different references, mainly from news channels' own profiles on YouTube or Vučić's own YouTube profile. The data therefore consists of different videotapes of the politicians' speeches, press conferences or interviews. What is common for all of the videos is that they have at some time been shown on national Serbian or Bosnian TV channels. As mentioned earlier, the data is from June 8, 2015 to July 11, 2017. As the neutrality of different types of media can be questioned, I have therefore chosen to use both Serbian and Bosnian references as well as media channels that are mixed regarding the employees' ethnicity.

As Aleksandar Vučić has his own official profile on YouTube, it has therefore been easier to find relevant data with full speeches or press conferences of his. However, Dodik on the other hand does not seem to have any official profiles on social media, therefore some of his speeches, press conferences or interviews come mainly from other sources such as Serbian or Bosnian media or even Vučić's YouTube profile. As a consequence, some of the data used to analyse Dodik's narratives about Srebrenica, does not contain the full speech or press conference, and therefore the analysis may miss or misinterpret some of Dodik's important statements about the Srebrenica massacre, as they have lost some of their context. Since Dodik's verbal statements are statements that have been aired on TV channels, the statements may therefore be biased, as TV producers have chosen which part of his speeches should be shown. There is a possibility that some of his statements may have been chosen to be shown on TV, if they were more interesting or provocative.

Furthermore, not all data found from the time frame that I use has been included in this project due to repetitiveness, but also if a particular video does not seem to come from a reliable source. Some videos have also been left out, as I have tried to identify important happenings related to Srebrenica from June 2015 to July 2017. This means that some data has been left out, as the importance of it was lacking. I have identified several events that have had a greater coverage than other events, and therefore I have focused on Vučić's and Dodik's statements about specific events during my time frame.

In 2015 many things happened that were related to the Srebrenica massacre. The UN proposed a resolution about the Srebrenica massacre, naming it genocide against Bosniaks, but Russia vetoed against the resolution (UN News Centre n.d.). On July 11, 2015 Vučić attended the 20th national Memorial Day for the atrocity in Srebrenica. However, he was attacked by the crowd, as people starting throwing stuff at him, before he even managed to get to the scene to hold a speech. In November 2015 a conference was held in Srebrenica with the purpose of increasing the economic development in the city. In the Spring of 2016, the trial against Radovan Karadzic ended, and Karadzic was found guilty of war crimes in the former Yugoslavian war, including the massacre in Srebrenica. These are some of the highlights related to Srebrenica that I have selected to focus on in this paper. Apart from these there are also data that contains statements related to general questions about Srebrenica from June 8 2015 to July 11 2017. For instance data produced around the July 11, the Day of Remembrance of the Srebrenica Massacre.

Theoretical Reflections

Milorad Dodik's and Aleksandar Vučić's narratives will be analysed using denial theory, particularly Stanley Cohen's perspective on denial, which he has elaborated in his book, *States of Denial*, from 2001. Understanding denial is important regarding this paper, as the focus is on the Srebrenica massacre, which many Serbs still deny or do not view the happening in Srebrenica as genocide, or they are confused about what really took place there during the war (Ramet 2007). However, some research also suggests that Serbian silence about the mass killings in Srebrenica tends to be interpreted as a type of denial of the event, even though it may also be a sign of acceptance and guilt (Obradović-Wochnik 2013). Nonetheless, both Dodik and Vučić have made statements about the atrocity in Srebrenica and both deny that it should be labelled as genocide, which will be later elaborated on. Denial theory can therefore aid in the understanding of why some Serbs deny the event, even though the ICTY has determined that the Srebrenica massacre as a war crime. Furthermore, Ramet (2007) uses Cohen's conceptualisation of denial to define the denial syndrome, which is a notion that is specifically founded on Serbian denial that has emerged during recent decades, although it is not exclusive to Serbs only. The denial syndrome is therefore useful in the analysis, as it can describe Vučić's and Dodik's narratives from a more corresponding theoretical point of view, whereas Cohen's (2001) theory is a more extensive theory based on denial in different cultural settings throughout different times. In other words, Ramet's concept contextualises Cohen's broader denial theory to Serbian denial and warfare.

Maternal thinking can, on the other hand, be used to criticise or support Serbian narratives regarding the Srebrenica massacre, as it offers insight into how political leaders should think and behave regarding security issues and international relations, since it criticises political practices that are based on specific premises that are impossible to uphold such as perfect control of threats and dangers. Regarding the focus of this paper, maternal thinking can inquire whether or not Dodik and Vučić make statements about Srebrenica or regional affairs that are based on the assumptions of mothering, which according to Carol Cohn (2013) and Sara Ruddick (1990) are more beneficial than politics that disregard these assumptions, as they can lead to opposite and undesirable effects. The premises of maternal thinking, if followed, can prevent future mistakes. Another reason, why I chose to research Serbian narratives through the lens of mothering is due to the fact that I have not been able to find any other study that uses maternal thinking to analyse Serbian narratives (or similar projects), and therefore I wanted to investigate, if this theory could help me discover new findings about Serbian politics.

Strategic Narratives

The following section will explain what strategic narratives are, the importance of researching narratives, the different types of strategic narrative analyses and how the analysis of this paper will unfold in a later chapter. I will use the framework laid out by Miskimmon, O’Loughlin and Roselle as the groundwork for my analysis, since I will be examining strategic narratives with the help of the method they refer to as ‘thin’ analysis.

The Use of Narratives

“*Communication and power are the touchstones for the study of strategic narrative*” (Miskimmon, O’Loughlin and Roselle 2017: 1). With these words Alister Miskimmon, Ben O’Loughlin and Laura Roselle (2017) start the introduction in their book, *Forging the World*, which describes four different methods for studying strategic narratives. They argue that there is a need for understanding actors’ strategic narratives, as this will help shed light on influence and power relations, as power is not merely obtained through force, but also through coercion – viewed as an essential part of soft power – and it “*is increasingly important in a period when the global rules of international order are being reshaped with the rise of new powers*” (Miskimmon, O’Loughlin and Roselle 2017: 2). Lawrence Freedman described in 2006 how narratives could be used to counter military opponents, but since then the study field of strategic narrative has expanded and is now being used to analyse different issues within international relations. However, communication can have both a positive and negative affect. For instance, China and USA, two of the largest economies in the world with different economic systems, may in the future either have a worsened or improved relationship depending on whether or not they are able to create a common strategic narrative between the two and keep working on it. From this aspect communication is important, and it can be beneficial for both parties, but sometimes it can be viewed as bad, if it is used for accomplishing selfish goals (Miskimmon, O’Loughlin and Roselle 2017). In this case, Miskimmon and O’Loughlin (2014) highlight Vladimir Putin’s blatant propaganda to distract the attention of Western media from the war in Ukraine, but also to make Western media seem more unreliable.

Apart from understanding power relations and influence, strategic narratives can also give insight into political actors’ identity, how they use narratives to coerce others in order to realise their objectives, and how they influence the audience’s understanding of threats in international relations. Strategic narratives can also help oppressed groups challenge dominant groups’ power and

behaviour, but also how dominant actors or states are bound by their own narratives. Narratives can also show how others narrate about your own country or organisation, and the impact of political actor's narratives on others (Miskimmon, O'Loughlin and Roselle 2017).

Nonetheless, researching strategic narratives can be difficult for several reasons. First, it is impossible to have perfect communication, therefore sometimes different actors' interests are bound to clash, and also just being exposed to a narrative does not necessarily mean that there will be an agreement later. Secondly, causality is problematic to clarify accurately. In this regard, one may need to simplify relationships to be able to prove some connection and influence of strategic narratives. Another reason is the possibility of creating undesirable effects. An international audience can become aware of the inconsistencies between a state's declarations and actions, hence increasing a negative attitude towards the country. If the citizens of the country then find out that others have a negative opinion about their country, their opinions about foreigners may become more negative. Fourth, there is also the possibility of political actors not having any strategy, as they may not have defined intents. However, even if they do have clear ambitions they may not know exactly what effects they are going for (Miskimmon, O'Loughlin and Roselle 2017). Finally, exploring the impact of narratives properly can be hard to undertake, as it is difficult to find out how many people are exposed to a specific narrative, or if people are open minded or rejecting when they are exposed to them. Also, there is a lack of yearly qualitative research of the general audience's reaction and understanding of world politics, as very few organisations conduct these often enough (Miskimmon and O'Loughlin 2014).

Definition of Strategic Narratives

Miskimmon, O'Loughlin and Roselle (2017) base their definition of narratives on Shaul Shenhav's strategies for defining narratives. Shenhav states that analyses of narratives are typically focused on the time sequence, but also on causality, attempts at resolutions and the idea that events are related and should not be seen as occurring randomly. Likewise they also focus on Kenneth Burke's definition on narratives, as he argues that people are making, using and abusing symbols. Therefore Miskimmon, O'Loughlin and Roselle's definition (2017) of narratives is concentrated on the actor, scene, act, agency and purpose, as they write that through strategic narratives actors try to create a shared understanding of the past, present and future, hoping that their narratives will influence both domestic as well as international actors.

More precisely, an *actor* is the character that is important to the narrative, as an actor has the power to shape it. In addition, an actor is also bound by the narrative, as pursuing and shaping narratives creates expectations. Hence actors' interests and behaviour are limited within the scope of the narrative (Roselle et al. 2014). Aleksandar Vučić and Milorad Dodik are two diplomats, who do have enough power to influence narratives in former Yugoslavia, as they are currently both presidents in their countries. Furthermore, regarding political actors Miskimmon, O'Loughlin and Roselle write that they "*attempt to create a shared understanding of the world, of other political actors, and of policy through the use of strategic narratives. The hope for these political actors is that strong narratives will triumph over counternarratives, that legitimacy will be strengthened, that power will be heightened*" (2017: 1). The analysis of this project will therefore contain a focus on the aspects mentioned in the quote.

The *setting* is described as the perspective on the international system, i.e. how the world is depicted (e.g. as full of enemies or of possibilities for international cooperation?) and who is perceived to be the important players in the setting (Roselle et al. 2014). The analysis will accordingly also look into the actors' perception of the international system and its important actors. In this regard, it is important to be aware of what time one is focusing on, as the international system and actors change over time, therefore the analysis will also look into *acts* and their impact on narratives through time. Past events have developed present narratives, but the past and the present also give grounds to understand and identify possible threats in the future. Therefore it is important to examine the political actors' understanding of what is threatening, and how they plan to protect themselves from and solve future dangerous situations (Roselle et al. 2014).

Srebrenica is still a case that affects the present politics in and between Bosnia and Serbia, so consequently the analysis will look into Vučić and Dodik's view on Srebrenica and what they warn about from 2015 to 2017, and if they already now have solutions to future conflicts or dangers. In this matter, *purpose* or resolutions are the link between thought and action, as they emphasise what is acceptable behaviour to solve conflicts or behaviour that has the intention of breaking the status quo (Roselle et al. 2014). This means that the analysis will also include a focus on Vučić and Dodik's perception of appropriate behaviour regarding conflict management and resolution.

Miskimmon, O'Loughlin and Roselle (2017) differentiate between strategic narratives at three different levels; system, identity and issue narratives. System narratives explain how the world is organised, i.e. how the international system works and who the important actors are within it,

meanwhile identity narratives describe political actors' history, values and intentions. Issue narratives focus on the importance and implementation of policies and on why policies are normatively desirable. Moreover, they “*set political actions in a context, with an explanation of who the important actors are, what the conflict or issue is, and how a particular course of action will resolve the underlying issue*” (Miskimmon, O’Loughlin and Roselle 2017: 8). It is important to note that these narratives, although different, are linked together, as they should not be seen entirely separated from each other, since they can affect each other. If narratives are contradicting each other at these different levels, the impact of them on the audience will lessen, as the effectivity and reliability of the narratives will suffer from contradictions (Miskimmon, O’Loughlin and Roselle 2017).

Miskimmon, O’Loughlin and Roselle (2017) have developed a spectrum of persuasion that explains four different types of strategic narrative analyses, which will be described later, and how they can help researchers look into system, identity and issue narratives. However, the spectrum of persuasion also demands that each type of analysis focuses on the formation, projection and reception of narratives. Researching the formation of strategic narratives involves exploring how narratives are created, i.e. what role do political actors have when creating new narratives, and which institutions have influence on narratives? Understanding the projection of a narrative involves tracking, how narratives are portrayed and challenged in the media, while the reception of a narrative encompasses how the average person understands and views narratives, but also how far the narratives can reach. Regarding formation, projection and reception of strategic narratives one needs to understand how media ecologies work and how their influence on the formation, projection and reception (Miskimmon, O’Loughlin and Roselle 2017).

Each of the four approaches on the spectrum has a different view on media ecology, which Miskimmon, O’Loughlin and Roselle (2017) define as the interaction of different types of media technologies that can be explored as an organic life-form. The environment of the different types of media is described as balanced, signifying that the relationships between them is complex, and any rapid or major changes will affect the entire environment. In this regard, it is important to note that “*Since this ecology is the condition that shapes how information flows and knowledge is spread through a society, a changing ecology affects the distribution and form of authority, legitimacy and – ultimately – power*” (Miskimmon, O’Loughlin and Roselle 2017: 10). Media ecologies around the world are not the same due to the fact that some governments, for instance, do not offer freedom of

speech to their journalists or their citizens. Therefore different media ecologies will create different possibilities for political actors to narrate about specific matters, and therefore it is important to have in mind what kind of media ecology is in place in a specific society (Miskimmon, O’Loughlin and Roselle 2017). Next the four positions on the spectrum of persuasion will be described in detail.

The Spectrum of Persuasion

O’Loughlin, Miskimmon and Roselle (2017) set out a spectrum ranging from thin to thick analysis, where thin analyses are characterised by taking actors for granted and looking into their rational claims to find out which actor’s rational claims have been able to make the biggest impact on the final decisions. Thick analyses focus on how history and narratives shape understandings of the world, states, actors, and how these meanings influence political debates.

O’Loughlin, Miskimmon and Roselle (2017) distinguish between four different types of positions on the spectrum; very thin (Rationalist Analysis), thin (Study of Communicative Action), thick (Reflexive Communication) and very thick (Poststructural Analysis). Rationalist Analysis claims that only the observable should be analysed, i.e. the announcements that political actors say in public and how they try to persuade or bargain with others – sometimes even trapping others into doing what they otherwise would not, hence persuasion is not always about trying to create a shared understanding of the world. Furthermore, different actors have different levels of power and opportunities to control others’ knowledge and behaviour. The Rationalist Analysis is seeking to find correlation or even causal relations between variables such as the final decisions made, the public view of the issue, clarity of a narrative’s projection etc. However, rationalist studies do not try to understand what made an actor change their opinion or behaviour, as this is not possible to find out, since it would be necessary to get in-depth knowledge of what an actor was really thinking and still thinks about an issue. Instead it is only possible to analyse which arguments won over in the public debates and influenced the final choices, meaning private interviews with political actors is not seen as reliable data, as *“All that is possible is to analyze the frames actors use in public”* (O’Loughlin, Miskimmon and Roselle 2017: 28)

The thin analysis, Study of Communicative Action, focus on political actors’ convincing claims and on the nature of media ecology viewed as a public sphere which may overlap with transnational public spheres. Media ecology is not considered to be a neutral space, as unconvincing statement fade away. From the perspective of thin analysis there are two types of persuasion, either through

strategic action (influencing behaviour through force) or communicative action, where political actors see each other as equals and try to reach a shared understanding of what should be done. This means that when two countries are trying to reach an agreement through communicative action, they need to be open-minded and keep back their individual interests in order to let themselves get influenced by convincing claims. This type of persuasion can last years and “*Much of this is played out in public, as leaders make regular statements about national strategy and policy ambitions that are debated in domestic media, clear for all to see in other countries*” O’Loughlin, Miskimmon and Roselle 2017: 30).

The difference between Rationalist Analysis and Communicative Action is that thin analysis puts attention on how actors are being socialised and create a shared identity (or at least improve others’ view upon them) and moreover on the period before and after negotiation. However, Communicative Action does not become thick “*because at the start of analysis all players are still taken to be coherent, rational actors with relatively stable preferences and identities*” (O’Loughlin, Miskimmon and Roselle 2017: 30). Another difference between thin and very thin analyses is that thin research can rely on data such as interviews and memoirs, but in this regard O’Loughlin, Miskimmon and Roselle (2017) argue that, though Rationalist Analysis would disregard this type of data, it is still valuable information and that ignoring it would mean to reject important findings just for the mere possibility that some of the data could be compromised.

Reflexive Communication holds the notion that actors are reflexive, since they observe each other’s actions and communication, resulting in them learning how to gain control over others’ emotional states. Actors worry about their reputation, as their status can be exploited by others. If an actor’s narratives and role get confronted and, as a result the actor’s identity and reliability weakens, the actor may need to create a new narrative and role about themselves. This means that actors do not only rely on rational or convincing claims, but also have to be able to deal with sometimes unpredictable and unintentional challenges in the media ecologies, where their identities or roles in the political system are at stake. The same accounts for when political actors make statements about their country, as these narratives create a national identity or Self, which they afterwards try to live up to through policymaking. The Self is therefore vulnerable, as it is dependent upon other people’s opinions, thus actors are not only interested in maximising and capitalising on their material interests. Due to these vulnerabilities less powerful states gain an advantage, as they can put pressure on more powerful states by emphasising when their behaviour is conflicting with their

identity narratives, making the powerful actors lose face in public. This makes the analysis more complicated, as it stresses the importance of what is not only said or written, but also on what can be felt or sensed, and, moreover, the analysis should use hour-by-hour or day-by-day based data to understand, how actors make sure to become a part of the news and stay relevant in the media. However, it should be noted that although the actors follow the logic behind different types of media to accomplish this, they are also subjected to the logics of international relations, i.e. to minimize security threats, enhance state interests, legitimise desirable norms and so forth. A smart actor is thus an actor that knows how to gain advantage from using the logics behind both different media forms and international affairs (O’Loughlin, Miskimmon and Roselle 2017).

The Poststructural Analysis is based on the view that societies contain different discourses such as religious discourse or news discourse, and each discourse regulates what shall be said by whom, and what is considered to be the truth. As a result, these discourses, which surface over longer time periods and change slowly, “*produce populations with certain identities, norms, and common-sense ideas*” O’Loughlin, Miskimmon and Roselle 2017: 37). This also applies to political discourses, which determine what type of political actors and policies exist and how people debate, as “*Poststructural accounts of international relations theorize that politics is made up of discourse – systems of power/knowledge made manifest in institutions, practices, and language*” (O’Loughlin, Miskimmon and Roselle 2017: 36-37). Furthermore, it is believed that political actors are products of the same discourse, but also that their power cannot be compared to each other, since existing discourses have determined what positions are available in society. Their identities and narratives are constructed upon these discourses, but the actors do have some possibility to be creative, when producing their narratives and identities, otherwise the present would just be a repetition of the past. Major events in the world like the terrorist attack on 9/11 can be an opportunity for political actors to change their narratives and be strategic, and this is what a Poststructural Analysis can demonstrate (O’Loughlin, Miskimmon and Roselle 2017).

O’Loughlin, Miskimmon and Roselle (2017) argue that the different positions on the spectrum should be treated equally; none is more scientific than the other, as all four types of analyses offer transparency regarding the research questions, data, how conclusions were derived and, if open to the public, are possible to get evaluated by other experts. Regarding this paper, the Study of Communicative Action will be used to analyse Vučić’s and Dodik’s verbal statements, as this project seeks to understand how they in recent years have been trying to convince and socialise

others regarding Srebrenica to have their narratives triumph over others. However, the intention is not to look into, how Dodik or Vučić try to stay relevant in the media, or how they control other's emotional states, which using the thick analysis would have led to. Also, in the past, both Vučić and Dodik had different views regarding Srebrenica and Bosnia than what they have been expressing in recent years (Kovacevic 2007; Dnevnik.hr 2008), however in recent years their political identity has been more or less the same, therefore the actors are perceived to have a rather stable identity.

Interviewing

As mentioned earlier, Miskimmon, O'Loughlin and Roselle (2013) argue that it is important to research people's reactions to strategic narratives to understand how they view the world, yet they criticise how rarely this is ever done. However, as I have not been able to find any relevant research that focuses on Bosniaks responses to Dodik's and Vučić's narratives, I have therefore created my own interview guide in order to be able to get an insight into the possible responses. Though Miskimmon, O'Loughlin and Roselle (2017) argue that this should be done yearly, I have chosen to work with an interview guide based on an experimental cross-sectional design. This entails that the variables will be presented one at a time, in order to make it possible for the researcher to compare the reactions to each variable (Bryman 2012). For this project, the informants were handed written verbal statements from the past two years as a substitute for the missing data of people's understandings of world politics and reactions to strategic narratives.

Interview Guide

The interview guide can be found as Appendix 1 in Bosnian with English translations. Before the interview started, each informant was informed about their rights throughout the interview. They were told that it would be anonymous, they could take a break, skip questions or stop the interview at any time etc. They were also informed about the project and structure of the interview guide in general terms. I also ensured them that this was not a quiz, but an interview, thus they should not be concerned with whether or not their answers were correct. Instead they should try to be as honest as possible.

The interview guide consists of three different parts. The first part aids in getting an impression of the informants background knowledge about regional politics and Srebrenica, while it also serves the function of getting the informant relaxed. At the start I asked very general questions about the politics in Bosnia and the political situation in the region. Afterwards, I also asked questions about Srebrenica, as this was a more sensitive topic. The second and third part contain short extractions of Vučić's and Dodik's verbal statements that I have gathered from June 2015 until July 2017. The statements have been chosen on the requirements from which year they originate from, and how often similar statements are made. Still, some extractions of their statements have also been chosen, if they contained new or different arguments with the aim of getting a wider collection of their statements. In other words, my intention was to ensure that they were exposed to statements from

2015, 2016 and 2017. Secondly, the statements should be representative of Vučić's and Dodik's general narratives, therefore they were chosen on how often the similar arguments appeared in their speeches. However, all the statements had to contain an element of something new, so that the informants were not exposed to the similar statements all the time. This would probably lead to the same answers given, and the informant would probably start to get bored eventually of reading similar texts and replying the same. Each statement was presented one at a time on a piece of paper, unless if the informant wanted me to read them out loud. Furthermore, after each part I asked the informants, if they had any comments or questions, before we move on.

The interview guide is semi structured, meaning that questions have been prepared beforehand, however with the possibility to ask impulsive questions along the way. Both the second and third part contain background questions about Dodik and Vučić, which I asked in the beginning to find out what impression they had of them, before I introduced them to their statements. After each statement was presented, I asked basically the same questions, "*What do you think about this statement?*" "*And do you agree?*". Then I asked questions about each specific main argument in the statement to get them to elaborate further on their answers, so that I could get a better insight into their reactions of the statements. After finishing all of Vučić's statements, I asked again about the informant's general impression of him like I did at the very beginning, so that I could compare the answers. The same accounts for Dodik. Finally, at the end I asked about the informant's general impression of Serbian politics, what they agree or disagree with the most and their perception of what the future holds. As a closure of the interview I ended with briefly asking them about their origin, educational background, job and civil status. For each question asked, I always tried to ask in a neutral way, for example by asking "*Do you agree or disagree..*" in order to avoid my questions leading them to give a specific answers. However, if they already answered a question, before I even asked about it, I would sometimes ask "*So you think that..*" just to confirm that I had understood them correctly.

Informants

The goal was to interview informants from Republic of Srpska, as Srebrenica is located there and Dodik is the president of the entity, therefore I chose to focus on this part. The informants that I interviewed all come from the northern part of Srpska, but some of them have been born elsewhere. Their profiles can be found in the analysis, before their responses are analysed, as I will not be going into details about each informant here. Yet it should be noted that some of the informants do

live outside of Bosnia, as I was not able to find enough willing participants, however I did try to find participants, who at least stayed for a long period of time in Republic Srpska and visited as often as possible. Though before I had my interview guide ready, I did have several interested people, but when I was ready to interview, some of them declined, as they were then busy with work or not able to participate due to personal issues. It came as a surprise for many, when they heard that the interview would last about 45 minutes. Several had expected the interview would last about 5-10 minutes. Also, I found that asking the youth and females to participate in an interview was more difficult than I assumed, as they were not interested in politics to begin with and therefore did not understand why I should interview them. Moreover, the informants are all people that I knew from beforehand, as the people who knew me were easier to persuade to participate.

Regarding the pilot interview, I did not change much about the interview guide, as the questions were understandable by the informant, but I did notice that some statements were superficial, and removed them. However, these were removed, before I presented them to the informant, therefore the pilot interview has been transcribed and is part of the five interviews that I have completed in total for this project. I interviewed three men and two women of varying ages, as my goal was to interview as many with as different backgrounds as possible. I was originally going for at least six interviews, i.e. three men and three women representing different generations.

Transcriptions

Steinar Kvale and Sven Brinkmann (2009) have described numerous difficulties regarding the validity and reliability of a transcription in their book, *InterView*. One struggle of transcribing an oral work is linked to the perception of the final written text. Transforming verbal statements into written ones can influence the way these statements are received and understood by the readers, as the oral language has its own set of rules that are different from and difficult to implement in the written text. For instance, the use of irony in a verbal statement is likely to get lost, once the statement is transcribed. Transcriptions are, in this sense, hybrids of different oral and written constructions or genres that may not fully meet the expectations of either construction. There is a phrasing that claims that ‘translators are traitors’, and the same can be said about transcribers, as the procedure of transcription is also already an interpretation process. Not only is it the rules of the oral language that risks disappearing, but body language and the tone and tempo of the verbal announcements can disappear as well. Although transcribers can add brackets that emphasise when something should be read as ironic, when there was a pause, or what the speakers body language

was like at the time they said something (Kvale and Brinkmann 2009). In my transcriptions I have only added brackets describing the informant's body language, if this was relevant or if they changed their mood dramatically.

Another dilemma regarding transcriptions, which Kvale and Brinkmann (2009) mention, is related to how one should transcribe, which there are no universal answers for, but there are some choices that every transcriber has to make. For example, should every word and sound be written, even if they are repetitive and may make the transcription less coherent and intelligible? Writing every word and sound can be considered positive, as one can argue that it improves the reliability of a transcription that was written with the intention of being as precise as possible. However, the problem lies in the possibility of ending up with a text that is not very fluent, creating the impression of the speaker as less intelligent and not very good at speaking the language, which makes the transcription less valid. The same argument applies for the layout of the transcription, as it can create an impact that one is either reading a boring and stupid text or that one is reading a poem, and this can affect the validity of the transcription, as the transcription hence impacts the interpretation of the text. Kvale and Brinkmann further warn about an ethical problem that can arise from this particular dilemma with transcriptions: "*Vær opmærksom på, at offentliggørelse af usammenhængende, ordrette interviewudskrifter præget af gentagelser kan medføre en uetisk stigmatisering af bestemte personer eller befolkningsgrupper*" (2009: 210 italics in original). This quote describes the risk of stigmatisation of individuals of specific groups, if the transcription is worded so correctly after the verbal speeches that it creates an incomprehensible text, which makes the speaker seem irrational (Kvale and Brinkmann 2009). I transcribed with the intention of being as close to the right wording, unless if the final sentence was not understandable. In that case I would try to change as little as possible in order to make it understandable. I also tried to make the layout look professional, where the informants' statements were written as an ordinary text, so this would not give the impression of a poem. However, I also set up the layout to give the reader an easy overview of the transcription, hopefully to keep the reader's attention on the text. One thing that should be mentioned regarding the layout is that the text in italics are the respondents answers, so that their answers are easier to distinguish from my questions.

Kvale and Brinkmann (2009) also add that the reliability of a transcription depends on where the transcriber adds commas and periods, as these can change the understanding of a sentence. For example, if a sentence ends with "you know" it is usually used by the speaker as a confirmation of

what they just said, but it is not necessarily suggesting that the listener actually knows something. However, if the period in a transcription was placed before the 'you know' then it could be the beginning of another sentence that indicates that the listener knows something. The function and meaning behind these two words therefore depends on where and what type of punctuation is used. So how can one know, when a transcription is reliable? According to Kvale and Brinkmann (2009) there is no objective truth that can determine what a transcription should look like to make it reliable, but they reason that it is up to the researcher to choose what works best for their study. I decided to not include pauses in my transcriptions, unless if avoiding the pause makes the transcription more difficult to understand. Sometimes people make a break and start a new sentence, before they have finished what they wanted to say, and as a result the transcription would end up more confusing, if the break was not emphasised in the transcription. Furthermore, I added the commas and periods, where I assume would be the most natural place to put by listening to the recording and trying to figure out, where the informant holds a short pause.

Analysis

The analysis consists of three parts; Vučić's and Dodik's analysis of strategic narratives and finally Bosniaks' reactions to these narratives.

Analysis of Vučić's Strategic Narratives

In the following, Alexander Vučić's strategic narratives will be described and analysed in relation to the theories used in this paper. His main arguments are focused on the reconciliation process between Serbs and Bosniaks, as he considers that there is only one way to overcome the former and current hatred or hurt feelings between the two ethnicities caused by past conflicts in the last century.

Vučić's Perception of the (Inter)national System and Its Actors

From June 8, 2015, until July 11, 2017, Vučić has expressed, who the important regional or international actors are, but also which of these are Serbia's close partners or, at least, who Serbia is interested in working with in the future, and which actors have questionable intentions to the region or Serbia. Republic Srpska is, unsurprisingly, considered to be a very close actor. Republic Srpska is such a close friend of Serbia that Vučić has said that there is no need to even spend words on explaining their relationship (Aleksandar Vučić 2015c), as this is obvious to everyone (TV1 HD 2015). However, he did state that Serbia and Republic Srpska would have a hard time thriving without each other, and therefore it is important that Republic Srpska and Serbia continue their great cooperation in the future (Aleksandar Vučić 2015c).

Regarding other regional actors such as Bosnian presidents, Majke Srebrenice (Mothers of Srebrenica) and Čamil Duraković (mayor of Srebrenica at the time) Vučić is interesting in meeting and cooperating with them, and his condolences go to Majke Srebrenice and other people, who have been affected by the atrocity in Srebrenica (Aleksandar Vučić 2015a). Vučić has specifically said in 2015 that Duraković can count on support from Serbia (Aleksandar Vučić 2015d), and in 2016 that he will always be able to converse with Duraković (Srbija uzivo! 2016). In other words, all of the regional players that Vučić has mentioned from June 2015 to July 2017 have all been actors, whom he respects and wants to continue working with. Regarding the issue of Srebrenica, Vučić is trying to improve the relationship with Bosniak and Bosnian actors.

Out of international actors, Russia - who vetoed against the Resolution about Srebrenica – is considered to be a close ally, as they did not let Serbia become the only country in the world (apart from Rwanda) accused of committing genocide. Russia is depicted as a great power, whom Serbia cannot demand anything from, and therefore Vučić argues that Russia chose to veto against the resolution, because of their respect towards their relationship with Serbia. Vučić further adds that this is rarely done in the world, and that it has only happened twice on the Balkans so far, if he remembers correctly (Aleksandar Vučić 2015a). In this regard, Vučić is thankful to other countries, i.e. China, Venezuela and Angola among others, as well, who have helped out Serbia (Aleksandar Vučić 2015a).

In the Spring of 2017, Vučić expressed great respect towards Angela Merkel as a political actor, as he said that “*Mrs. Merkel is a very rational, serious and responsible woman. She knows exactly what it is needed to push thing forward, and that is the economy*” (Vučić in Dnevni Avaz TV: 17:27, my translation). Her suggestions for how to improve the regional stability are aligning with his, as she focuses on economic development as a key to increase regional stability, but this will be explained later, when Vučić’s solutions to regional problems are presented. Vučić has also shown interest in overcoming former barriers with political actors that Serbia has not earlier had a good relationship with, as he decided to meet with Bill Clinton in 2016. Vučić claims that he was heavily criticised in Serbia, as people could not understand, why he wanted to meet with Clinton, when Bill Clinton was the American president during the former Yugoslavian war, when NATO member countries decided to attack Serbia (Srbija uzivo! 2016).

On the other hand, in 2015 Vučić articulated a very negative view of the United Nation’s Security Council, as he argues that they (with their proposal about the Resolution about Srebrenica) never tried to “*secure understanding, forgiveness, respect and a normal life*” (Vučić in Aleksandar Vučić 2015a: 00:40, my translation), instead it would have increased the hate among different ethnicities in the Western Balkans. Moreover, Serbia would not be able to fight for peace and regional stability, if the Serbian people were labelled as evil-doers. The Security Council was labelled as ‘rubbish’ by him (Aleksandar Vučić 2015a). The great powers that sought UN’s Security Council’s consent to the Resolution about Srebrenica intended to ‘break’ and ‘humiliate’ Serbia (Aleksandar Vučić 2015b), though Vučić does not directly state who the great powers are, Great Britain is part of them, as they suggested the resolution to the Security Council. This reveals that Great Britain is

not considered to be a close ally of Serbia, as well as other Western powers (Aleksandar Vučić 2015a), which he does not define precisely.

Vučić's Perception of the Regional Situation

Regarding Bosnia and Hercegovina as a country, Vučić is very interested in overcoming the difficulties that exist between Serbia and Bosnia, as he stresses several times that Bosniaks and Serbs need to live in peace with each other and work together (Aleksandar Vučić 2015a, 2015b, 2015c; Srbija uzivo! 2016; Dnevni Avaz TV 2017; Happy TV 2017). Furthermore, Vučić considers the relationship between Serbs and Bosniaks as perhaps the one with the most significance for the future (Dnevni Avaz TV 2017). In fact, if Serbia and Bosnia do not focus on improving the reconciliation process and increasing the cooperation and economic development, Vučić is “*very much afraid of the future of the Western Balkans*” (Vučić in Srbija uzivo! 2016: 10:00). He further adds that due to the bloody history among Serbs and Bosniaks hatred is still thriving, thus he is not that optimistic regarding the future. He explains that Bosnia is characterised by two distinct thinkings; Bosnian Serbs, who believe that with help from Serbia they can win against Bosniaks, and Bosniaks, who believe that they can win over Bosnian Serbs, as Bosniaks constitute the majority of the population (Srbija uzivo! 2016). Therefore the current situation, as he described it in 2016, has brought “*us to the terrible position in which you cannot explain anything to anyone, and this is the reality. Sorry to say that. This is the reality, and that's why I was insisting to make as many, as it is possible, meetings, arrangements, agreements, whatever we needed with the Bosniak side*” (Vučić in Srbija uzivo! 2016: 25:35). A year later he further elaborates on the situation and describes different Bosniaks feelings, as he says:

“I understand very well, how upset the Bosniak heart is. I know that people are waiting for something greater; that you have extremists who are waiting for some sort of revenge, that you have others waiting for political justice, and thirdly the minority are waiting to see, how they will be able to live in the future” (Vučić in Dnevni Avaz TV 2017: 14:40, my translation).

Vučić views the situation between different ethnicities as fragile, and there is potential that hatred can take over, and therefore he is not that optimistic about the future. However, in order to improve the situation, there is but one solution, and that is following the strategy for reconciliation that he advocates for, which he also claims is the most objective. As shown in the second last mentioned

quote above, Vučić believes there is a need to improve and increase the communication and cooperation between the Serb and the Bosniak sides. Regarding Srebrenica Vučić donated 5 million Euros on behalf of Serbia to the town with the intention of improving the schools, nursing homes, infrastructure and overall to attract investors and companies to Srebrenica. His strategy to help out Srebrenica, but also the general process of reconciliation between Serbs and Bosniaks is concentrated on economic development (Aleksandar Vučić 2015d). People should focus much more on the future, and how the economy and cooperation among Serbia and Bosnia can be developed, but Vučić is not demanding that the past should be forgotten. Merkel suggested to him that an improved economy in the two countries would create “*a different economic perspective*” (Vučić in Dnevni Avaz TV 2017: 02:41, my translation), which would create a new ground for people to view the situation from, thus reconciliation would be made an easier process.

In order to further improve the relationship among the two ethnic groups, Serbs must acknowledge the terrible crime that took place in Srebrenica, as the majority is still in denial of the atrocity even having happened according to Vučić (Happy TV 2017), but also people accept that the Srebrenica massacre cannot be qualified as genocide. As earlier mentioned, if the Resolution about Srebrenica had been accepted by UN’s Security Council, and the Serbian people was labelled as genocidal, it would have made the matter worse, as Serbia would not be able to continue focusing on the peacebuilding process. Regarding this matter, Vučić finds that acknowledging victims’ suffering is essential, and he criticises people, who focus on what the Srebrenica massacre should be qualified as, as he claims that they are more concerned with a country’s punishment than achieving reconciliation. Furthermore, there should be a greater focus on Serbian victims and understanding towards Serbs in general, as well as all war criminals should be brought to justice (Aleksandar Vučić 2016; Srbija Uzivo! 2016).

Vučić argues that Serbia’s neutrality in this matter is showing through, as they have caught several former war criminals in Serbia alone, yet he has not noticed other countries doing so. Due to this he views Serbia as a more neutral regional actor compared to others, but also because he has noticed that some people are trying to completely ignore Serbian victims, as if they do not exist, while Serbia acknowledges all victims and all war criminals regardless of their ethnic backgrounds (Aleksandar Vučić 2016). Moreover, he declares that if the reverse situation of the attack on him had happened, i.e. if a Bosniak diplomat had been attacked in Serbia, the consequences would have been greater, as Serbia “*would have been bombarded with metaphorical words. You all know what I*

am talking about“ (Vučić in Aleksandar Vučić 2015c: 50:44, my translation). He does not precisely explain what the meaning is behind this statement, but it is clear that Serbia is in some way in a worse position in the regional system compared to Bosnia.

Furthermore, Vučić explains that *“in Srebrenica, as well as everywhere else on the territory of former Yugoslavia, there are no winners. There are only victims who require our piety and respect”* (Vučić in Aleksandar Vučić 2015a: 00:16). Therefore other countries and their people should also show more understanding towards Serbs and focus more on prosecuting war criminals from their own countries. Vučić promises that he and his country will focus on improving the relationship between the different ethnicities in the region, however he also underlines that this is not something that can be achieved with Serbia working on it alone. Other actors in the region need to work on it too in order to be able to overcome the ethnic divide among people and boost the economy (Srbija uzivo! 2016). It is important that countries in the region should try to solve the problems among themselves without letting themselves get influenced by outsiders, while still respecting all victims of the past (Aleksandar Vučić 2015a).

Vučić’s Representation of Serbia and its Values

In the previous section, Vučić’s perception of Serbia as a relatively more neutral country compared to others has already been mentioned. Vučić’s approach to improving the situation is also inspired by Ghandi’s teachings. Vučić mentions that Serbia will show itself as greater and stronger by following Ghandi’s rule of using non-violence, when it stands up for itself (Aleksandar Vučić 2015a). After the resolution was rejected, Vučić explained to the public that this should not be viewed as a victory, as mentioned earlier, there are no winners from former Yugoslavian countries, and that Serbs should not start celebrate and mock others. Instead *“it is time for all of us to return back to self-criticism and show the difference between us and others. Let us show that we are ready for reconciliation and that we are ready to bow our heads for other’s victims”* (Vučić in Aleksandar Vučić 2015a: 06:09, my translation). Furthermore, Vučić mentions one of Ghandi’s sayings that *“We are not (...) on our way to peace. Peace is the way”* (Vučić in Aleksandar Vučić 2015a: 11:47, my translation). This is why Serbia decided that Vučić should go to Srebrenica to show his condolence to the many victims, but also because Vučić claims that if they do it, others will follow in their footsteps and start respecting Serb victims (Aleksandar Vučić 2015a). In Srebrenica he wanted to proudly present Serbia as a country that is both *“beautiful and good willed, as it is capable of admitting that some individuals have committed crimes”* (Vučić in Aleksandar Vučić

2015a: 08:28, my translation). Vučić wants Serbia to be humble, even when it goes well for Serbia. He also portrays himself in a similar way: *“You know, I am just an ordinary man, not better than all the others. Not a superman that didn’t make any mistakes. I hate those people that will always say that they didn’t make any mistakes. I did them a lot, and I am not ashamed to say that”* (Vučić in *Srbija uzivo!* 2016: 26:40). Vučić believes in the importance of being humble, apologetic and honest, however he also will not let anyone ‘step on’ Serbs just because of their ethnicity (RTRS vijesti 2016a).

As mentioned earlier, the Resolution about Srebrenica was very humiliating in Vučić’s opinion, and Serbia is not ready to be humiliated, as Serbia is not a rogue and undignified country. As long as, no one intends to humiliate the country or hurt Serbs only because of their ethnicity, Serbia is ready for working with others and improving lives of all people in the region. Vučić argues for reaching out to others, as this should illustrate that Serbia has now become a greater country than it was ever in the past, even before the current borders were ever established (Aleksandar Vučić 2015a).

Theoretical Analysis of Vučić’s Statements

To sum up, Vučić has expressed that the closest associates of Serbia are Russia and Srpska, but this is not the case with Western actors, who have been represented in his verbal statements as players who want to humiliate Serbia. Albeit some politicians are an exception, such as Merkel, who shares the same belief as Vučić; that economic development will change the current relationship among the different ethnic groups, particularly between Serbs and Bosniaks. Rise of ethnic hatred is the biggest threat to the region, as it can destabilise all countries. According to Vučić, maintain stability is even more difficult today than previous years, therefore he does not hold an optimistic view of the future, unless if the economic cooperation among regional countries can be developed, as this will hold the hatred back. He therefore advocates for humility in times, when Serbia succeeds in something that is beneficial to them, as Serbia needs to portray itself as a country with a good intentions and respect other victims, whom the success of Serbia could be interpreted as something negative.

In relation to maternal thinking, Vučić believes it is important to be self-critical and humble, just how practicalism claims, as all practices must be tested, but also socially accepted by others. Social acceptance is one of the three demands, that maternal thinking is established on, therefore Vučić does make statements that somewhat align with maternal thinking, as he does care about how

regional actors perceive Serbia. Social acceptability will, according to Vučić, help improve Serbia's growth. Yet he will not accept that anyone hurts Serbs for their ethnic origin, hence this is a factor that can change Vučić's intention to be socially accepted. In other words, Vučić follows the demand of social acceptability, until preservation, another demand of maternal thinking, is under pressure. This is common with maternal thinking, as Ruddick (1989) argues that mothers do get in situations where they have to choose, between the three demands, as they can contradict each other. According to Vučić's statements he clearly favours preservation over social acceptability or growth. This is what Cohn (2013) and Ruddick (1989) criticise standard militarist thinking, as it is based on the illusion of complete control and survival, even though everything is bound to die and having control at all times is impossible. Instead countries should focus on survival within a reasonable frame. They should ask themselves, how probable are the threats? According to Vučić, if people do not start to change their opinions about other ethnicities, a very gloomy future is waiting ahead, as preserving the peace is becoming more and more difficult by each day that passes. This could be interpreted as if he is starting to become a bit frantic about the threats. On the other hand, if his vision is correct, then he should be worried. At least, he still possesses the ability to think in concrete terms, as he is trying to improve the relationship by being open-minded to different solutions and is willing to do anything to secure the peace. As the above illustrates, his goal is to strengthen the economic ties between Serbia and Bosnia, funding different projects in Srebrenica and setting up as many meetings, agreements and arrangements as necessary. One could question, if his concrete thinking is limited, as he will not accept the term genocide to describe the Srebrenica massacre, like the ICTY has determined it was. He believes this would make things worse, but on the other hand he is working on making the Serbs, who are still in denial of what happened in Srebrenica, believe that a crime did take place in Srebrenica.

Regarding Vučić's narratives they do stand up to the three concepts that Ruddick (1989) claims make narratives useful. Vučić does talk about the problems that exist among Bosniaks and Serbs, and he mentions his own flaws from the past, which he apologises for. This improves the credibility of his statements, as he is not trying to picture a situation that is perfect or overly cheerful, so that it becomes difficult to believe in them. Vučić is also investing in Srebrenica and wants to collaborate with Bosnia, in order to see both countries become more successful in the future. Therefore his statements do contain both delight and realism. Moreover, he has expressed empathy to Bosniak victims, therefore he is also compassionate. However, due to the possible future conflict between two of the three demands, which constitute maternal thinking, his statements reveal that he will

always stand by the side of Serbs, and not Bosniaks. He prioritises the preservation of Serbia rather than having Serbia social accepted by others. Therefore in other ethnic people's view his narratives are weakened by this, as only Serbs can count on having Vučić's support all the time.

Since Vučić focuses on changing Serbian's opinion about the Srebrenica massacre, as he acknowledges that a massacre really did take place, and not many Serbs believe in this. According to Cohen's denial theory, Vučić is dealing with cultural denial, i.e. denial that is neither public nor personal, but at medium level. Serbs have the free choice to decide what they want to believe in, when it comes to Srebrenica, but many of them deny the massacre or genocide. Regarding the denial paradox or denial syndrome, Vučić accept that something terrible happened, but even though the ICTY has gathered lots of different types of evidence, he still does not accept the truth that in order for the massacre in Srebrenica to have become a reality, it demanded great planning from higher authorities. Therefore Vučić's own denial can be characterised as interpretative denial, specifically as denial of responsibility, since Vučić claims that the atrocity in Srebrenica was committed by individuals. The massacre can thus not be categorised as genocide, as the responsibility cannot be placed on the higher military authorities.

Analysis of Dodik's Strategic Narratives

This section will look into who Dodik views as the main actors, his understanding of the international system, future threats and their possible solutions. The main arguments of his are focused on the discrimination against Serbs, as others are twisting or denying the truth.

Dodik's Perception of the (Inter)national System and Its Actors

Milorad Dodik has shown that Republic Srpska has both Russia and Serbia as close allies. Regarding Serbia, Dodik has criticised the Bosniak president of Bosnia, Bakir Izetbegović, for demanding that Vučić does not visit Bosnia, until the trial against the former Bosniak general, Naser Orić, has been settled. Dodik argues that a visit from Vučić at the time would have been proper, and that Izetbegović does not have the power to speak on behalf of Bosnia, as he only represent 1/3 of the Bosnian presidency (RTRS vijesti 2015a). Furthermore, he has questioned the intentions of the ICTY, when the trial against Karadžić ended, as his sentence was officialised on the day, when NATO bombarded Serbia (FACE HD TV 2017), as he considers this a double blow against Serbs. He thereby expresses that Serbian diplomats are welcome in Bosnia at any time, and that he feels the pain of victims in Serbia too.

Regarding Russia, Dodik has expressed that he cannot demand anything from them, but he will try to explain to the Russian diplomat, Sergey Lavrov, why it is important for Serbs to have the Resolution about Srebrenica rejected (RTRS vijesti 2015a). Furthermore, he projects Russia as an economically strong country that, despite economic sanctions, emits enthusiasm, and that they "*did not fall on their knees, as you can read in some Western media*" (Dodik in RTRS vijesti 2015a: 10:28, my translation). Russia, like other BRICS countries, has potential for developing the market. In this regard, it is important for Srpska to maintain their good relation with Russia to see, if there is a possibility for Srpska to join and benefit from Russia's development.

Dodik has criticised several actors. As already mentioned above, Bakir Izetbegović is one of the actors that Dodik does not have a particular close relationship with. However, Dodik also blames Bakir's father, Alija Izetbegovic, who used to be the previous Bosniak president of Bosnia and Hercegovina. Dodik argues that before there was any shooting in Bosnia Alija had expressed that he was ready to sacrifice peace in order to gain an independent Bosnia and Hercegovina. Therefore he is considered to be one of the main actors behind the past war (RTV Pink Official 2016). In relation to this, Dodik therefore also has a negative view of the Hague Tribunal and the ICTY, as they did

not prosecute Alija Izetbegovic or any of his colleagues and are therefore not fair towards Serbs. Instead it is a matter of “*selective justice*” (Dodik in TV1 HD 2016: 00:26, my translation). Dodik has expressed after the end of the trial against Karadžić that “*if you have voiced that someone behind happenings like these should be prosecuted, then you should have prosecuted all. However we found out that when Alija Izetbegović died, the investigation of him at the Hague Tribunal ended, as if everyone [Alija’s collaborators] had died too*” (Dodik in RTV Pink Official 2016: 05:340). Dodik blames the Hague Tribunal for not being objective. Instead they are deliberately prosecuting only Serb former military leaders and politicians, while ignoring or not doing their job well enough, when it comes to investigating Bosniak leaders. This can only increase the distrust among people in Bosnia (RTV Pink Official 2016)

Dodik specifically has a negative opinion of Paddy Ashdown, a British diplomat who served as the International High Representative for Bosnia and Herzegovina during the former war in the 1990’ies. He blames Ashdown for having ruined the Dayton Peace Agreement as an international agreement, and that he, too, had influenced the Resolution of Srebrenica in a negative way. Dodik adds that Ashdown only knows how to weaken Bosnia. In this regard, he therefore also criticises Great Britain, as their diplomats like Ashdown do not genuinely care for the situation in Bosnia and Hercegovina, as they otherwise would have known that the Resolution about Srebrenica would have a negative impact on Bosnia and the region. The resolution can only separate the different parts of Bosnia even further, and Great Britain should have taken this into account before the proposed the resolution (Sens Servis 2015b). Likewise, Dodik argues that Britain had ulterior motives behind the proposal, as their intent was to avoid having Muslim organisations show up in London and create trouble. With the Resolution about Srebrenica Britain would be able to say that they do care for Muslims and they are trying to help them in a different part of the world (Aleksandar Vučić 2015c).

Dodik has also criticised the association, Majke Srebrenice, for expressing political views, though the purpose of the organisation is to gather the surviving victims, instead they have chosen not to invite people, who do not recognise the atrocity in Srebrenica as genocide, which shows how politicised the Srebrenica massacre has become. He claims that it is obvious when their tears are falling for the dead and when for political reasons. Although Dodik does show understanding for the victims of Srebrenica and the pain that these mothers and others still bear, however he does not understand why there is a difference between mothers of Srebrenica and mothers of Srpska, as a differentiation has been made between the two (RTRS vijesti 2016c).

Dodik's Perception of the Regional Situation

The previous section has already illustrated part of Dodik's understanding of the international and national system, as he expresses very clearly who the allies are and who the foes are. Western actors are portrayed as not having a strong interest in improving the situation in the region, while Russia and Serbia are good comrades of Srpska. Internally, the former and the current Bosniak presidents have left a negative impact on the region and Bosnia.

He views Serbs as being in a bind regarding the Srebrenica massacre, as people are lying about what really happened there in 1995 and have some other motive behind it. It is "*a whole world*" (Dodik in Oslobodenje ba 2015: 01:09, my translation) that stands behind the promotion of this lie about the Srebrenica massacre being qualified as genocide. According to Dodik, labelling the atrocity in Srebrenica as genocide would not demand this much effort to have it proven, as so many international and national parliaments and organisations need to through the Resolution about Srebrenica. Serbs must not out of fear submit to this lie, as he stresses that "*obviously a thing that explains just how important something is to them, it must be clear that it is just as important for us to have the falsehood proved*" (Dodik in RTRS vijesti 2015a: 01:26, my translation). After Karadžić was sentenced to 40 years of prison in the Spring of 2016, Dodik explained that if the tribunal intended improve the reconciliation process, it should be noted that there has never been a higher level of distrust in Bosnia than now, and that Serbs felt really unwell and unsafe after the trial ended. Dodik criticises why Serbia is the only country, whose warfare is being labelled as genocidal, while all the other countries that were also part of war in former Yugoslavia in the 1990'ies (RTV Pink Official 2016). He therefore sarcastically asks that "*They [Bosniak and Croatia military leaders] were the ones who only protected something, but here [in Republic Srpska] it should be acknowledged that everything was planned?*" (Dodik in RTV Pink Official 2016: 03:48, my translation). According to Dodik the rules of war probably did get broken, "*but it is impossible that it only happened on one side*" (Dodik in RTV Pink Official 2016: 04:10, my translation).

Moreover, he states that people who insist on this falsehood of the Srebrenica massacre are the people, who themselves have omitted behaviour that could be qualified as genocidal against other people in the past. In 2015 he states that Bosniaks are deliberately trying to collectivise the responsibility of just one event, the Srebrenica massacre. Regarding Bakir Izetbegović's request that Vučić should not come to Serbia, before Orić's trial is over, Dodik has argued that this shows that

the Bosniaks are now ready to protect their crimes and the people who committed them. Therefore Serbia and Srpska must not give into the untruth about Srebrenica, as the only thing that can be proved is that 3,500 Serbs died around Srebrenica (RTRS vijesti 2015a).

However, Dodik has suggested a solution to the current situation. Srebrenica could be acknowledged as a place, where both Serbs and Bosniaks were victims of genocide, so that Serbian victims receive the same level of respect and recognition as Bosniak victims. This would be a correct way of reaching mutual understanding. Additionally, he would also have accepted the Resolution about Srebrenica, if it had claimed that both Serbs and Bosniaks were victims of genocide (RTRS vijesti 2015a). Then the resolution “*could have become an integral part of reconciliation, and not a part of constant exposure of conflicts*” (Dodik in RTRS vijesti 2015a: 08:10, my translation). As a part of this solution, Dodik states that a new international committee should be established that would have a greater objective perspective on the whole situation, meaning that all war criminals, including Bosniaks, should be investigated and punished for their crimes (Oslobodenje ba 2015; RTRS vijesti 2016b). “*Only in this way can it [Srebrenica] become a place for reconciliation and a place for complete understanding*” (Dodik in Oslobodenje ba 2015: 00:50, my translation). He said in 2015 and 2016 that the story about the Srebrenica massacre is based on the fact that 8.000 people died in a few days, however 20 years later only 4.000 have been buried, which he interprets as a sign of the data having been manipulated, hence the story about Srebrenica is not trustworthy (Sens Servis 2015a; RTRS vijesti 2016b).

Dodik’s Representation of Srpska and its Values

As mentioned earlier, Dodik claims that many people are against Serbs for political reasons, and therefore he portrays Srpska as a state that needs to be strong and believe in itself, as there are not many that will stand beside Srpska or Serbs. “*Clearly everything is fixed against us*” (Dodik in RTRS vijesti 2015a: 00:29, my translation). The truth is, according to Dodik, that Serbian victims are being ignored by the Hague Tribunal, Great Britain and other Western actors, thus Dodik is portraying his policy as the one that is fair and objective towards all victims and war criminals of the past war. Therefore he suggests that genocide should be acknowledged in Srebrenica, but that both the Bosniak, Croatian and Serb army contributed to it, and that all the responsible leaders from these countries should be arrested for participating in genocide. Likewise, Dodik also wants to illustrate Republic Srpska as a strong state that will not let anyone question the jurisdiction of Srpska. Therefore he urges people in Srpska to come together and stand strongly up against anyone,

who doubts the authority of Srpska (RTV Pink Official 2016). After Karadžić's sentence became known to the public in 2016, Dodik said that "*Republic Srpska has never before been more aware of itself and more determined to protect its vested rights, and from this perspective no verdict, not even Karadžić's, will be able to touch or undermine the power of Republic Srpska*" (Dodik in RTRS vijesti 2016a: 05:27, my translation). He thus views the Hague Tribunal's decision regarding Karadžić as an attempt to challenge the power of Republic Srpska. He insists on protecting the rights of Srpska, which he considers to be under pressure, and on uniting Serbs in Srpska, when people accuse their former generals and commanders of having broken the rules of war.

Furthermore, he characterises Srpska as very responsible towards its territory, including Srebrenica (RTRS vijesti 2015a), as he does not view it as a distinctive part of Republic Srpska (N1 2015). His interest is to see Srebrenica more developed and attractive to investors. At the conference in Srebrenica in 2015, he expressed that "*we are here to support all effort and everything else that is important for bringing more investors to Srebrenica. We did it in the past, and we will do it in the future*" (Dodik in N1 2015: 00:25, my translation). He does state that the government cannot create factories, but that they can create opportunities for investors to open up a business and create more jobs (N1 2015). His intent is therefore to boost the economy, in this case in Srebrenica, as it is the responsibility of the government in Republic Srpska.

Theoretical Analysis of Dodik's Statements

As the above has demonstrated, Dodik values the strength and power of Srpska, and Republic Srpska is represented as a responsible administration that governs over its territory rightfully. Dodik asserts that it is important to be determined to get the truth unfolded, as Western and Bosniak actors in the international system are trying to twist the truth about Srebrenica. The massacre in Srebrenica cannot be classified as genocide, as it was not planned by the former political and military leaders in Srpska. Serbs must not bow under the pressure or fear of Western or Bosniak actors. If the atrocity in Srebrenica can be qualified as genocide, then other actors from the previous war should be accused of genocide too, as the suffering of Serbian victims should not be ignored or undermined. His solution to overcome the barriers of the peacebuilding process is to found a new international board that would be better at handling the happening in Srebrenica by having a more objective approach. The actors in the international system are viewed as either for or against Srpska.

From the perspective of maternal thinking, Dodik's understanding of the regional situation is not completely based on maternal thinking, because he often criticises Bosniak or Western actors. He is not working on creating a socially accepted Republic Srpska, since he bluntly criticises the others, except for Serbia and Russia. His statements can therefore only be socially acceptable by Russia, Serbia and the other actors whom he has mentioned in a positive light. However, he is concerned with the preservation of Srpska, as he is trying to protect it from the West, which he finds threatening. In addition, he did donate money to Srebrenica and express an interest in seeing Srebrenica develop further. As Dodik publicly accuses other actors of being against the Serbian people, he also does not exactly illustrate that he thinks concretely, as he has been claiming that there is only one solution to the regional problems; accepting Serb victims on equal terms with Bosniaks by either claiming that the Srebrenica massacre was not genocide or recognising it was genocide against both ethnicities. As a part of this solution, a new international and objective committee should be established. If this does not get accepted by the Bosniaks and others, then there is nothing else to be done. This means that Dodik's narratives are not overly optimistic, and therefore they should be received as more trustworthy. However, as he keeps denying some facts, then this has a counterproductive effect on others, who do not share the same world view as Dodik. Yet he is trying to show his understanding towards the Bosniak victims, but he only ever stands by the side of Serbian victims.

Concerning denial theory, Dodik is denying the Srebrenica massacre literally, since he in 2015 questioned the validity of the evidence and claimed that there had been some manipulation with the evidence. He stated that the number of victims had been deceitfully increased, and he questioned how many Bosniaks died, as he claims that 3,500 Serbs died near Srebrenica. Moreover in 2017 he criticised the association of victims, Majke Srebrenice, for being politicised and having ulterior motives. In combination with literal denial, Dodik also denies the interpretation of the Srebrenica massacre, when he suggested that Srebrenica should be recognised as a place where genocide happened, but against both Bosniaks and Serbs. Furthermore, Dodik's understanding of the international system is very suspicious of Western and Bosniak actors, and since he is also trying to make Serb victims to be just as acknowledged as Bosniak victims, one could interpret this as being the latent effects of denial. According to Ramet (2007), these are the latent effects that can occur, when a population is in denial over a longer period of time, but the blame does not get imported by others.

Analysis of Bosniaks' Responses to Serbian Strategic Narratives

In this section the five informants' reactions to Vučić's and Dodik's verbal statements will be described. First there will be a presentation of each informant, whose real name and other personal information will not be revealed, as the interview is anonymous and therefore will stay only known to me. The transcriptions of the interviews can be found in the appendix. For a greater understanding of the informants' reactions to Serbian statements I urge the reader to take a look at them, if they are familiar with Bosnian. Since I only have limited space to explain the informants' responses and understandings of Vučić's and Dodik's statements, only the main arguments will be described in the following.

Profile of Each Informant

Esma was born in 1944 in a town located in the Federation of Bosnia, but which is close to Republic Srpska. Now she lives in Republic Srpska close to Banja Luka, but after the war she has been living in Sweden too, as she spends half of her time in Bosnia and in Sweden every year. She has only completed elementary school and has never been employed, as her parents did not let her continue studying or find a job. She has been living as a housewife, since she got married at a young age. She is now a widow, and she has several children. Esma is very interested in politics and follows it regularly via television, but she also discusses politics occasionally with relatives and close friends. Esma is mostly interested in the political situation in Bosnia, and therefore she is mostly familiar with Bosnian politicians. She does not agree with any politicians, as they do not focus on the youth enough, however she does vote for the SDA, which is the Bosniak nationalist political party in Bosnia and Hercegovina, as she is a nationalist herself.

Nihad was born in 1958 in a village near Banja Luka, Republic Srpska, and he still lives, where he was born. He is a former employee at a company specialised in producing parts for machines, but now works as a farmer. He is married and has children. Nihad too is interested in politics, and he often follows politics by reading newspapers, watching TV and discussing with others. Nihad is mostly interested in politicians from Bosnia such as Bakir Izetbegovic, Milorad Dodik and Dragan Covic. He is also familiar with Aleksandar Vučić. His political stance mostly aligns with Bakir Izetbegovic, whose party he has voted for, and he mostly disagrees with Milorad Dodik.

Sara was born in 1985 in a town in Republic Srpska. She is an educated social worker and has been working as this for the past 9 years. She lives in Denmark, but visits Republic Srpska in Bosnia and

Hercegovina every year. Sara is not interested in politics, only a little. Therefore she does not pay that much attention to it, and she almost never talks about it with people close to her. She is married and has a few smaller children.

Ibrahim, was born in 1955 also in Republic of Srpska, close to Banja Luka. He has had several jobs, but currently works at a school as a technical assistant. He is married and has children. Ibrahim is also very interested in regional politics and knows a lot about different politicians. He considers Alija Izetbegovic as being one of the best and most honest. He votes every time, but mostly for the Bosniak party, SDA.

Adis was born in 1985 in a small village near Banja Luka, but now lives in Denmark. He does visit Republic Srpska every year. He is currently studying programming, while working a part time job for a phone company. He is married and has children. Adis votes at elections, as he is interested in politics and is somewhat updated about news, as he searches for information online. He also discusses politics with his friends or family, and knows mostly about Bosnian politicians such as Alija Izetbegovic, Bakir Izetbegovic and Milorad Dodik.

Bosniaks' Reaction to Vučić

In general, all of the informants had a mostly positive view and reaction to Vučić's statements, though they were at times unsure, if one could trust him. Esma is the only informant, who had a complete negative opinion about him, and she said that he was "*a big wolf*" (Esma 14:35, my translation). She views him as a hypocritical politician, who tries to say all the things that Bosniaks wants to hear, and then behind the scenes he says something completely different. He is a wolf in sheep's clothing, who is trying to blind Bosniaks with his words, while supporting Republic Srpska and policies that are beneficial to Serbs, but not to Bosniaks. Adis' impression of Vučić, before I presented any of Vučić's verbal statements, was mostly positive. He felt that Vučić was trying to be a neutral part regarding regional affairs, however he also claimed that Vučić was nothing special, but just a professional politician. Nihad had a similar opinion to Adis, though he was more optimistic, as he believed that Vučić could change things in the region, if he is a trustworthy politician. Nihad was unsure about whether or not Vučić himself believed in the things that he said. Ibrahim had a similar view as Nihad, as he thought that Vučić may become the first of the most popular politicians to recognise the Srebrenica massacre as genocide, although he mentions Vučić's past extreme nationalism. Therefore he questions if Vučić can be trusted today. Sara, on the other

hand, did not know, who Vučić was before the interview, and she was therefore the only one, who was pleasantly surprised after reading Vučić's first statement.

Regarding Vučić's first statement, which was about the rejection of Resolution about Srebrenica, Sara agreed with Vučić, as she herself believes that it is important that Bosniaks, Serbs and Croats work on the peacebuilding together, and thereby evening out the responsibility of the reconciliation process equally among the three ethnicities. However, she disagreed that all were victims on the Western Balkans, as she views Bosniaks as being the only victors of the former war, as they succeeded in gaining a country. Adis and Nihad did not feel that the statement said anything concrete about Srebrenica, instead it was a try to make a general, but objective stance on the whole situation. Adis claimed that Vučić's statements were political, exactly because they avoided saying anything precise. Adis, Nihad and Ibrahim also claimed that Vučić thinks about his votes, therefore he avoids saying specific things. Nihad viewed Vučić's first statement as lacking strength, meaning Vučić avoided admitting that what happened in Srebrenica was genocide, because he did not have the courage to do so. Ibrahim felt the same too, as he claimed that "*The statement is not complete, because he does not name it genocide. Everything is said well, but he does not mention it anywhere*" (Ibrahim 09:40). Later in the interview, he reasoned that this was probably also, because he could lose many of his votes, if he did admit it. Esma interpreted his statement as insincere, since her argument for, why Vučić or Serbs in general do not want to admit to genocide is "*because Muslims experienced genocide, Republic Srpska was established*" (Esma 21:32, my translation). If they did accept the qualification of genocide, they would lose Republic Srpska as an entity. According to Esma, this is the biggest fear among Serbs. Overall, all the informants want Vučić to directly express that the atrocity in Srebrenica is qualified as genocide, then they would know that he was a trustworthy politician.

Concerning Vučić's second statement about the attack on him, Nihad claimed that he was attacked, because "*his statement that for each [dead] Serb 100 Bosniaks should be killed has not been forgotten by people*" (Nihad 12:15, my translation). Therefore Nihad demands that Vučić should come out to the public and make an official apology for his past statements, then he will gain more respect and trust in Vučić, as admitting a mistake is an honourable act in Nihad's opinion. Adis and Sara agree with Vučić's second statement, but Sara believes that he is bound to say this, because he the president of Serbia now. Adis does not like the statement, as he can see, how Vučić is trying to make himself look like the victim. Adis argues that Vučić should first acknowledge genocide, if you

want to make a progress. *“First you need to provide a hand of apology. Now it seems like he carries the hand of reconciliation, and Bosniaks have to accept that hand”* (Adis: 15:28, my translation). Both Adis and Nihad agree that it is difficult to move on, if you do not apologise first and admit your mistakes. Ibrahim again focuses on the trustworthiness of Vučić’s statement, because words are not enough *“you need to show it through your actions”* (Ibrahim 14:47, my translation), but this is something that time will show. Esma has a whole other perspective on things, as she believes the whole attack on Vučić was planned by Serbs in order to damage the reputation of Muslims. The attack only confirmed her suspicions of Vučić.

Most of the informants, apart from Nihad and Ibrahim, do not receive Vučić’s donation to Srebrenica as something special nor his statements from the conference. Nihad thinks it is great, if his intentions are good willed towards all citizens in Srebrenica, while Ibrahim believes it is a good start, but they should probably pay 50-100 million to be fair. Sara finds his words as good, but she is not satisfied about the fact that Vučić said that he hopes people will be happy with their future and destinies. When asking her, is she was satisfied with this statement, she responded *“Unfortunately I am. But he cannot talk like this that the people will never get back their brothers, sons, and that those people should be satisfied with their fates”* (Sara 08:05, my translation). This is demanding too much, as people can never get back the people whom they have lost. Sara and Adis doubt the effect of the money for the same reason. Adis reasons that *“the mothers whose sons were killed, even if they received a billion, it would not matter to them”* (Adis 19:51, my translation). Both Adis and Sara think that this is an attempt to make people forget about the past. Esma believes that he is only supporting the development in Srebrenica, because of the Serbs living there. She explains that this is the same as *“a gentle caressing after beating you up”* (Esma 36:12, my translation) and with these words she rejects his statement.

Nihad and Adis criticise Vučić’s opinion about Serbian victims, when he states that some people tend to ignore that Serbs lost people too. They view this as an attempt to even out the different wrongdoings from the past, as you cannot compare genocide with ordinary warfare. Ibrahim too states that Serbia is trying to equally even out the blame behind the evil doings from the past, as if everyone was equally guilty of breaking the rules of war, therefore he is starting to see Vučić as a twofaced person.. Sara claims that she is not sure, if Vučić really does respect all victims of the war equally due to her lack of knowledge about Vučić and the politics on the Balkans. She still suspects that Vučić is not telling the truth, and that he actually favours Serbian victims more: *“I think he*

does differentiate. And again he is defending himself. Here he is saying that there are Serbs who died during the war, but that no one is mentioning them” (Sara 11:38, my translation). Esma believes that Vučić would be killed, if he did acknowledge genocide, and she adds that it is not enough to admit that a crime took place, and that you know ask for forgiveness. Instead you also need to demand that they get their punishment. However, Serbs have never before admitted to any of their wrongdoings, even from previous wars, where they killed Muslims in Kosovo and Albania, according to Esma.

Regarding Vučić’s understanding of the situation in the region, most of the informants disagree with his statement that you have two types of understandings in Bosnia; a Serbian and a Bosniak way of thinking, where each side believe they can win over the other. Nihad claims that there will always be some people, who are affected by the politicians in the media, and that *“To the smart you can explain anything, but to the ones, who are evil, it is difficult”* (Nihad 26:17, my translation). Additionally, both Nihad and Adis believe that only a minority of the people are like this. Adis is also again dissatisfied with Vučić’s perspective on things, as he claims that Vučić is again trying to share the blame equally among the different ethnicities. Esma states that you can explain to everyone what they did wrong, *“so that they will not repeat their mistakes, so that new wars will not emerge”* (Esma 46:20, my translation). Esma believes that understanding your mistakes is essential for maintaining peace. Ibrahim believes that because Bosniaks have been forgiving and forgetting easily, they have now experienced the 11th genocide against them in the past two centuries. Therefore Ibrahim claims that this is also a reason for why wars or genocides have had a tendency to keep repeating themselves in the region.

Finally, the informants all agree that having good relationships between Serbs and Bosniaks are important, though Esma interprets this statement, as Vučić is trying to improve the relationship to Bosnia, due to the fact that Bosnia is working on getting accepted as a new member of the EU. Therefore Vučić wants to cooperate with Bosnia to improve Serbia’s access in order to also be able to join the EU. Sara, Adis and Nihad completely agree with Vučić on the importance of focusing on the future and improving the relation among the different ethnic groups, though they also believe that that the past crime in Srebrenica must be acknowledged as genocide. Ibrahim too feels the same way and adds that the past must not be forgotten, which they all mention throughout the interview several times. Nihad and Adis also claim that the Bosniak and Serbian warfare cannot be compared.

Bosniaks' Reaction to Dodik

When I first asked the informants about their impression of Dodik, they all had a negative opinion about him to begin with. Sara only had the impression that he wanted to chase all Bosniaks out of Bosnia, as this was what she had been told about once. Nihad viewed him as a person who likes to be in the government, but he could not believe that he himself was as bad as he appeared on the television. Adis was confused about Dodik, as he used to think that he was just a nationalist, but now he seems to be just a 'rotten' person, who is willing to do anything to achieve his goals. Esma had a very clear opinion about him as a person without any praiseworthy traits, and he only deceives people. Ibrahim claims that he is the reason why the economy is stagnating in Bosnia.

Concerning Dodik's view on Srebrenica and the Resolution about Srebrenica all the informants disagreed with Dodik, as they all believe that the Srebrenica massacre should be qualified as genocide, a new international committee is not necessary, and the Hague Tribunal is a neutral actor. Nihad and Ibrahim argue that the truth is already known, as there is lots of evidence supporting this. The Hague Tribunal as an international organisation has already proved this. Nihad also claims that Dodik cannot even be described as a hypocrite, since he is only lying to himself, as Dodik used to believe that the Srebrenica massacre should be qualified as genocide 10 years ago. *"At the time there was only one truth, you cannot have two truths, only one"* (Nihad: 38:02, my translation). Ibrahim claims that there is no need for a new international committee, though if the investigation continued, they would probably just conclude that more places, where crimes took place during the war, could have been labelled as genocide too. Sara, too, argues that the truth is already known, therefore there is no need to create a new international committee. She also has a hard time understanding, how a Bosnian president can keep making these statements. Srpska should apologise and accept a punishment for the past war crimes that they are accused of, in order to show the victims from Srebrenica that they are sorry. Adis claims that admitting that one's army from the past contributed to genocide will not bring in more trouble. In fact, this is the only way to peace. Any reasonable human would have understood what it means, if thousands of people die in a short amount of time, but not Dodik. Furthermore, Adis also doubts the neutrality of a new international committee, as they would probably try to solve things quickly and try to satisfy everyone in some way. Esma is certain that Dodik only wants a new international committee, so that Russia could join it and free the former Serbian army of the accusations of genocide. Furthermore, Esma adds again that they risk losing Republic Srpska, if the qualification of genocide was accepted. Esma also claims that acts done by the Serb and Bosniak army cannot be compared, *"He only wants to*

compare the army that was armed and killed the people that was not" (Esma: 1:17:17, my translation). According to Esma, the army from Srpska received help from Russia, Serbia, Kosovo and Vojvodina, and therefore they are at fault too for what happened in Srebrenica. These and Serbs should share the collective guilt behind the Srebrenica massacre, though Esma is aware of the Serbs, who have remained loyal to Bosnia and Hercegovina, therefore she does not want all of the Serbs, especially civilians, to be accused of having supported genocide.

The informants also oppose Dodik's statement that Serb victims are being ignored or undermined. Sara and Adis are not sure, exactly how many Serb victims there are, but they doubt there are that many, as the Hague Tribunal would otherwise have focused more on these. Sara states that Dodik only "*Lies, lies, lies*" (Sara: 28:57, my translation). The Bosniak army could not have committed genocide, as it was the Serbian army that kept attacking Bosniaks, thus there cannot be that many Serbian victims. Adis says that "*It is not like mothers and others, who lost 8.000 and something, would now go look for evidence for Serb victims. They have not even solved their own. First they need to solve their own*" (Adis: 37:50, my translation). He therefore believes that the surviving victims need to figure out what happened to their lost ones, before they go and look for evidence of other's victims. Adis also claims that the Serbs cannot expect to wage a war and expect that others simply give in to them. People will defend themselves, and therefore some Serbs have died. In this regard, Esma states that there were people killed on both sides, however Serbs started the war, and the Bosniak army fought respectively, as they only protected themselves. The never broke the international rules of war. Nihad and Ibrahim reason that Serb victims do not get the same attention as Bosniak victims, since there are fewer of them in comparison to the amount of murdered Bosniaks, and "*this is simply how things have to be*" (Nihad 42:29, my translation). Nihad further keeps insisting that Dodik is only trying to twist the truth around and make it seem like Bosniaks performed similar crimes as the Serbs during the war, which the evidence does not support Dodik's statements. "*Without truth no one can be satisfied. The truth must always remain truth, and that is that*" (Nihad: 46:29, my translation). Ibrahim shares the same view, as he claims that "*They [Serbs] want peace established on lies*" (Ibrahim 37:25, my translation), and thus if what Dodik perceives to be the truth is not accepted, then there is no reconciliation. Moreover Ibrahim adds that Dodik's main interest is to even out the responsibilities behind all the war crimes and portray everyone as equal victims, when in fact it was already proven by researchers that Serbs were behind 90 % of all of the crimes in the former war in Yugoslavia. Therefore Serbs must admit that their former army contributed to evil doings and apologise. That is all that Ibrahim wants.

Conclusion

This section will explain the conclusion of the problem formulation, *How do Serbian politicians, Aleksandar Vučić and Milorad Dodik, strategically narrate about the Srebrenica massacre from June 8, 2015 – July 11, 2017, and how are these narratives received by Bosniaks from Republic Srpska?*

Firstly, the informants were suspicious of Vučić's statements, as they were not sure, if he meant what he said. He needs to use the word genocide to describe the Srebrenica massacre, otherwise his words are empty, and he needs to prove it too through his actions. They therefore feel that he needs to be more specific in his statements. Regardless of how much knowledge they had previously about Vučić or Serbian politics, they were all doubtful, though they did agree with most of his statements. Sara was the only informant who was surprised about his few statements, as she did not know about him before, but then doubt started taking over along the way. She was not sure, if a Serbian president could be trusted that easily, but also because of her lack of knowledge, she was not sure if she should trust him, as he may have only said good things, but not actually followed up on his words later. Esma, on the other hand, had a negative view of all Serbian politicians, as they do not want to accept the qualification of genocide regarding Srebrenica. As long as they do not do this, everything they say is twofaced. All the informants suspect that Serbian politicians may not be trustworthy, but at varying degrees. From the point of maternal thinking this could be explained as Vučić's narratives were lacking delight and compassion, since Bosniaks were not sure enough, if they could trust him, meaning they do not believe that he will stand by their side at all times. When Vučić focuses on the preservation of the Serbian people, the Bosniaks understand that he does prefer Serbs over Bosniaks, and therefore his interest in improving the relations are not honest.

In addition, all of the other informants do not view the current situation as pessimistic regarding the relation between the different ethnicities, as Vučić is trying to make it, as they do believe that the relationship between Serbs and Bosniaks in Bosnia is already good or will improve. However, they are not sure, if the Serbs would ever admit to their wrongdoings. Regarding the solution that Vučić is offering, they agree that it is important to look into the future and improve the economy, but the past must not be ignored or forgotten. It can also be difficult to move on, if the Serbs do not recognise the crime in Srebrenica as genocide. Also, donating money is good, but it is not enough, as you cannot buy people, who have lost someone. In other words, the Bosniaks do not agree with Vučić's possible pessimistic vision, as they do not view the threats probable enough.

Furthermore, they all disagree with his view on the victims, i.e. that Serbian victims are being overlooked. The informants feel that this is happening, because there are not that many Serb victims. The ones who died were not civilians, and if civilians were killed it was done by some individuals, who wanted revenge or power, but the intent of the Bosniak army was never to eliminate a whole people. They all defended themselves.

Regarding Dodik all informants had a negative impression of him to begin with, though some could not understand, if he himself believed in what he was saying, or if there was even a boundary to what he would say. This impression remained bad, and several informants expressed that their opinion of him changed for the worse after reading all of the statements. Also, they all disagreed with everything that Dodik said, as he was simply a liar and trying to twist the truth. Everyone had a positive opinion of Western actors, as they were considered to be fair towards all the victims and war criminals from the past war. The informants also focus on the fact that there is only one objective truth, and that is what the evidence points at. Two conflicting truths cannot exist side by side, therefore the informants do not share the same understanding of the situation in Bosnia, as acknowledging what happened in the past is not meant to undermine Serb victims or discriminate against them due to their ethnicity. Only Esma believes that if the truth does get recognised then Republic Srpska faces being demolished, as it came to existence based on genocidal warfare. As mentioned earlier, Dodik focused less on the social acceptability of Republic Srpska compared to the preservation, therefore Bosniaks do not view in a positive light, as he favours Serbs and Srpska over Bosniak victims. Therefore his narratives, from the point of Bosniaks, do not contain compassion or delight.

In general the verbal statements did not affect the informants' previous impression of Serbian politicians or policies. Sara was initially surprised by his statements, until the doubt in Serbian politicians, which all the informants share, started showing. Also, as they all highlight, these are just statements. Seeing some action would actually be what could change their opinion about Vučić and Dodik. Some of the statements left a better impression on the informants, but in general their impression of Vučić and Dodik and their narratives never swayed. Finally, the informants shared the view that there was only one thing that could be done to improve the relationship for good, and that was to admit genocide. Some did believe that investing is a good idea, and it will change something for some people, but it is not enough.

Bibliography

- Aleksandar Vučić (2015a) *Aleksandar Vučić - konferencija za novinare u Vladi Srbije (7.7.2015)*. [Online Video]. 8 July 2015. Available from <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WStAgfxHwAA>> [accessed: 25 October 2017].
- Aleksandar Vučić (2015b) *Aleksandar Vučić - obraćanje javnosti nakon napada u Potočarima.* [Online Video]. 12 July 2015. Available from <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pMTPnv32OCs>> [accessed: 25 October 2017].
- Aleksandar Vučić (2015c) *Aleksandar Vučić I Milorad Dodik - konferencija za novinare (17.7.2015)*. [Online Video]. 17 July 2015. Available from <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HoNinvtAo1c>> [accessed: 25 October 2017].
- Aleksandar Vucic (2015d) *Govor Aleksandra Vučića na Investiciono-razvojnoj konferenciji*. Online Video]. 11 November 2015. Available from <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ISCVtp62-1c>> [accessed: 23 October 2017].
- Aleksandar Vučić (2016) *Vučić: Srbija osuđuje svaki zločin*, [Online Video]. 26 March 2016. Available from <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fuyYmnJBjUU>> [accessed: 23 October 2017].
- Brennan, M. (2016) “Kerry compares Aleppo slaughter to Srebrenica genocide” in *CBS News*. [Online] 15th December. Available from CBS News’ web site <<http://www.cbsnews.com/news/secretary-of-state-john-kerry-compares-aleppo-slaughter-to-srebrenica-genocide/>> [Accessed 28 October 2017].
- Bryman, A. (2012) *Social Research Methods*, Oxford University Press: New York.
- Burton, N (2012) “Jean-Paul Sartre on Bad Faith” in *Psychology Today*. [Online] 20th March. Available from Psychology Today’s website <<https://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/hide-and-seek/201203/jean-paul-sartre-bad-faith>> [Accessed 28 October 2017].
- Cohen, S. (2001) *States of Denial: Knowing about Atrocities and Suffering*, Polity Press: Cambridge
- Cohn, C. (2013) “‘Maternal thinking’ & the Concept of ‘vulnerability’ in Security Paradigms, Policies, and Practices,” *Journal of International Political Theory*, vol. 10(1).
- Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide 1948 , GAR 260 A (III), proposed for signature 9 December 1948, entered into force 12 January 1951.
- Dnevni Avaz TV (2017). *Aleksandar Vučić intervju za Dnevni Avaz*. [Online Video]. 16 March 2017. Available from <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gu60KBjNhhU>> [accessed: 23 October 2017].
- Dnevnik.hr (2008) “Iako postuje snimke, Vučić nije će upletenost u zločine” in *Dnevnik.hr*. [Online] 30th December. Available from <https://dnevnik.hr/vijesti/hrvatska/iako-postoje-snimke-vucic-nijece-upletenost-u-zlocine-u-glini.html> [Accessed 28 October 2017].

- DR (2015) “Bosnisk-serbisk leder: Srebrenica-massakre er en løgn” in *DR*. [Online] 4th July. Available from CBS News’ web site <<https://www.dr.dk/nyheder/udland/bosnisk-serbisk-leder-srebrenica-massakre-er-en-loegn>> [Accessed 28 October 2017].
- Face HD TV (2017) *Dodik ponovo negirao genocid u Srebrenici, ali i opsadu Sarajeva*, [Online Video]. 6 June 2017. Available from <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DB-a1QyAKSs>> [accessed: 26 October 2017].
- Happy Tv (2017) *Aleksandar Vucic o Srebrenici (Tv Happy, Cirilica 10.07.2017)*. [Online Video]. 11 July 2017. Available from <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Tfvj6pgVkXo>> accessed: 26 October 2017].
- ICTY (n.d. a) “About the ICTY” in *United Nations International Criminal Tribunal of the former Yugoslavia*. [Online] [No date]. Available from United Nations International Criminal Tribunal of the former Yugoslavia’s website <<http://www.icty.org/en/about>> [Accessed 23 October 2017].
- ICTY (n.d. b) “Outreach Articles Archive” in *United Nations International Criminal Tribunal of the former Yugoslavia*. [Online] [No date] available from United Nations International Criminal Tribunal of the former Yugoslavia’s website <<http://www.icty.org/en/outreach/outreach-articles-archive>> [Accessed 23 October 2017].
- ICTY (n.d. c) “ICTY Remembers: The Srebrenica Genocide 1995-2015” in *United Nations International Criminal Tribunal of the former Yugoslavia* [Online] [No date]. Available from United Nations International Criminal Tribunal of the former Yugoslavia’s website <<http://www.icty.org/specials/srebrenica20/?q=srebrenica20/>> [Accessed: 23 October 2017].
- Ifimes (2009) “European Parliament adopts the Resolution on Srebrenica” in *ifimes*. [Online] 15th January. Available from ifimes’ web site <<http://www.ifimes.org/en/8210-european-parliament-adopts-the-resolution-on-srebrenica>> [Accessed 28 October 2017].
- Kovacevic, Z (2007) “Dodik rekao da se u Srebrenici desio genocid” in *Radio Slobodna Evropa*. [Online] 7th November. Available from Radio Slobodna Evropa’s website <<https://www.slobodnaevropa.org/a/718932.html>>. [Accessed 28 October 2017].
- Kvale, S. and Brinkmann, S. (2008). *InterView*, Hans Reitzels Fotlag: København.
- Minority Rights Group International (2008) “Bosnia and Hercegovina – Bosniaks” in *Minority Rights Group International*. [Online] [No date]. Available from Minority Rights Group International’s website <<http://minorityrights.org/minorities/bosniaks/>> [Accessed 28 October 2017].
- Miskimmon, A and O’Loughlin, B (2014) “Weaponising information: Putin, the West and competing strategic narratives of Ukraine” in *European Geostrategy*. [Online] 18th December. Available from European Geostrategy’s website <<https://www.europeangeostrategy.org/2014/12/weaponising-information-putin-west-competing-strategic-narratives-ukraine/>> [Accessed 28 October 2017].

Miskimmon, A., O'Loughlin, B. and Roselle, L. (2017) *Forging the World*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Narayan, C (2016) "Aleppo joints events that define moderns evil, UN envoy says" in *CNN*. [Online] 15th December. Available from CNN's website <<http://edition.cnn.com/2016/12/15/world/samantha-power-aleppo-srebrenica/index.html>> [Accessed 28 October 2017].

Nardelli, A, Dzidic, D and Jukic, E (2014) "Bosnia and Hercegovina: the world's most complicated system of government?" in *The Guardian*. [Online] 8th October. Available from The Guardian's website <<https://www.theguardian.com/news/datablog/2014/oct/08/bosnia-herzegovina-elections-the-worlds-most-complicated-system-of-government>> [Accessed 28 October 2017].

N1 (2015) *Govor Milorada Dodika na Investiciono-razvojnoj konferenciji*, [Online Video]. 11 Novembar 2015. Available from <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Aq2DkufVgY0>> [accessed: 24 October 2017].

N1 Sarajevo (2017) "Zvizdić: Odnosi sa Srbijom bolji, Srebrenica i dalje rana" in *N1*. [Online] 23rd March. Available from N1's website <<http://rs.n1info.com/a236961/Svet/Region/Zvizdic-Odnosi-sa-Srbijom-u-uzlaznoj-putanji-Srebrenica-i-dalje-rana.html>> [Accessed 28 October 2017].

Obradovic-Wochnik, J. (2013) "The 'Silent Dilemma' of Transitional Justice: Silencing and Coming to Terms with the Past in Serbia," *The International Journal of Transitional Justice*, vol. 7(2).

Oslobodjenje.ba (2015) *Milorad Dodik neće u Srebrenicu na obilježavanje 20. godišnjice genocida*. [Online Video]. 8 June 2015. Available from <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wTEdw1Ovmg0>> [accessed: 23 October 2017].

Outreach (2005) "Facts about Srebrenica" in *Outreach*. [Online] October. Available from Outreach's website <http://www.icty.org/x/file/Outreach/view_from_hague/jit_srebrenica_en.pdf> [Accessed 23 October 2017].

Ramet, S. (2007) "The denial syndrome and its consequences: Serbian political culture since 2000," *Communist and Post-communist Studies*, vol. 40(1).

Roselle et al. (2014) "Strategic narrative: A new means to understand soft power," *Media, War & Conflict*, vol. 7(1).

RTRS vijesti (2015a) *Dodik: Srebrenicu proglasiti mjestom genocida i nad Srbim*. [Online Video]. 16 June 2015. Available from <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=asOpyJ4etWo>> [accessed: 23 October 2017].

RTRS vijesti (2015b) *Investiciono-razvojna konferencija "Mogućnost i perspektive razvoja - Srebrenica 2015" // Press*. [Online Video]. 11 November 2015. Available from <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eis-3KoiJHM>> [accessed: 25 October 2017].

RTRS vijesti (2016a) *Radovanu Karadžiću 40 godina zatvora*, [Online Video]. 24 March 2016. Available from <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qAz8AUUM4Ek>> [accessed: 23 October 2017].

RTRS vijesti (2016b) *Dodik: U Srebrenici nije bilo genocida, to je manipulacija*, [Online Video]. 11 July 2016. Available from <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=H2h-pcYJhL0>> [accessed: 23 October 2017].

RTRS vijesti (2016c) *Srbi nikada neće priznati genocid u Srebrenici, jer se on nije desio* [Online Video] 11 July 2016. Available from <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vxICWS2wkBY>> [accessed: 26 October 2017].

RTV Pink Official (2016) *Milorad Dodik , kzn, reakcija, presuda, Radovan Karadzic*, [Online Video] 24 March 2016. Available from <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YLqARrCy06E>> [accessed: 23 October 2017].

Ruble, K (2014) “Dutch Forces Found at Fault in the Srebrenica Massacre — 20 Years Later” in *Vice News*. [Online] 17th July. Available from Vice News’ website <<https://news.vice.com/article/dutch-forces-found-at-fault-in-the-srebrenica-massacre-20-years-later>> [Accessed 28 October 2017].

Ruddick, S. (1989) *Maternal Thinking: Towards a Politics of Peace*, The Women’s Press: Boston

Sens Servis (2015a) *U Srebrenici pobijeno osam hiljada ljudi, a sahranjeno je tek četiri hiljade* [Online Video]. 8 June 2015. Available from <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dzCVnB7xvwk>> [accessed: 23 October 2017].

Sens Servis (2015b) *Dodik o Rezoluciji o Srebrenici*. [Online Video]. 23 June 2015. Available from <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=64dQ0nnsdBA>> [accessed: 23 October 2017].

Srbija uzivo! (2016) *Aleksandar Vucic , Bill Clinton | TRIBINA New York 2016*, [Online Video] 22 September 2016. Available from <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gj7-V1ryQ8U>> [accessed: 23 October 2017].

Thykier, M (2016) ”Røde Kors om Aleppo: »Det minder om Srebrenica«” in *Jyllands-Posten*. [Online] 13th December. Available from Jyllands-Posten’s website <<http://jyllands-posten.dk/international/mideast/ECE9222425/roede-kors-om-aleppo-det-minder-om-srebrenica/>> [Accessed 28 October 2017].

Traynor, I. (2010) “Srebrenica genocide: worst massacre in Europe since the Nazis” in *The Guardian*. [Online] 10th June. Available from The Guardian’s website <<https://www.theguardian.com/law/2010/jun/10/hague-bosnian-serb-srebrenica-genocide1>> [Accessed 28 October 2017].

TV1 HD (2015) *Predsjednici i premijeri Srbije i RS zatražili odbacivanje rezolucije o Srebrenici*. [Online Video]. 26 June 2017. Available from <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=R49NyXZvVFo>> [accessed: 24 October 2017].

TV1 HD (2016) *Dodik na Palama otvorio studentski dom nazvan po Karadžiću*, [Online Video], 20 March 2016. Available from <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Tn4h811B5Yo>> [accessed: 26 October 2017].

UN news centre (n.d.) “UN officials recall 'horror' of Srebrenica as Security Council fails to adopt measure condemning massacre” in *UN News Centre*. [Online] No date. Available from UN News Centre’s website <<http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=51359#.WeJVn6BJHqA>> [Accessed 28 October 2017].

Appendix 1: Interview Guide

Interview Guide

Presentation of the interviewee's rights

- Anonymous and recorded, but only for transcriptions, deleted hereafter
- Can stop, take a break or skip questions any time
- Reaction, not knowledge – interview, not quiz
- I appreciate honesty, try to be as honest as possible. Do not hold back
- First I will ask some background questions and later I will present some quotes from politicians. Should not take longer than 45 minutes

Part 1

Background questions:

- Da li te zanima politika? (Are you interested in politics?)
- Kako pratis politiku i koliko cesto? (How do you stay informed? How often do you follow politics? Do you discuss politics with friends?)
- Za koje politicare znas najvise? A najmanje? (Which politicians are you most familiar with or informed about? And the least?)
- Sa kim se najvise slazes/neslazes? (Whom do you agree the most with? The least?)
- Glasas li? I za koje partije ili politicare si glasao ako smijem znati? (Do you vote? And for which politician or political party, if I may know?)
- Kakav je tvoj generalni utisak o politici u Bosni? U regionu? O odnosima izmedu Srba i Bosnjaka? (What is your general impression of politics in Bosnia? In the region? About the relationship between Serbs and Bosniaks?)
- Jesi li cuo sta se dogodilo u Srebrenici 1995, i sta znas o tome? (Have you heard about what happened in Srebrenica in 1995, and what?)
 - o Kad si prvi put cuo za to, i od dakle ili od koga? (When did you first hear about it, and from where or whom did you first hear it from?)
 - o Koji je tvoj stav sta sa tice toga? (What is your opinion about it?)
- Je li znas za ikakvi politiciki debata u regionu vezano za dogadaj u Srebrenici? (Are you familiar with any political debates in the region regarding Srebrenica?)
- Kakvu budcnost vidis sta se tice odnosa Srba i Bosnjaka u vezi Srebrenice? (Which future do you see for the relationship among Serbs and Bosniaks?)

Prepare for Part 2

- Komentar? (Comments?)
- Pitanja? (Questions?)

Part 2

Znate li ko je Aleksandar Vucic? Objasni ako ne. (Do you know who Vucic is? Explain if not)

- Sta mislis o njemu? (What do you think about him?)
- Je li znas kakav je njegov politicki stav vezano za Srebrenicu? (Do you know what his political standpoint is regarding Srebrenica?)

Znas li za Savet Bezbednost? O Rezolucije o Srebrenici? I koja je definicija rijeci genocid? Objasni ako neznas. (Do you know about the UN's Security Council? About the Resolution about Srebrenica? And what the definition of the word genocide is? Explain, if not.)

Na tu rezoluciju, Vucic je rekao (Regarding the resolution Vucic said): (T7) (Read slowly)

Rezolucija o Srebrenici danas nije usvojena na Savetu Bezbednosti Ujedinjenih Nacija. Srbija ovu vesti nedozivlja kao pobjedu jer u Srebrenici, kao i bilo gde drugo na prostoru bivse Jugoslavije, nema pobednika. Ima samo zrtava koje zahtevaju nas pijetat i postovanje.

Onaj veliki korak koju bezbeduju razumevanja, oprastanje, postovanje i normalan zivot nikakav Savet Bezbednosti nije ni pokusao da ucini. To mozemo da uradimo samo mi, Srbi i Bosnjaci, pravoslavni muslimani, mi koji zivimo na ovim prostorima I koji nemamo gde drugo. Srebrenica I svako drugo stratiste, svako srpsko stratiste, jeste pred svega nas balkanski greh i nas bol i velika opomena, opet nikome drugom, nego nama koji ovdje medu tim grobljima tamo gde trebamo da zivimo.

- Sta ti mislis o njegovoj izjavi? (What do you think about this statement?)
- Jeste li zadovoljni sa ovim rijecima? (Are you satisfied with these words?)
- Da li se slazes ili neslazes sa tim da samo ljudi sto zive na balkanu trebaju se brinuti o pomirenju i politickim sukobima u regionu? (Do you agree that only people who live in the Balkans should care for reconciliation and political conflicts?)
- Ima li pobednika na ovim prostorima? Ko i kako se neko moze smatrati pobednikom? (Is there a winner? Who and how can someone be considered a winner?)
- Jesmo li svi zrtve, kao sto je on objasnio? (Are we all victims, as he said?)

U juli 2015 bio je napad nad Vucica u Potocarima kad je dolazio na posjetu na Dan Zalosti. Poslije je Vucic rekao (July 2015 Vucic was attacked in Potocarima when he visited on the Day of Sorrow. Afterwards he expressed): (t30) read slowly

Zao mi je sto neki ljudi nisu prepoznali moju iskrenu namjeru da gradimo prijateljstvo izmedu Srba I bosnjaka. Kao sto sam jutros porodici rekao "Bez obzira na ovome sto se desilo, bez obzira na to sto sam video mrznju kakvu nikad prije nisam vidjeo, moja ruka prema Bosnjackom narodu ostaje izpruzena. Ja cu nastaviti sa tom politikom I uvek cu biti spreman da razgovaramo o tome kako da probleme prelazimo. Budale ima u svakom narodu. Nismo ni mi u defecitu sa takvima i ja razumem da najveći deo Bosnackog naroda se neslaze sa onim sto su danas pokusali da urade.

Ja pozivam sve Srbe da danas koracuju ponosno kroz nase ulice onako kako sam i ja danas koracao u Srebrenici dajuci pocast ubijanjim Srebrenicarima. Da nikada i nigdje pokazuju mrznju prema Bosnjackom narodu, nasim komsijama i prijateljima Bosnjacima. Da niko nigdje ne podigne ruku ili nepomisle da sada ima pravo da cini stam u je volja, jer mi sa bosnjacima moramo da zivimo zajedno u buducnosti. I oni ce tu ruku pomirenja prihvatiti. Dosta je bilo mrtvih, dosta je bilo besa.

- Sta ti mislis o njegovoj izjavi? (What do you think about his statement?)
- Jesi li ti zadovoljan sa ovim rijecima? (Are you satisfied with these words?)
- Sta mislis o napadu nad Vucica? (What do you think about the attack on him?)
- Da li se slazes ili neslazes sa tim da vredi pruzati nekome ruku pomirenja, i da ce oni na kraju prihvatiti je? (Do you agree with him that it is important to reach out a hand of reconciliation, and that people will accept it eventually?)

U novembru 2015 bila je Investiciono-Razvojnoj konferencija u Srebrenica i gdje je Vucic ucestvovao. Takode na taj dan je rekao (In November 2015 there was a economic development conference in Srebrenica, and Vucic participated. He said): (read slowly)

Zelim da izgovorim i da kazem, da niko sestrama nemoze da vrati bracu. Niko majkama nemoze da vrati sinove ili decu, ali ono sto mozemo da uradimo to je da gledamo u buducnost. Da drugaciju buducnost napravimo, da brinemo o ovih jedno 21-22.000 ljudi koji danas zive u srebrenici, da bih ih u buducnost bilo vise i da bih bili sretniji i radosniji. Da bih u narodnih 100 godina ziveli u miru, blagostanju i da tih ljudi budu zadovoljni svojim sudbinama i jos zadovoljniji svojim buducnostima.

- Sta ti mislis o njegovoj izjavi? (What do you think about his statement?)
- Jesi li ti zadovoljan sa ovim rijecima? (Are you satisfied with these words?)
- Da li se slazes ili neslazes sa tim da je vrijeme da se gleda u buducnosti? (Do you agree or disagree that it is time to look forward in to the future?)
- Srbija je ulozila 5 milliona euro za Srebrenicu taj dan, bez ikakvi obaveza za Srebrenicu. Sta mislis o tome? Kakav utjecaj mislis da ce to imati na odnose medu Srbije i Srebrenice? (Serbia invested 5 million Euros that day without demanding any obligations. What do you think about that? What effect do you think it will have on the relationship between Serbs and Bosniaks?)

Jeste li culi za Karadzica i za njegovu kaznu? Objasni ako nezna. Vucic ja posle toga rekao (Have you heard about Karadzic and the trial against him? Vucic said the following): (T15) (read slowly)

Srbija osuduje svaki zlocin. Svaki zlocin koji je pocinio neki Hrvat ili Bosnjak nad Srbinom i svaki zlocin koji je Srbin pocinio nad bilo kim. Mi to, ako ste primetili, jedini u regionu smijemo na takav nacin da kazemo. Ja sa ponosom mogu da kazem da vodim vladu koja nerazlikuje zlocince i zlocine

ni po imenu ni prezimu. Vec dakle da li nam se to ime i prezime svida ili ne, vec da li je neko pocio taj zlocan delo ili nije.

Nezaboravite da smo mi ljude koji smo ucinila najteze zlocine u Srebrenici. Cak 14 njih uhapsili ovdje u Srbiji. Nisam primetio da se slicne stvari dogadaju u nekim drugim republikama bivse jugoslavije. Neki kao da se svakoga dana pitaju ili zele sebi da kazu da nijedan Srbin nije stradao ili da nije bilo zlocina protiv Srba. Sto se nas tice mi nemamo taj problem. Ja mislim da to pokazuje velicinu naseg naroda, ozbiljnosti i odgovornosti nase vlade.

Tako da, o pojedinacnim presudama da govorimo, usli bih smo u nesto sto nije nas posao, posebno ako te presude nisu pravoslavne. Mislim da smo najbolje, najtacnije i najpreciznije reagovali.

- Sta ti mislis o njegovoj izjavi? (What do you think about his statement?)
- Jesi li ti zadovoljan sa ovim rijecima? (Are you satisfied with these words?)
- Da li se slazes ili neslazes sa tim da je Srbije neutralna, sto se tice zlocina uradeni na Balkanskim prostorima? (Do you agree that Serbia is neutral regarding the atrocities that happened in former wars on the Balkan?)
- Mislis li je Srbija vise neutralna nego drugi zemalja? (Would you say that Serbia is more neutral than other countries?)
- Vucic nije htjeo komentarisati o Karadzicu ili drugim pojedinacnim presudama, posto nesmatra da je to njegov posao? Sta ti mislis o tome? Da li premijer ili politicari iz Srbije trebaju ulaziti u te teme? (Vucic did not want to comment on the trial against Karadzic or other individual cases, as he does not consider this to be his job. What do you think about that? Should he or other politicians bring this up?)

U Septembru 2016, Vucic se sastavio sa Bill Clintom i Camil Durakovicom. Vucic je rekao (September 2016 Vucic met with Bill Clinton and Camil Durakovic, and he said): (t19)

problem na nasim prostorima je da Bosnjaci u Bosni misle da mogu da podbjede Srbe, posti njih ima vise. A sa druge strane bosanski Srbi vjeruju da oni mogu pobjediti Bosnjaci, ako dobiu pomoc od Srbije. To misljenje nas vodi u tu situaciju gdje nikome nista nemozes objasniti.

- Sta ti mislis o njegovoj izjavi? (What do you think about his statement?)
- Jesi li ti zadovoljan sa ovim rijecima? (Are you satisfied with these words?)
- Da li se slazes ili neslazes sa tim da je danasnja situacija u Bosni u Srbiji tako kako je on predlozio? (do you agree that this is what the current situation is in the region?)

On je takode rekao u martu 2017 (In March 2017 he said):

Sve vreme govorite o necemu sto treba da ima pravnu posledicu. Niko nikada neumanjuje tezinu zlocina, tezinu uzasni stvari koje su se dogodile u Srebrenici. Sto je mnogo vaznije.

Onda se postavljuje pitanje Srbima sa druge strane, a sta je to zbog cega neko zeli pravnu kvalifikaciju? To nema veze sa tim da li nesto osjeca i da li ste razumeli sta je to sto se tamo dogodilo. Vec ima sa necim drugim.

- Sta ti mislis o njegovoj izjavi? Jeste li zadovoljni? (What do you think about his statement? Are you satisfied?)
- Da li mislis da pravne kvalifikacije o jednom događaju imaju drugi cilj nego o ljudskoj patnji? (Do you agree with him that legal qualifications have something else to do with than with people's pain?)

10 Jula 2017, Vucic je bio upitan uvezi za napad nad njega u Potocarima na koje nije htjeo da predugo prica.. Ali je rekao ovo (July 2017 was questioned about the attack on him to which he did not want to talk to much about, but he did say):

Dakle tu mi jos od Balkanski ratova nismo razmenjivali zive ljude. Mi smo imali zarobljenike. Jednim drugima smo sve ubijali. Mi muslimanima, muslimani nama u 1. i 2. Svetskom Ratu i 90'tih. Ja zato smatram da su odnosi Srba i Bosnjaka od kljucnog znacaja za buducnosti, iako znam da mnogi Srbi to nevole da cuju.

Ovo negovorim da bih se bilo kome udvorio. Dok sam predsednik Republike na tome cu iskreno i otvoreno da radim. Uvek razume se stiteci i cuvati i Srpske nacionalni interese i interese drzave Srbije. Ali su nama potrebni Bosnjaci za buducnost onoliko koliko smo i mi potrebni njima. To je ono sto ja stvarno mislim. To je ono sto iskreno osecam. Znam koliku bih smo stetu i kako bih katastrofalno izgledala nasa buducnosti da se vodi drugacija politika.

- Sta ti mislis o njegovoj izjavi? (What do you think about his statement?)
- Slazes li se ili ne? Do you agree or disagree?)
- Jeste li zadovoljni sa ovim recma od Predsednika Srbije? (Are you satisfied?)
- Jesu li odnosi između Srba i Bosnjaci od kljucnog znacaja? (Is the relationship between Serbs and Bosniaks of utter importance?)

Posle svih ovih izjava, kakav ti je sad utisak o Vucicu? O njegov politici prema Srebrenici? Bosnjacima?(After all these presentations of statements what is your impression of Vucic now? Of his political standpoint towards Srebrenica? Towards Bosniaks?)

Prepare for Part 3

- Komentar? (Comments?)
- Pitanja? (Questions?)

Part 3

Znate li ko je Milorad Dodik? Objasni ako ne zna. (Do you know who Dodik is? Explain if not)

- Sta mislis o njemu? (What do you think about him?)
- Je li znas kakav je njegov politicki stav vezano za Srebrenicu? (Are you familiar with his political standpoint regarding Srebrenica?)

Juni 2015, Dodik izjaio je o zlocinu u Srebrenici (June 2015 Dodik said): (t1 – read slowly)

Taj slučaj je potpuno ispolitizovan od početka, i kvalifikaciju tog događaja kao genocid je apsolutno namednuto iz politički razloga. Sve „zahtnje“ pokazuju da to nije tako, i ta upravo polizitacija mene dovodi u poziciju da nemogu da prihvatim i da legitimisem ili legalisujem takvu jednu kvalifikaciju

I ja mislim da se treba obezbediti prije svega jedno mješovito međunarodnu komisiju, koja će sa ove vremenske distancije veoma objektivno procijenuti šta se tamo desilo i dati kvalifikaciju. Samo na taj nacin može da to bude mjesto pomirenje i mjesto potpuno razumijevanja

- Sta ti mislis o njegovoj izjavi? (What do you think about his statement?)
- Jeste li zadovoljni sa ovim rijecima? (Are you satisfied with this?)
- Da li se slazes ili neslazes sa tim da je kvalifikacija genocid jedan ispolitizovan slucaj sta se tice Srebrenice? (Do you agree or disagree that the qualification of the case in Srebrenica is 'overpoliticised'?)
- Mislis da je potrebna jedna objektivna medunarodna komisija da procijeni sta se desilo u Srebrenici? Slazes li se s tim da je to jedina opcija, i sto (ne)? (Do you think there is a need for an international objective committee to decide what happened in Srebrenica? Do you agree that that is the only option, and why (not)?)

Juni 2015 Dodik je rekao sledece o Rezoluciji o Srebrenici (June 2015 Dodik was interviewed, and he said the following about the Resolution about Srebrenica): (t3 read slow)

Očigledno razne konceptije koje idu za tim da održe pažnju na Srebrenici iz politički razloga širom svijeta, evo iznova predloženoj Rezoluciju na različitim mjestima. Koliko je to već izgubilo neki smisao govori činjenica da nema od toga mjesta gdje se nešto nepredlaže u tom smislu parlamenta BH [Bosnia and Hercegovina]. Evo i parlamenta Republike Srpske pa preko Evropskog Parlamenta do parlamenta zemalja Evropske Unije i na kraju do sami, evo kao što i vidite, samog Savete Bezbednosti. To govori o naporu da se nametne istina. Da je istina neupitna, nebi trebalo voliko napora.

činjenica ja da se uporno namjeće termin genocida – upravo od onih koji su možda imali problema s tim vrzeci zločin genocida na drugi narodima kroz vijekove. Sada nama pokušavaju zbog jednog događaja da nametnu odgovornost. Ništa to nije novo. Dakle Bošnjaci uporno žele da kolektiviziraju krivicu.. a Srebrenica im je dobar i jasan pogod.

- Sta ti mislis o njegovoj izjavi? (What do you think about his statement?)
- Jeste li zadovoljni sa ovim rijecima? (Are you satisfied with these words?)
- Da li se slazes ili neslazes sa tim da neko namijerno zeli kvalifikaciju gencid iz politicki razloga? (Do you agree or disagree that someone deliberately wants to classify the happening in Srebrenica as genocide for ulterior reasons?)
- I da je to lazna kvalifikacija dogadaja u Srebrenici 1995? (And that it is a fake classification of the hapening?)
- Da li se treba kolektivizirati krivica dogadaja u Srebrenici? (Should the blame of the happening in Srebrenica be collectivized?)

U intervjuvu on je nastavio i predlozio da (He further added): read slowly

Istina je da je tamo u kontinuitetu izginulo 3,500 ubijeno, 3,500 Srba, da boli koliko su nezainteresovani za sudbinu Srba na tom prostoru. A pomalo iritira već nastojene da nam nametnu tu istinu koja uporno kažemo da neželimo da prihvatimo taku. I sve je to znači vezano za promociju jedne neistine, a to je da se tamo desio genocid zanemarujući stradanih prije svega Srba.

Evo ja predlažem da se Srebrenica proglasi kao mjesto genocida i nad Srbima i nad Bošnjacima. I da na taj način odamo zajedničku pomen žrtvama i da na zajednički način kažemo i poručimo svijetu da je to zaista bio genocid sa obe strane, i da se sa obe strane stradalo ogroman broj ljudi, i da u tom pogledu moramo da imamo posebnu pažnju za to mjesto i da posebno to pominjeno.. i vapi za pomjerenom između Srbima, Bošnjacima i svim ostalim. Mislim da bi to bio neki ispravan put i koji bih bio moguće i valjano prihvatljiv za sve i naravno da sam i u ovome trenutku verujem da će to biti prvo Bošnjaci.

- Sta ti mislis o njegovoj izjavi? (What do you think about his statement?)
- Jeste li zadovoljni sa ovim rijecima? (Are you satisfied with these words?)
- Da li se slazes ili neslazes sa tim da se premalo brine o Srpskim zrtvima na tim prostorima? (Do you agree or disagree that there is too little attention or care for Serbian victims at those places?)
- Sta mislis o tome da Srebrenica bude prihvacena kao mjesto genocida nad Bosnjacima i Srbima? (What do you think about having Srebrenica accepted as a place in which there was a genocide against both Bosniaks and Serbs?)

Ljeto 2015 Dodik je odbacio Rezoluciju o Srebrenici sa ovim argumentima (Summer 2015 Dodik rejected the Resolution about Srebrenica with the following arguements): (t4 – slow)

Resoluciju i predlog Resolocije Britanije smatramo lošom ponudom, nepristojnom ponudom koju nam šalju. Odbijamo je kao nepotrebnu, kao onu koja može samo da unosi više problema u Bosni i Hercegovini nego što može da unose ono što je svima potrebno i to je pomirjenje.

- Sta ti mislis o njegovoj izjavi?

- Jeste li zadovoljni sa ovim recima od predsednika Republike Srpske?
- Da li se slazes ili neslazes sa tim da Rezolucija, to jest prihvacene dogadaj u Srebrenici kao genocid, bio dovelo do vise problema nego pomirenja?

Dodik je istog ljeta rekao sljedece (Dodik said around the same time the following): (t8) slow

Inaci svih onih tamo sto sjede u Ambasadima u Sarajevo su prestraseni organizacije muslimana. Oni se boje da ce pred njega u kancelarije doci jedno 10.000 koje ce vikati „Allahu Ekber!“ I to je njihov strah. I njihove ponasenje trebate da razumete iz tog razloga. Inace kad sa nama sjede pricaju ponesto drugo.

Ali u svakom slucaju visoki predstavnik nije doprinio da se Bosna konstituise na Daytonskom principu, nego je napravio jedno anti-daytonsko Bosna i Hercegovinu. Protiv te anti-daytonske Bosne i Hercegovine mi se borimo. A taj isti visoki predstavnik nas optuzuje da mi krsimo dayton. Apsolutno absurdno...

Ni kao sto nije ovaj predlog Rezolucije Velike Britanije bio usmjeren na tom da se dode do pomirenje u Bosni i Hercegovini. Takvo je i njegovo ponasanje. Naj lodesniji visoki predstavnik je bio Paddy Ashdown, i to svih znaju. To neznaci da mi trebamo o njemu da cutimo. Dakle velike Britanija je predlozila u Rezoluciju da bih prorucila Islamskim bezbjednostima, kao „Evo mi podrzavamo muslimane eto na nekom drugom mjestu. Nemojte nama ovdje u Londonu praviti problema.“ Njihova motivacije je mogla da bude i to.

- Sta ti mislis o ovoj izjavi? (What do you think about his statement?)
- Jeste li zadovoljni sa ovim rijecima? (Are you satisfied with these words?)
- Slazes li se ili neslazes sa tim da Britanci su predlozili ovu Rezoluciji, da nebi muslimani kod njih pravili probleme? (Do you agree or disagree that Britain proposed this resolution in order to escape having muslims creating problems in their country?)
- Mislis li da ima ta mogucnost da rezoluciji o Srebrenici nije bila usmjerenja na to da uveca pomirenje izmedu Bosnjaka i Srba? (do you think ther eis a possibilty that the Resolution about Srebrenica was not created with the intent of bringing reconciliation among Serbs and Bosniaks?)

Kad je Radovan Karadzic bio osuden na 40 godina, Dodik se izjasnio o sljedecem (When Karadzic was sentenced 40 years in jail, Dodik said the following):

Republika Srpska smatra da treba da odgovori bio on Srbin ili neznam nija ko, ali ako izostanu drugi koji neodgovaraju. Samo se sa jednima forsira ta odgovornost, onda tu postaje naravno stvar u koje nemate povjerenja.

Tako i ovaj put vidimo Nasera Orica koji seta po Sarajevu. Atifa Dudakovica kojemu nista nefali. Naser Oric je naredivao ubistva. Radovan Karadzic je bio politicar. Naser Oric u

Sarajevu slovodobitno daje izjave o samom Radovanu Karadzicu. Neodgovora za ono sto je pobio tamo ... nekome drugom samom kraju okoline Srebrenice.

Sve to govori i ostaje jedan gorak utisak nepravde. Dakle nezelim nikoga pojedinačno da odnesiram odgovornosti, ali ako se zeljela pravda onda se moralo voditi racuna da postoje i druge zrtve. Ne samo da se sterotip koji je nametnut samom formiranje Haskog Tribunala odrzi a u njega upadnu svi odgovorni Srpski politicari i vojni rukovodioci, a za jednog Atifa Dudakovica nema cak ni procesuirana odogovornosti.

- Sta ti mislis o ovoj izjavi? ? (What do you think about his statement?)
- Jeste li zadovoljni sa ovim rijecima? (Are you satisfied with these words?)
- Slazes li se ili neslazes sa tim da Haski Tribunal izostaje neke zrtve, posebno Srpske zrtve? (Do you agree or disagree that the Tribunal in Hague ignores or forgets some victims, especially Serbian victims?)
- I da li se treba vise fokusirati na komandante i generale bivse Bosanske vojske? (And should there be a greater fokus on former generals and commanders of the Bosnian army?)

Takode je rekao (He further added):

Sve su to stvari koje ostaju neobjasnjene i samo se smerava ona prica o krsenju zakona i pravila rata. Verovatno je toga i bilo, ali nemoguce da je to samo bilo na jednoj strani, kao da nije bilo na drugoj strani. Nismo to videli nit kroz jednu presudu dosada i zato i sama ova odluka Haskog tribunala u tom pogledu nema snagu. Uvjerenja da se radi o mestu pravde, nego mestu politickog eksekucije i politicke osude jednog vremena, jednog naroda.

- Sta mislis o ovoj izjavi? ? (What do you think about his statement?)
- Jeste li zadovoljni sa ovim rijecima? (Are you satisfied with these words?)
- Sta mislis o tome kad kaze da Haski Tribunal proganjuje samo jedan narod? (What do you think about his statement when he says that the Tribunal in Hague is only chasing one people?)

Juni 2017 Dodik je rekao sledece (June 2017, Dodik expressed):

Nemoguce da ovde bude upotreba udvenice Federacije u kome se pise da su Srbi napravili genocid i da su drzali pod opsadom Sarajevo. To nije tacno i to nece se ovde izlecavati svidelo se kome ili ne, postoji dogovorini kriterium. Oni ne podruzemevaju tako nesto i nemojte nam slati udzbenike, jer nece uci u skolu. Nece uci u skole i gotovo.

To da nama ovdje podvale da u nasim skolama se uci kako smo mi genocid.. pa ko bih to priznao? Bili Bosnjaci pristali da mi napisemo udzbenike u kojem se oni tako kvalifikuju ili neko drugi. To bih iznad bilo kakve logike i odnose. Kako to da mi pustimo ? necemo pustiti, nemozemo. Dovidjenja, nemoze. Pa nek se ljuti ko hoce. Dakle apsolutno ako zele da izlodavaju tu vrste price

eno u Federacijama skole, neka uce. Mi to nemozemo da spretimo. A da nama nametnu udzbenike u kojima ce ovdje pisati da su Srbi izvrsili genocid. to se nikada nece desiti.

- Sta mislis o ovoj izjavi? ? (What do you think about his statement?)
- Jeste li zadovoljniji sa ovim rijecima? (Are you satisfied with these words?)
- Slazes li se sa icime? (Do you agree with anything?)

Posle svih ovih izjava, kakav ti je sad utisak o Dodiku? O njegov politici prema Srebrenici? Bosnjacima? (After all these statements, what is your impression of Dodik now? Of his political standpoint regarding Srebrenica? And regarding Bosniaks?)

Closure

Sad imam jos poneka generalna pitanja (Now all that is left are a few general questions):

- Kakav ti je cijeloukupni utisak od Srbskoj i Srbijanskoj politici o Srebrenici? S cime se najvise ili najmanje slazes? (What is your overall impression of Serbian politics about Srebrenica? What do you agre or disagree with the most?)
- Moze li se sta uciniti da se promjeni situacija u vezi Srebrenice, i sta? Kakvu budcnost vidis za BH i Srbije u vezi Srebrenice? (Do you think there is anything that can be done to change the situation regarding Srebrenica, and what? What future do you see for Bosnia and Serbia related to Srebrenica?)
- Imas li koji komentar za nesto, sto nisi stigao reci? Ili pitanja? (Any comments or questions? Something you did not get to say?)

Za kraj imam kratke pitanje da mi samo odgovoris (Now I just have a few quick questions remaining):

- kad si roden/-a (when were you born?)
- gdje (where?)
- tvoja edukacija (what is your educational backgrounds?)
- trenutni posao (current job?)
- civilni status (civil status?)

Hvala! (Thanks!)

Appendix 2: Transcription of Interview with Adis

Transcription of the Interview with Adis

To begin with the informant was informed about their right to take a break, quit the interview, skip questions, anonymity etc. and about the structure of the interview guide and the overall purpose of the project.

Introduction to Part 1

- 02:00 Kakav je tvoj generalni utisak o politici u Bosni ili o Bosni?
- 02:10 *Da se puno prica, a malo se radi. Da nema neke promjena, vecinom je sve isto. Da nemoze se promjeniti i da hoce.*
- 02:28 A o politici u regionu? Mislim na odnose izmedu Srba i Bosnjaka?
- 02:44 *Pa isto. Svi gledaju svoje, jos uvijek se gleda nacionalizam i tako. Nema neki napredak veliki.*
- 03:02 Jesi li cuo za sta se desilo u Srebrenici?
- 03:06 *Jesam.*
- 03:09 Kad si prvi put cuo?
- 03:15 *Kad sam bio dijete. Kad se to desavalo.*
- 03:23 A kako si dosao do te informacije?
- 03:27 *Pa preko vijesti i kad se pricalo o tome.*
- 03:34 I koji je tvoj stav sta se tice toga?
- 03:38 *Pa da nije uredi, da je to pogresno.*
- 03:45 Jeli znas za ikakvi politicki debata u regionu vezano za Srebrenicu?
- 03:55 *Znam. Svi politicari pricaju o tome. Ali taj, sto je najkontroverznan, sto ima nesto o tome reci, je Dodik. On prica o tome kao da nije nista bilo. I Srbi da "To nije tako, da se laze". Svi su drugi bili [unclear]. Normalno, Bosnjaci to prihvate. Ovih bih zaboravili, a drugih kazu da se nesmiije i tako.*
- 04:38 Kakvu buscnosti vidis u vezi odnosa izmedu Bosnjaka i Srba?
- 04:50 *Mislim da ce biti bolje, ali kao neke stvari se ence zaboraviti. Nevjerujem da ce biti to neka.. za nekoliko 500 godina.. Uvijek ce tu biti malo glume, malo folerisanja. Nevjerujem da ce odnosi biti kao izmedu drugi prijateljski zemalja, ali ce to biti bolje nego sto je sad.*

Introduction and preparation for Part 2

- 05:58 Znas li ko je Aleksandar Vucic?
- 06:02 *Da, predsjednik.*
- 06:06 Sta mislis o njemu?
- 06:11 *Pa nista posebno, ali zvuci nako fer, ono koliko moze biti. Neznam sad toliko bas da ti kazem, ali utisak mi je da je vako korektan.*
- 06:28 Znas li za njegov politicki stav vezano za Srebrenicu?
- 06:36 *Neznam, bas sad. Ali ako se sjecam rekao je da.. neznam, nemogu se sjetiti sta je rekao.*

Presenting Vucic's statement about the Resolution and UN's Security Council

- 08:56 Sta mislis o ovoj izjavi?
- 09:00 *Pa da je politicka izjava. Nije nista rekao, ali nije nista rekao mjenati to. Generalise dosta. On negovori sad u vezi genocida u Srebrenici koje kriv, vec on nekako napravi da su svi nekako krivi i da se svi trebaju pomiriti. Neka neutralna izjava da glasaci budu zadovoljni i da glasaju za njega, a i da nekako i zadovolji zrtve genocida. Politicka izjava eto.*
- 09:33 Na sto mislis kad reknes politicka izjava?
- 09:36 *Pa bez neceg konkretno. Nije konkretno rekao da je Srbija kriva. Nije rekao da nije bio genocid, ali nije ni da jeste genocid. A rekao da se svi trebaju pomiriti. Svi bih trebali oko toga oprastati, jer oni svi zivu tamo zajedno. Znaci generaliso je to, problem je napravio. Nije specificno rekao ko je kriv za Srebrenicu.*
- 10:15 A jesi li zadovoljan sa ovim rijecima?
- 10:19 *Nisam. Ako pricamo samo o Srebrenici, nisam.*
- 10:25 Sto?
- 10:27 *Zato sto 7-8.000 ljudi su ubili i na taj nacin zahtjeva malo vise.. treba se reci da su pogresili i da se to prizna toliko koliko. A ne vaki neki neutralan..*
- 10:54 A sta mislis o tome, sto je rekao, da samo ljudi sto zive tu se trebaju brinuti o pomirenju u regionu?

- 11:07 *Pa to jeste. Trebali bih normalno da i te ljudi sto zive tu brinuti se o tome. Ali to ispada malo kao ono da nezeli da mu se mjesa.. Pa jest, sa tim se slazem, normalno da Bosanci, Hrvati i Srbi se trebaju brinuti o tome. Sta ima Amerika tu sta reci?*
- 11:40 *Znaci Savet Bezbednosti bih trebali to ignorisati?*
- 11:43 *Ne bih trebali ignorisati. Oni bih trebalo nesto.. Ali oni nemogu nista. Oni bih trebali donjeti neku odliku, ali ako se neko sa tim neslaze. Naprimjer Srbi ili Bosanci ili neko kazu „Mi to nepriznajemo.“ Nema veze za Savet Bezbednosti, ako ovih drugi nepriznaju, nista nisi dobio posebno. Jesi dobio neku.. sad mozes ici dalje, ta prica ima neki svoj kraj, ali isto se moze desiti sutra tako nesto, zao sto tih, Bosanci, Srbi, Hrvati ili oo kojem je rijec, nisu se dogovorili. Oni su na istom gdje su bili i prije.*
- 12:33 *Moze li se iko smatrati kao pobjednikom na ovim prosotorima?*
- 12:43 *Pa ja bih rekao, da nema bas neki pobjednika, ali bih rekao da su Bosnjaci, ako se gleda koliko su oni bili.. da je to bilo prica da ce za par dana nestati i Bosne i muslimana, da ce svi biti otjerani. Ja bih rekao da su oni, ako ces zvati nekog pobjednikom, onda su to Bosanci, mada to isto nije neka pobjeda.*
- 13:18 *Bi li rekao da smo svi zrtve?*
- 13:24 *Ko svi?*
- 13:26 *Kao sto je on rekao..*
- 13:28 *Muslimani, Hrvati..*
- 13:29 *Da.*
- 13:30 *Ma nismo ni blizu zrtve toliko koliko.. pa to, s time se neslazem jer on to stavi ili generalisuje da smo svi isto krivi i da smo svi isto zrtve. A mi nismo. Najvise zrtve su Bosnjaci bili. Zna se ko je po brojevima, govoriti sve..*

Presenting Vucic's statement about the attack on him

- 13:54 *Sta mislis o ovoj izjavi?*
- 14:00 *Pa mislim da je upravu. Nije to nacin neki. Nije do njega, ali opet on svoje politicki govori.. Kao sto sam rekao ranije, on meni zvuci onako nekako korektan. Ali opet okrece sebi politicki. Pravi sebe zrtvom i kako on to ponosno hoda i kako on to.. opet sve politicki govori. Da prizna naprimjer krivicu za Srebrenici, ovo se nebi trebalo, onda bih bilo lako se pomiriti. Nemozes se ti pomiriti, ako nisi prizno sta si uradio. On govori da se treba pomiriti, i jeste treba to, ali nemozes se pomiriti ako nekazes istinu sta se desilo. Ali on to nekako neutralno politicki kaze da to dovodi do snah..*

- 15:15 Mislis da se treba pruzati ta ruka pomirenja, i mislis li da ce je mozda Bosnjaci iz Srebrenice prihvatiti?
- 15:28 *Prvo treba pruziti ruku izvinjenje. Sad ispada kao da on nosi ruku pomirenja i Bosanci ce prihvatiti tu ruku. Treba se pomiriti i normalno treba se zivjeti zajedno. Zemlja se treba dijeliti, ali trebaju i oni da priznaju i da se izvinu za to sto su uradili, i onda se moze ici dalje. Nemozes ici dalje, ako ti pricas okolo kao da se to nije desilo.*
- 16:10 A sta mislis o napadu nad Vucica?
- 16:16 *To je glupo. Kad on nije ista ima s tim, sta je on bio tad? Dijete? On je bio dijete kad se to dogadalo u Srebrenici prije 20 godina. Neznam koliko mu je sad godina, ali on je mozda u 20'ima bio tad. Nije on kriv sta se tamo dogodilo.*

Presenting Vucic's statement which was from the Conference in Srebrenica

- 16:55 *Pa slicna izjava kao i ove dosad. Da on opet daje nadu nekog pomirenja i govori koliko on moze reci. Da on sad kaze da je Srbija kriva, izgubio bih mozda pola glasaca. Nemoze on ni to tako ni reci, i da hoce da kaze. On treba da se brini o tim ljudima da budu sretni, ali ako hoces da bude sretan moras priznati tim majkima da si im ubio sina. Po meni, jest da je to politicki, on mora to tako pricati, ali kad se radi o tolikom majkama sto su izgubili muzeve i sinove treba se [unclear].*
- 18:00 Jesi li zadovoljan sa ovim recima?
- 18:05 *Pa nisam nesto posebno. Ja mislim da bih on rekao vise, ako moze, ali opet mora misliti na glasace i zato kaze vako malo okolo politicki, da se treba pomoci, ali nikad nekaze sta je ono.. Kao da je opet sa marsa pala Srebrenica i treba se pomoci, a neuzima odgovornost. Ono pravi nekako da svi zajedno trebamo pomagati.*
- 18:39 Na taj dan on je rekao da ce Srbija dati 10 miliona maraka, gdje prvi 2 miliona su odmah spremne poslije nekoliko dana i bez ikakvih obaveza. Sta mislis o tome?
- 18:58 *Da je to nacin neki da se treba da se kupi to, da se zaboravi i da se ide dalje i negleda.. to je sitna para koliko su oni.. to da se prizna i sud donose da je Srbija kriva za to, i da to bude javno, oni bih moda trebali platiti milijardu za to. A ta 2 miliona su vise politicki opet, da neke usutis i da se ide dalje.*
- 19:44 Znaci ti mislis da ce to imati pozitivan utjecaj na odnose izmedu Srba i Bosnjaka?
- 19:51 *Nemislim da ce ista biti. Hoce neki par reci „Super, sto pomozau,“ ali onima majcima sto su im sinove ubili, i da im dadnu milijardu, njima bih to bilo svejedno. Sta ce njima 2 miliona maraka, ako nemaju sina. To je samo politika, da ih zadovolji.*

Presenting Vucic's statement regarding the trial against Karadzic

- 21:14 *Pa opet je izjava gdje je pitanje izbjegao i odgovorio politicki kako pokusava izvuci sebi neke plusove. Hvali sebe i Srbe kako reaguju, ali nikad kaze da je.. Opet generalizaje i kaze kako i Bosnjaci ovako, kako Hrvati onako.. Znaci pravi sebi da taj isti zlocin imaju svi, i da su oni su jedini kofol, eto.. tako da nisam zadovoljan odgovorom. Opet negovori nista, i nekako tretira te Srbe sto su uhvatili u Srbiji, kao da nisu Srbi nego kao da su neki tamo. Nisam nesto posebno zadovoljan. Opet politicki neutralno i gleda kako ce sebi ono..*
- 22:22 Mislis li da Vlada Srbije je neutralna u ovome slucaju sto se tice zlocina u prethodnom ratu bivse Jugoslavije?
- 22:35 *Kako mislis neutralna?*
- 22:38 Prema razlicitim zrtvama i zlocincama.
- 22:43 *Nemislim. Mislim da su oni svjesni sta je bilo, svjesni krivice, svjesni sta moze da bude, ako priznaju. Jer oni ako priznaju da su krivi, onda ih moze neko i tuziti i reci „Hocu ostetu,“ sta ja znam mozda pola milijarde. Ima isto to da ce se pisati ako priznaju. Oni su svjesni i mozda bih oni to rekli, ali opet bih on izgubio pola glasova i ne bih ni bio politicar.*
- 23:20 A mislis li da njegov posao da on mora pricati o tome o Karadzicu i ostalim pojedinacnim presudama?
- 23:29 *Pa da su pravi politicari, svi bih pricali o tome. Nebi nista skrivali, da su [unclear], ali nisu to, nego su politicari. Gledaju vise kako ce sebe odrzati na funkciji i da ce reci ono sto treba reci da dobije glasove. Da neodgovori na neko tesko pitanje kao ovo, nego gleda da izbjegne i da preokrene.*

Presenting Vucic's statement about the situation in the region to Bill Clinton

- 24:16 *Pa iskreno to odprilike jesto tacno, mada mislim ili nevidim da Bosanci bas hoce da njih pobjede. Bosanci samo hoce da se Bosna zove Bosna. Ja bih rekao da ako Republika Srpska kaze da su Srbi i da zive u Bosni, da tu nebi bilo neki problema. Ali odprilike ima i neki Bosanaca sto tako misle i govore da hoce da otjeraju sviju. A ovo za Republiku Srpsku i te tamo Srbe, nisu ni oni svi takvi, ali vecina sigurno misle da, mozda jos uvijek zbog Dodika, posto on stalno gura tu politiku, da jos uvijek mogu napraviti Veliku Srbiju ovdje u Republikoj Srpskoj. Tako da je to odprilike tacno.*
- 25:14 Znaci slazes se?
- 25:16 *Pa nebi rekao da se slazem 100 %, ali nekim stvarima mozes reci, ali nisam 100 %.*

25:23 Jesi li zadovoljan sa ovim?

25:27 *Pa nisam zadovoljan posto on opet, kao sto nastavlja, pravi 50-50. Krivicu djeli na 50-50. Uvijek sve generalno govori, kao da su svi isto krivi. [Unclear]*

Presenting Vucic's statement about the demand for legal consequences of the Srebrenica massacre

26:21 *Opet politicki. Sigurno je pitanje, radi se o Srebrenici i o tim pravnim.. znaci ako su oni krivi. Opet to izbjegava i onda on govori o nekim drugim stvarima da izbjegnje to pitanje i nisam nesto zadovoljan, jer on to nekakookrece kao da ljudi traze to samo da izvudu neke pare iz Srbije, a da nema veze sa tim sto ni osjecaju.*

27:08 Nemislis da je moguće da neko ima drugu namjeru?

27:14 *Pa ima, ima sigurno ljudi u Bosni sto misle da bih mogli zaraditi na ovome. Ali to kad gledas sve sto se desilo u svijetu kad je neko nesto uradio da bih se izvinili ima neke posljednice ti zlocini. Nemozes ti da ti bude posljednica, ako si nesto uradio, „Izvini mi smo to pogresili“ i da nema posljednice. Imaju posljednice i trebali bih na neki nacin da pomognu zrtvama. Ali on bih to sad da zaokrene. Ali ima sigurno Bosnjaka sto bih zeljeli naraditi na tome, ali to je manjina.*

Presenting Vucic's statement about the importance of having good relations between Serbs and Bosniaks

28:17 Kakv ti je utisak o ovoj izjavi?

28:22 *Pa opet se nastavlja sa istim, da su muslimani ubijali Srbe da su srbi muslimane, i da je to isto sve. Djeli na 50-50, da smo isto krivi. Da se samo trebamo pomiriti i ici dalje zajedno da idu u buducnosti. Slazem se sa tim, da se treba gledati buducnosti i zajedno zivjeti, ali neslazem se 100 % da je to toliko pojednako da su svi krivi.*

Final questions regarding Vucic

29:05 Kakav ti je cijeloukupni utisak o Vucicu?

29:11 *Kao sto sam rekao da odprilike zvuci korektan, da bih on tu mozda i vise nesto rekao, ali da mora misliti i na politiku i glasove i da govori neke stvari malo politicki i tako. Naprimjer ima dosta sto svaca sta se desilo i tako. Ima Srebrenica zna se sta se desilo, ali nemoze da prizna 100 %. Sa politicke strane je to i pametno, mora brinuti o svojim glasovima, ali ima i bolji od njega. Tako da kratko receno, ima i gori od njega. Okej je, ali nije ni on nesto posebno sad ono..*

30:07 Jesi li ocekivao ovo od njega?

30:13 *Ovo je odprilike nesto profesionalno, odgovor i ponasanje njegovo odprilike koliko toliko. Razumno ponasanje. Nije nesto negirao toliko da je zlocin bio, a i nije nesto poseban dobar bio, znaci odprilike profesionalan je bio. Takav utisak imam od njega, i nije me nesto ni iznedilo toliko.*

Preperation for part 3

31:03 Spomenuo si Dodika prije. Sta mislis o njemu?

31:08 *Dodik izgleda kao neki sto samo gleda sebe. Prije sam mislio da mu je Republika Srpska i Srbi nacionalizam, ali neznam. Nekako toliko radi neke stvari samo radi sebe najvise, samo da se obogati. Sigurno on voli Srbe i to, ali je pokavren covjek. Pokvaren, sebican.. pametan je. Ja rekao bih da je pametan, ali bih rekao svasta samo da.. nema neki granica ili stida sta ce reci da postigne sta on hoce. Na taj nacin je prokvaren. Svejedne su mu te zrtve. Sve ce negirati samo da dobije neki svoj cilj.*

32:05 Znas li sta on misli o Srebrenici?

32:10 *Kako se sjecam misli da je to nametnuto, da se nije toliko pobilo ljudi, da je to neki broj izmisljen, da je isto toliko i Srba izginulo. Tako nesto.*

Presenting Dodik's statement about the Srebrenica massacre being completely politicized

32:57 *Pa to sam i rekao, ocekivao. Nece da prizna to. Trazi nesto kofol to nije nesto legalno, to se nemoze prihvatit, treba neko drugi objektivno to da gleda. Svaki razuman covjek bih rekao da ako 8000 ljudi pogini za dan, da je to nesto.. ali kod njega to nema.*

33:23 Znaci neslazes se sa tim da je ispolitizovan slucaj?

33:27 *Nimalo se neslazem.*

33:33 Mislis da je potrebna jedna medunarodna komisija?

33:42 *Ne. Posto nevjerujem da bih oni bili objektivni. Oni bih gledali mozda interes kako sto prije sviju zadovoljiti. Tesko je priznat sad i reci „Vi ste krivi za ovaj rat.“ To ako kazu, mogu zaplat jos vise i tako.*

Presenting Dodik's statement about the Resolution about Srebrenica

34:26 *Pa to je ista izjava kao ona sto malo prije, mozda malo siriya. [Unclear] Opet pokusava nesto pokriti neke zlocine. Tipicni njegov arogantni odgovor, da nepriznaje genocid.*

- 34:50 Da li se treba krivica o Srebrenici kolektivizirati?
- 34:59 *Kako mislis kolektivizirati?*
- 35:01 Imaju neki ljudi sto su to uradili i oni su krivi, ali ato onda Republika Srpska..
- 35:10 *Znaci mislis generalizirati, na taj nacin jeli?*
- 35:15 O krivici da je Republika Srpska kriva za to ili mislis li da su samo individualni ljudi krivi?
- 35:25 *8000 i nesto ljudi su i danasnji dan.. To nemoze saka ljudi uraditi, to je velika organizacija. To je vode te vojske.. on je to kreno tako da je to vojska Republike Srpske ili Srbije, ili cija li je to uradila, uradila. Nije samo saka ljudi.*

Presenting Dodik's statement about the lies behind the Srebrenica massacre

- 36:35 *Pa utisak opet isto kaze. Neda da se prizna taj genocid i on okrece, kao sto sam govorio, da je nad Srbima napravit genocid, i tako da nisam zadovoljan sa tim. Normalno da su Srbi izgunili. Ako napadnes neki narod, normalno da ce se braniti taj narod. Nebi on predlozio tako to, hajmo reci, genocid nad Srbima i Bosancima i odmah.. Kao da bih on to predlozio tako. Inace bih on to tako da se to zaboravi i da se ide dalje, jer zna sta je istina, a pravi se glup. Opet kretensko ponasanje i nista neocekivano od njega. Ali neslazem se nimalo sa ovim.*
- 37:47 A sa tim da se premalo brine o zrtvama?
- 37:50 *Pa treba on da donose te dokaze ili nesto. Nece sad neke majke i narod, sto su izgubili 8000 i nesto, sad traziti dokaze za Srpske zrtve. Nije ni svoje rijesio. Prvo moraju svoje rijesiti. Sta je sa njihovim sinovima, djecom, muzevima, pa ce onda doci.. ali nemozes gledati nekoga drugog i brinuti se o njemu, kad nisi ni svoje rijesio. A normalno ako ima genocid nad Srbima treba se i to, ali nije. Nevidim gdje bih to bilo. Isto se sve na to vode, jer on.. On da prizna to on ne bih nista bio. On od toga zivi u Republikoj Srpski, zato kontrira sve to bosansko. Zivi od tih Srba sto to podrzavaju. Neslazem se, ali opet sa politicke njegove strane, razumljivo je sto to govori.*
- 39:07 Mislis li da ako se Srebrenica prizna kao genocid da bih dovelo vise problema nego pomirenja?
- 39:18 *Ne, nimalo. To je gluposti reci. Ako hoces da ides dalje, nemozes nesto samo potisati, gurati, sto kazi, pod tepih. Jer ce opet izbit neki novi rat, izbit ce nesto novo, jer se to drzi u sebi. Nisi dobio pravdu. Imas masu ljudi sto ce osjecati da niko nije, generacija ce pricati da nisu dobili pravdu svoju. Nije, treba se istina uvijek iznjeti. Treba se reci jer da bih mogao, sto kazu, da se moze napredovati, moras priznati svoju gresku.*

Presenting Dodik's statement about the accepting the term genocide against both Serbs and Bosniaks

[This part was not properly recorded, therefore not transcribed]

Presenting Dodik's statement about the Resolution as a factor that could destabilize the region

[This part was not properly recorded, therefore not transcribed]

Presenting Dodik's statement about the fear of muslims

43:01 *Ista izjava. On kontrira to sve i negira. Njegovo arogantno ponasanje. Neslazem se i eto.*

43:15 Neslazes sa time da bih Britanija mozda mogla imati neki drugi interes?

43:27 *Britanija sigurno misli, oni bih voljeli sto prije.. Nemaju za to vremena, kako bih ti to rekao. Ali ovaj, nije. Mislim da su ipak, kako god vidis i ko imalo ima malo mozga, vidis da su toliki ljudi zakopani. Sta ces drugo misliti nego genocid? Nije slucajnost. Neslazem se sa tim. Ustvari sta god su imali sa tim, mislim nije ni bitno sta su oni imali od motiva. Jer nije to poenta, poenta je da je bio genocid.*

44:30 Mislis da su Britanci umali namjeru da uvode pomirenje?

44:40 *Pa imaju namjeru da to uvode, ali neznam sta imje namjera, kad su i oni toliko krivi za taj rat. Sta ja znam. Ali imali su namjeru da se prizna genpcid. Sto je sad.. mozda su sebi htjeli da izvuku sebi nesto, ali neznam sta bih ti rekao.*

Presenting Dodik's statement about the trial against Karadzic and the neglect of jailing Bosniak generals

46:36 *Pa opet neslazem se. Opet slicno onome drugome, kako se zove.. Opet okrece na neku drugu temu, na Atifa Dudakovica i na Nasera Orica kao da su oni isiti takvi, sta ja znam. Ali gdje su dokazi da su oni taki, gdje su ti Srbi toliki pobijeni? Nigdje. Znaci nema ih, ali to mu je nacin da izbjegne istinu, da nemora priznati. Tako da se neslazem sa tim. Opet njegovo kretensko, arogantno ponasanje.*

47:20 A mislis da mozda Haski Tribunal izostaje neke zrtve, posebno Srpske, kao sto on to predlaze?

47:33 *Mislis da ima neki Srba sto njima nije pravda?*

47:38 Da, sto mozda Haski Tribunal mozda ignorise?

47:43 *Ne, pa bili su evo Naser Oric. Dvaput mu je sudeno, i obadva puta pusten je na slobodu, znaci nema dokaza da je on ista uradio. Pricalo se da je mozda tri vojnika neka ubijo, kad su bili zarobljiti. To nemozes meni staviti, i da jeste istina, nema to nista sa enocidom, sta ja znam, 10.000 ljudi ili koliko ima. Ne bih rekao da nesto izostavlja. ako ima se nesto da kaze, neka postave dokaze, nek se osudi taj sto je kriv za neko nehumano ponasanje, ako je neko maltrahirao, bio, izivljavao se. Ali da ima, bilo bih.. oni prvi bih napravili 100 neki sudova.*

Presenting Dodik's statement about both sides having crossed the rules of war

49:07 *Ma ja opet isto prica da je.. Opet se neslazem, jer isto prica. On bih da to podijeli, da su svi krivi isto, a nemoze se biti isto krivi kad nije tako. On bih da napravi istinu da su svi krivi isto. Muslimani su potjerani. Muslimani su poubijani. Da su Srbi poubijani, sigurno bih bili dokazi i sta ja znam.*

49:40 Nemisli da mozda Haski Tribunal proganja vise Srbe?

49:45 *Nevjerujem. Proganja one, koje imaju razlog da krive i koje imaju dokaze, da bih mogao kriviti nekoga za nesto. Sigurno ima muslimana kao Atif, koji da ima neki dokaz, bili bih isto proganjani. Ali nema dokaza.*

Presenting Dodik's statement about what should be written about Srebrenica in books in Srpska

50:20 *Ocekivano opet, ali isto okrece da bih bilo „Eto, da mi Bosancima tako govorimo..“ On negelda uopce sto se navodi genocid. Neitereseju ga sto, interesuje ga samo kako ce on nesto svoje. Uopste ga neinteresuje, je li bio ili nije bio genocid i tako po tome.. Kretenski se ponasa opet i neodgovorno, ali ocekivano od njega.*

Final questions regarding Dodik

51:00 Kakav ti je utisak sadod Dodika?

51:06 *Pa isti kao sto je i bio. To sam i napocetku rekao da sam to imao misljenje o njemu. Ako razmislja da ce odprilike to govori, isto mi, to sam i znao.*

51:23 isto mislis tako i o njegovoj politici prema Srebrenici?

51:28 *Pa da isto on gleda sebe, gleda kako da zaradi svoje glasove, da zadrzi soju poziciju. I nema haman granica sta ce on reci. Neinteresuje ga koliko ljudi ili sta se desilo ili istina, nego sta ce on. Tako da isto mi se ponasa, isto kretenski idiot.*

Closure

- 52:00 Kakav ti je sad cijeloukupni utisak o Srpskoj i Srbijanskoj politici prema Srebrenici? Mislim i na Dodika i Vucica.
- 52:19 *Prema Srebrenici samo? Srbija malo vise profesionalna. Vucic je malo vise profesionalan i njegovi odgovori. Malo je vise human, ali i on nemoze, imaju granice sta moze reci, tako da su oni odprilike negdje.. ali i on nije mozda ili nemoze biti 100 % iskren, dok Republika Srpska i Dodikova politika je skroz bas ono kretenska politika. Samo vidis sebe. Sve drugo te ne zanima. Sta god neko protiv tebe, ti se pravis budala, kako to nije tako i dajes samo kontra odgovore bez ikakvog pravog odgovora. Samo ono „Pa i vi ste.“ On ima bas otvoreno kretensku politiku.*
- 53:28 Mislis da se mozda sta uciti da se promjeni situacija
- 53:34 *Moze se promjenuti situacija, ako se promjeni Dodik. Treba se neke politicare u Bosni promjenuti, da bih to islo na bolje. Znaci da treba jedino tako da se prizna krivica.*
- 54:00 Kakvu buducnosti vidis izmedu odnosa izmedu Srba i Bosnjaka sto se tice Srebrenice?
- 54:10 *Male sitne korake prema boljem, ali to su sitnice. To ce tako biti sve, dok se neprizna, jer se mora pravda donjeti ljudima. Dok ta pravda nedode, nemoze se napraviti korak unaprijed. Jer nemozes na nekim lazima nesto graditi.*

Appendix 2: Transcription of Interview with Nihad

Transcription of the interview with Nihad

To begin with the informant was informed about their right to take a break, quit the interview, skip questions, anonymity etc. and about the structure of the interview guide and the overall purpose of the project.

Introduction to Part 1

- 02:03 Kakav je tvoj generalni utisak o politici u Bosni?
- 02:11 *Puno se obecava, a malo se sta zna. A zna se sta je isitina.*
- 02:18 A u regionu?
- 02:20 *Isti taki utisak.*
- 02:23 Sta mislis o odnosima između Srba i Bosnjaka.
- 02:28 *Mogli bih biti puno bolji.*
- 02:33 Kad si prvi put cuo za Srebrenicu i odakle ili od koga?
- 02:44 *Pa kad smo bili jos ovdje u ratu, tu se desavale strasne stvari. Preko medija.*
- 03:10 Koji je tvoj stav sta se tice Srebrenice?
- 03:16 *Pa desio se strasan zlocin, genocid i eto.*
- 03:19 Je li znas za ikakvih politicki debata u regionu vezano za Srebrenicu?
- 03:26 *Mnogo ih je bilo.*
- 03:32 Kakvu buducnosti vidis sta se tice odnosa Bosana i Srba u vezi Srebrenice?
- 03:40 *Mislis li na politicare ili narod?*
- 03:45 Na oba. Generalno samo.
- 03:50 *Mislim da ce su tu odnosi popraviti, posto je Turska tu usla pa je utjecajni faktor. Sta se tice same Srebrenice tu ce se tesko sta promjenuti.*

Introduction and preparation for Part 2

- 05:03 Sta mislis o Vucicu?
- 05:07 *Ako misli kao sto prica moze izadi kao jedan dobar politicar. Jedan covjek koji ce promjenuti stvari u regionu, ako misli sta prica.*
- 05:25 Znas li za njegov poiticki stav vezano Srebrenicu?

05:30 *Ma znam odprilike. Desio se zlocin, ali tesko da on tu jos priznaje da je tu bio genocid.*

Presenting Vucic's statement about the Resolution and UN's Security Council

08:26 Sta mislis o toj izjavi?

08:28 *Pa dobro ja sam tu izjavu tu i tamo procitao. Mislim da je dosta.. samo polako da nadem rijec koja to objasnava. Mislim da je dosta neodredena izjava. Nije tacno rekao sta se desilo, a on nije imao snage da kaze istinu i o pravdi.*

08:55 Jesi li zadovoljan sa ovom izjavom?

09:00 *Tom njegovom izjavom? Pa to je samo jedan korak prema pomirenju i istini i nista drugo. Nisam bas najzadovoljniji.*

09:16 Jeli se slazes ili neslazes sa tim da samo ljudi na Balkanu trebaju se brinuti o pomirenju ili bih trebali neki drugi internacionalni agent?

09:32 *Pa najvise treba ovdje se raditi na tome naravno, ali dobro dode i pomoc sa strane, i Europa treba da ucestuje.*

09:41 On je rekao da nema nikakvih pobjednika na ovim prostorima, je li se slazes sa tim?

09:49 *Pa tu je relativno i istinu rekao. Nema negdje pobjednika, i zato je i ovako stanje.*

09:58 Je li onda smatras da smo zrtve isto?

10:03 *Nesmatram, najvece zrtve su Bosnjaci. Medunarodni sud u Hagu je to dokazano, i privrednik iz Europske Unije je prije 20 godina [unclear] koji je iznadnovio tacan broj ubijenih nad Bosnjacima, Srbima i Hrvatama. Blizu 80 % zlocina je ucinito nad Bosnjake.*

Presenting Vucic's statement about the attack on him

12:11 Sta mislis o ovome?

12:15 *Tu konstitaciju njegovu i to sto se desilo se desilo zbog njegovi prijasnji izjava. Da je on bio korektan politicar bio 90'tima i vrijeme rata, vjerovatno se to nebi ni desilo. Jer ona njegova izjava, da za jednog Srbina treba ubiti 100 Bosnjaka, nisu ljudi zaboravili. Uvijek ce mu ljudi tesko vjerovati, jer morao bih kad tad izaci na televiziju i reci „Izvini, pogresio sam, ali sad sam se opametio“ i neznam ni ja, „to je mladost, ludost“ i sta je jos mogao reci. Uglavnam ta izjava ga vjerovatno stavlja u takvu situaciju da ga neko napadne.*

- 13:14 Jesi li zadovoljan sa ovim rijecima?
- 13:18 *Pa sve je to nako ljepo, korektno. Nema tu sta. Njegova prica je taka, a opet ponavljam, ako misli kao sto prica on je dobronamjeran.*
- 13:36 Znaci ti se slazes sa tim da vrijedi pruzati nekome ruku pomirenja?
- 13:41 *Naravno, naravno. Uvijek treba traziti mirno rijesenje, oprostiti sto se moze, ali netreba zaboraviti.*
- 13:53 On je vise puta rekao, sto ja znam, da je on rekao da on nije nikakav supermen i naravno da je pogresio prije. Vise puta je to rekao, cak i ove godine kad je postao predsjednik, da je u prosolosti pravio greske i tako. Jesi li sa tim zadovoljan?
- 14:46 *Ako je iskren, naravno da sam zadovoljan. Covjek ako pogresi pa se pokaje iskreno onda je vjerovatno.. kako bih ti rekao.. Ako se pokajao svoji greski to je velicina jednog covjeka dakle. Onda on postaje sasvim drugi covjek, postaje dobronamjeran nego kakav je vec bio.*

Presenting Vucic's statement which was from the Conference in Srebrenica

- 16:08 Sta kazes o tome?
- 16:11 *Kao i o ovim sadasnjim. Ako je rekao tako i tako misli, ali misli na sve tri naroda ne samo na Srbe. Uredu je to, i to jedna korektna izjava.*
- 16:28 Jeli se slazes ili neslazes sa tim da je vrijeme da se gleda u buducnosti?
- 16:35 *Naravno da se treba u budcnosti gledati, ali mora se u prvom redu istina znati, da bih se lakse islo u buducnosti. Bez isitne tesko ce to ici nadalje. Dakle mora se prihvatiti kao sto je u Njemackoj Israelu priznala i izvinila se zidovima. To je velicina jednog covjeka, medutim to iz Srbije nije niko izjavio tako nesto. Osim ovih politicara koji nisu u vladi.*
- 17:22 Srbija je taj dan rekla da ce uloziti 5 miliona Eura. Prvo odmah imaju 2 miliona maraka sto cekaju na njih, i poslije toga ce ostale pare sa vremenom predati, i to bez ikakvi obaveza. Sta mislis o tome?
- 17:44 *Mislim da je to dobar potez ako je istina. Pitanje je o iskrenosti.*
- 17:57 On je rekao da se treba dijeliti izmedu svijju i Srba, Bosnjaka i Hrvata. Kakav utecaj mislis da ce imati na odnose izmedu Srba i Bosnjaka?
- 18:14 *Kakav utjecaj? Trebao bih imati, ako sa neke strane dolaze strane pomoc, trebao bih imato pozitivan utjecaj. Jer se ta sredstva mogu izkoristiti na gubitak.*

Presenting Vucic's statement regarding the trial against Karadzic

- 21:12 *Ja mislim da je to dosta providno i nekorektna izjava. To izjednocavanje zlocin.. Jest zlocin. Jedno ubiti covjeka, donjetu ostetu na dvojicu ili trojicu, nema veze koje je, a drugo je sistematski imati cilj da se protjera i unisti jedan narod. To su velike zablude koju pokusavaju da izjednace zlocine. To nikad nemoze biti isto genocid i ubistvo jednog ili dva covjeka na nekim izoliranim mjestima gdje je doslo do takvog slucaja. Dakle genocid je nesto najstrasnije sto se moze desiti jednom narodu i to trebaju da priznaju. Kad to priznaju, izvinu se, onda ce biti vjerodostojno.*
- 22:07 *Znaci ti nisi bas najzadovoljniji..*
- 22:12 *Nisam. Jer on mora prvo svoje zlocine da prizna nakon svog naroda, da kaze „Jest ucinili smo toliko i sud u Haskom Tribunalu je to dokazao koliko je.“ Medunarodni sid su dokazali koliko je zlocina bilo nad kome, na kojim mjestima, sve se zna. Imaju argumenti. Zasto bih sad te medunarodne institucije Zapadne Europe bile u nasu koristi? Sta smo to mi njima drazi nego Srbi i Hrvati? Ako neko to moze odgovoriti, da smo mi njima drazi nego Srbi ili Hrvati zato sto smo muslimani, onda cu ja mozda i promjeniti misljenje. Ali sta se tice same ljubavi mogu im samo oni biti drazi vise nego mi Zapadnoj Europi.*
- 23:08 *Znaci ti mozda nesmatras da Vlada Srbije nije bas najneutralija sta se tice..*
- 23:17 *Apsolutno. Evo zasto. Zasto sada u ovog momenata kad treba osuditi Ratka Mladica, svi znaju koje i kakve zlocine je po svojim komandom pocinio. Zasto mu sad pruzaju prenciste da dode u Srbiju i Vlada mu daje garant tamo da Zasto dobrodoslica nekome sto je ucini takav zlocinu Srebrenici? Odmah ja vidim da li si dobronamjeran, a ne da se on treba cuvati. Dakle licomjer je.*
- 24:05 *Vucic nije htjeo komentarisati o Karadzicu ili o pojedinacnim presudama, posto nesmatra da je to njegov posao. Slazes li se sa tim?*
- 24:20 *Da je neka druga strana, neznam da li bih tako govorio. To je ta njihova uvijek ista prica. Svi su zlocini isti, sad bih izjedninacili zlocine.*

Presenting Vucic's statement about the situation in the region to Bill Clinton

- 25:35 *Ta njegova izjava.. to mozda neki manji dio ljudi misli i sa jedne i druge strane. Ogromne sile stoje i za jedne i druge, i tesko je da neko moze biti pobjednik. Mora covjek malo vise razmisliti o tome.*
- 26:10 *Znaci ti se neslazes sa tim da je situacija takva gdje nemozes nikome nista objasniti?*
- 26:17 *Nije takva bas. Pametnim se uvijek moze objasniti, a oni koji su zla tesko.*

Presenting Vucic's statement about the demand for legal consequences of the Srebrenica massacre

- 27:22 *Zasto? Normalno i svijet.. ali oni sami nezele govoriti o genocidu, ako bih Srbija prihvatila i bila odgovorna za genocid, ane da nije nista ucinila kako se prica o genocidu. Onda su tu velike poteze za zrtve i zato se blezi od toga. Tako bih morali platiti veliku ratnu ostetu kao sto je Njemacka placala prije par godina Izraelu. Zato se toliko negira da je bio genocid, da se desilo sto se desilo. To je politika.*
- 28:04 Ti se znaci neslazes sa ovim?
- 28:07 *Neslazem.*

Presenting Vucic's statement about the importance of having good relations between Serbs and Bosniaks

- 29:28 Sta kazes na tu izjavu?
- 29:30 *Koliko sam cuo sve je korektna izjava.*
- 29:37 Slazes se?
- 29:38 *Pa vecim dijelom.*
- 29:42 I zadovoljan si?
- 29:44 Da.
- 29:46 *Smatras li da su odnosi izmedu Srba i Bosnjaka od kljucnog znacaja?*
- 29:52 Naravno.

Final questions regarding Vucic

- 29:55 Kakav sad utisak imas o Vucicu?
- 30:03 *Imam pozitivnu, ali kazem samo se bojim tog licomjerstva, da to nije dvolicnosti jednog politicara i jedne drzave. Tu su interesi posjeta turskog predsjednika, gdje su mnogi Srpskih investitori dobro prosli. Turska ulaze u Srbiju i to je dobar znak za približanje i odnosa svi nas na Balkanu, i Srbiji i tako i Bosni i Hercegovini.*
- 30:43 Je li ti to isto mislis i o njegovoj politici prema Srebrenici i Bosnjakama i tako?
- 30:50 *Pa morao bih biti konkretniji kad je Srebrenica u pitanju i tako. Mora reci da je bio genocid, mora reci da su odgovorni, krivi su Srbi i to je jedino ispravno.*
- 31:07 Imas li koje pitanje ili komentar? Inace idemo dalje.

31:38 **[Informant made a joke, therefore a part of the answer has not been transcribed]** *Imam za kraj jednu zelju za reci, da jednog dana svi ovdje zive na Balkanu u slavi, jedni prema drugima da budu dobri prijatelji i dobri komsije, da nikad vise nebude rata na Balkanu. Da jedni drugima oblazavamo, da jedni drugima samo dobro mislimo.*

Preperation for part 3

32:12 Sta mislis o Dodiku?

32:17 *Milorad Dodik? Daon voli vlasti. Nemislim da je on to toliko los kao covjek. Toliko na vlasti prica neke stvari koje mozda vako u normalnom zivotu nebi nikad pricao. Ali eto zbog same vlasti, zbog samog stanja u kojem se nalazi prica nekad i nesto, sto pametan nebih pricao.*

33:17 A znas li za njegov politicki stav vezana za Srebrenicu?

33:22 *Pa prije odprilike 10 godina je govorio da svi trebaju da odgovaraju za zlocin u Srebrenici i desio se strasan zlocin. Sad govori da tamo nije ni blizu zlocin bio, da nije ni blizu bilo 8.000 mrtvih. Je li on to zbilja tako misli ili on to po naredbi nekoj mora tako misliti da bih ostao na vladi.. ni sam neznam.*

Presenting Dodik's statement about the Srebrenica massacre being completely politicized

34:53 Sta kazes o toj izjavi?

34:55 *Kazem da je to jedna, ne licemjerna, nego sam sebe laze. Nista drugo. Jedno je pricao prije 10 godina i tad je imao vise argumenata da je bio genocid, a sad prica neku sasvim drugaciju pricu, koja njemu.. ali on je jedini, opet ponavljam, sto bih medunarodne institucije i sud u Hagu bio nesto za nas? Sta to ima puno za nas, da nisu cinjenice dokazane i ti zlocine isto?*

36:15 Mislis li da je potrebno imati jednu objektivnu medunarodnu komisiju da se procijeni st se tamo desilo?

36:24 *Nepotrebna apsolutno. Imaju dokazi ista ta medunarodna komisija i takvi ljudi koju su dolazili na lice mjesto i to utvrdili. Sad izmislja toplu vodu.*

Presenting Dodik's statement about the Reseolution of Srebrenica

38:02 *Ma izgleda totalno komponovana, totalno vani pamet. Prije 10 godina je bilo sasvim drugacije. Tad je bila jedna istina, nemogu biti dvije istine, samo jedna.*

38:27 Je li ima ista s cime se mozda slazes?

- 38:29 *Nista se s time neslazem. On pokusava isto kao svi da izjednacini zlocin, da bude isto zlocin gdje je neko slucajno ubio dva covjeka radi neke osvete i negdje gdje je pocinjen genocid,*
- 38:47 *Znaci ti se neslazes sa tim da krivica nad zlocin u Srebrenici nebi trebao ostati na individualnom nivou? Mislis da se treba kolektivizirati da bude citava Srpska kriva za to?*
- 39:17 *Republika Srpska treba da nosi posljednicu, ako je ucinio zlocinacw to se zna. Vrh i policija Srpske najvise su zlocina ucinili. Dakle on je vrh republike Srpske i to dokazano u medunarodnoj komisiji i to se nemoze vise nikada ovaj pobiti. To je dokazano, imaju cinjenice, dokazi. Sve moguci dokazi postoje dakle moze on pricati kome hoce, ali to ce biti kako je vec dokazano.*

Presenting Dodik's statement about the lies behind the Srebrenica massacre

- 41:11 *Gluposti, bezobrazno.*
- 41:17 *Sa cime se neslazes, je li sa svemu ili?*
- 41:23 *Niscim. Nema pojma da je nad Srbima bio genocid. Opet kazem imaju dokazi i da je bio genocid i u Prijedoru i ostalim gradovima Bosne i Hercegovine. Isto ubijeno jedno 2-3.000 ljudi, djece. Isto tako nad njih bio ustavljen genocid. Ali eto i tu je bio najveći genocid razni zajednica. [Unclear]. Treba dokazati zlocin, istinu, pravdu, kao sto je dokazano vec, ali on se sa time neslaze, er njemu je medunarodna zajednica kao opet napraviti za Bosnjake. Nema veze sta prica. Sto bih oni bili napravljeni Bosnjacima?*
- 42:20 *Mislis li da se mozda premalo brine o Srpskim zrtvama na tim prosotorima?*
- 42:29 *Nije to premalo. Srpski zrtava toliko malo ima nad Bosnjackim tako da jednostavno tako mora i da bude. Nemozes se brinuti za 25 sto je ubijeno kao i za 8.000 sto je ubijeno. Eto on kaze 3,500, ali je on to.. Njemu to nisu ni dokazi one tolike grobnice sto su pronadene, nisu dokazi svih nisovi sto ih gore vec ima blizu 7.000. To po njemu nsta neznaci. On samo dakle vodi jednu antibosnjacku politku, nece nista da se.. Hoce da se izjednjace zlocine, e to je njihov cilj. Cilj Srpske politike je da se izjednjace zlocine, zato tako pricaju.*

Presenting Dodik's statement about the accepting the term genocide against both Serbs and Bosniaks

- 43:50 *Naravno da ce on biti protiv toga, zato sto uporno iskrivljuje istinu opet. To su bili Britanci. Sto bih oni vise voljeli nas nego Srbe? Zato sto su ljudi pravedni, sto nemogu pomesti istinu, sto imaju dokaze i zato su za takvu Rezoluciju.*

- 44:10 Misliš li da je moguće da možda ta Rezolucija dovede više problema nego pomirenja?
- 44:16 *Nemislim.*
- 44:22 I vi niste zadovoljni sa ovim riječima?
- 44:25 *Sa kojim riječima? Dodikovim? Naravno da nisam zadovoljan.*

Presenting Dodik's statement about the Resolution as a factor that could destabilize the region

- 46:17 *To je izjava jednog bolesnog političara*
- 46:25 Nema niste čime se slažeš?
- 46:29 *Nije to dobronamjerno. Samo su oni dobronamjerni, mi trebamo preko svega precizirati šta njihovim usima godi da bih eto doslo do nekog mira kako on to veli i svi bih bili zadovoljni. Bez istine nemože niko biti zadovoljan. Istina mora uvijek biti istina i to je to. Totalno nakaradavna izjava koja imalo ko se razumije u politiku može je odbaciti kao neargumentovano*

Presenting Dodik's statement about the fear of muslims

[For some reason this part was not recorded and could therefore not be transcribed]

Presenting Dodik's statement about the trial against Karadzic and the neglect of jailing Bosniak generals

- 48:40 *Šta reći? Gluposti. Prije 10 godina pričao jedno, sad drugo. Bolsetan, bolesna izjava.*
- 48:55 Nema ništa čime bi se mogao složiti?
- 49:00 *Šta se tiče ti izjava? Malo čemu. Možda neka sitnica, ali nevažna.*

Presenting Dodik's statement about both sides having crossed the rules of war

- 49:52 *Ništa, isto bezmisleno. Jednu tu istu priču priča koju samo njemu..*
- 50:05 Nemisliš da Haski Tribunal proganja samo jedan narod?
- 50:15 *Čak je i više njih napravilo. Da bih se vodilo pravedno, mnogi bih trebali doživotno kazniti se.*
- 50:33 Misliš li da bih se trebali više fokusirati na komandante bivše vojske Bosne i Hercegovine? Misliš li da su možda preblagi prema njima?

- 50:48 *Ko je preblag?*
- 50:49 Haski Tribunal.
- 50:53 *Pa preblag je prema.. a mislim da jesu. Sta se sve desilo, jeste preblag.*
- 51:05 I prema Srpskim i Bosanskim generalima?
- 51:18 *Preblagi su prema najvećim zlocincama. Ja o njima govorim. A najveći zlocin je ucestivao njihov narod sta se tice etnickog ciscenja i genocida.*

Presenting Dodik's statement about what should be written about Srebrenica in books in Srpska

- 53:17 *Dovoljno je sve. Koliko zeli istinu, da je pobio 5 miliona ljudi, nasmiju ti 5 miliona ljudi cuti za to. Kako ce oni u skolama govorili da jesu? A jesu pobili, i normalno da.. vidis po njemu koliku neistinu prica i koliko je nedoustojan. Nesmijes istinu znati.*
- 53:52 Ima li ista s cime se slazes?
- 53:57 *Tu nista.*

Final questions regarding Dodik

- 54:00 Poslije svi ovi izjava kakav ti je sad utisak o Dodiku?
- 54:08 *Kakav je utisak? Izuzetan los poslije svi ovih izjava. Ni ja sam nevjerujem da je takav kako...*
- 54:24 Sta mislis o njegovoj politici prema Srebrenici i Bosnjakama?
- 54:34 *Totalna losa politika, iskrivljena. Pokusava da uvijek isto izjednace zlocine i eto, da negira genocid i eto..*

Closure

- 54:47 Kakav ti je cijeloukupni utisak o Srpskoj politici i Srbijanskoj politici o Srebrenici?
- 54:58 *Licomjerna. Dvolicna. Kad je u pitanju o Srebrenici.*
- 55:13 Imas li utisak da je Republika Srpska i Srbija da su isti nacin licomjeri ili..?
- 55:22 *Isto, isto.*
- 55:28 Ima li ista s cime bih se slozio sa njima?

- 55:31 *Malo sta.*
- 55:38 *Moze li se sta uraditi da bih se promijenila situacija u vezi Srebrenice?*
- 55:45 *Kad se promjeni sta imaju u glavima. Kad dodu neki pametniji politicari koji hoce da pricaju istinu, koji hoce iskreno da sluzu pomirenju e onda bigh se moglo pomiriti. A ovako gledajuci jednu televiziju, gdje samo jedan covjek se na noj vrti i istinu zaobilazi, vjerovatno nece za dugo, dok nedodu neki pametniji.*
- 56:20 *Znaci ti nesmatras da buducnosti vezano za odnose izmedu Bosanaca i i Srba nece se uskoro promijeniti?*
- 56:30 *Pa nemora znaciti da nece uskoro, sve zavisi od izbora do izbora, kakvi ljudi udu na vlasti. Mogu da dodu ljudi pametniji da se to promijeni brzo i ganjaju da promijene medusobne odnose. Sve je do njija i sta pricaju, sta slusaju na televiziji i tako. Sta medije prenose, tako i ljudi neki svoj stav mjenjaju.*

Appendix 3: Transcription of Interview with Sara

Transcription of the interview with Sara

To begin with the informant was informed about their right to take a break, quit the interview, skip questions, anonymity etc. and about the structure of the interview guide and the overall purpose of the project.

Introduction to part 1

- 00:00 Da li te zanima politika?
- 00:02 *Ne. Mozda malo o Bosni.*
- 00:04 Ima li neki poseban politicar o kojemu znas iz Bosne?
- 00:10 *Nema, samo znam za Dodika i on ne bih trebao biti bas dobar.*
- 00:15 Jesi li cula sta se desilo u Srebrenici 1995?
- 00:21 *Jesam.*
- 00:22 Kad si to prvi put cula?
- 00:25 *Mozda te godine.*
- 00:27 Od koga ili odakle?
- 00:30 *Preko televizije kod mame i babe.*
- 00:35 Je li znas za ikakve politicke teme ili debate, o cemu se trenutno prica u regionu? Izmedu politicara, vlasti i tako?
- 00:42 *Ne bas.*
- 00:43 Kakav ti je utisak o odnosima izmedu Bosanaca i Srba?
- 00:47 *Mislim da ljudi sto zive u Bosni imaju dobar odnos. A dijaspori je teze zato sto oni nemoraju ziviti sa njima. A mi sto nezivimo sa njima, nama je lakse mrziti ih.*

Introduction and preparation for part 2

- 00:48 Znas li ko je Aleksandar Vucic?
- 00:51 *Neznam.*
- 00:52 To je trenutni predsjednik Srbije.

Presenting Vucic's statement about the Resolution and UN's Security Council

- 02:26 *Je li on ovo rekao? Ne bih rekla da je on ovo rekao.*
- 02:30 Sto?
- 02:32 *Nezvuci mi to kao nesto sto bih predsjednik Srbije rekao.*
- 02:40 A sto to?
- 02:50 *Zato sto on kaze da svi zajedno uzmu tu odgovornost. Jeli tako? Nisam mislila da bih on to rekao. Iznenadena sam.*
- 03:08 A jesi li zadovoljna s time?
- 03:13 *Pa upravu je. Jesam zadovoljna.*
- 03:20 On je kritikovao Savet Bezbednosti i kaze da samo mi sto zivimo ovdje mozemo to rijesiti, i nezeli vanjsku pomoc.
- 03:40 *Ali da li ce to sad biti tako u Bosni?*
- 03:48 A jeli se slazes s time da smo mi zvi zrtve, ili ima neko sto se moze smatrati pobjednikom?
- 04:04 *Pa muslimani su pobjednici. Znaci neslazem se sa tim. Muslimani su.. [unclear]*

Presenting Vucic's statement about the attack on him

- 05:05 Sta mislis o njegovoj izjavi?
- 05:09 *Opet mislim da je upravu da moraju da zive zajedno i da se netreba generalizirati. Kako on kaze u svakom narodu imaju budale sto ce nesto uraditi. Da je pruzio ruku pomirenje [unclear].*
- 05:55 [The interview changed its direction, and as it is irrelevant it is not transcribed]
- 06:29 Mislis li da vrijedi pruziti ruku pomirenja? Posto kaze da ce pruziti ruku i da ce Bosanci na kraju prihvatiti. Da li se slazes sa tim?
- 06:51 *On je predsjednik. On mora to reci.*

Presenting Vucic's statement which was from the Conference in Srebrenica

- 07:28 Sta mislis o ovoj izjavi? On je isto rekao taj dan da ce uloziti 10 miliona za razlicite projekte u Srebrenici?

- 07:41 *Pa jeli dao?*
- 07:43 *Dao je odmah 2 miliona, kao sto je rekao, a ostale ce se s vremenom dati. Jesi li zadovoljna sa ovim rijecima?*
- 08:05 *Jesam. Nazalost jesam. Ali on nemoze pricati tako da ti ljudima se nemoze vratiti braca, sinove i da moraju ti ljudi biti zadovoljni sa svojim sudbinama.*
- 08:33 *Znaci sto previsa fokusira na buducnost..*
- 08:40 *Da, on hoce da se to zaboravi, a to se nikada nece zaboraviti i netreba.*
- 08:58 *Kad je govorio o tim parame, rekao je da su dane bez ikakvih obaveza i da se trebaju dijeliti izmedu Srba i Bosnjaka. Rekao je da se moze uloziti u skole, domove za starce, da se poprave ulice i tako. Jesi li zadovoljna sa tim?*
- 09:20 *Neznam jesam li zadovoljna, kad neznam da li je to uradio, da li je zaista tako bilo. To je super da on to govori, ali ako to i neradi onda je to ono.. znas..*
- 09:35 *Kakav utjecaj mislis li da ce ovo imati na odnose medu Srba i Bosnjaka?*
- 09:55 *Iskreno da ti kazem, nemislim da ce to imati neki utjecaj, jer pare nemogu uraditi da Bosnjaci zaborave sta je bilo. Ali oni moraju zivjeti sa tim ljudima. Tako da on mozda treba priznati sta je bilo i pricati o ome. Jer on kaze da se treba zaboraviti.. Ili nekaze da se treba zaboraviti, ali treba se pomiriti sa tim. Ali kao predsjednik super izgovara sve.*

Presenting Vucic's statement regarding the trial against Karadzic

- 11:22 *Sta sad mislis o ovome?*
- 11:38 *[Reading a part of the statement out loud] Ja nisam toliko u ovoj nasoj politi tako da neznam da li ono govori istinu kad kaze da nerazlikuje ni po imenu ni prezimu. To sto malo znam mislim da on laze, jer mislim da razlikuje. I opet ono brani se. On ovdje kaze da ima i Srba sto su stradali u ratu, ali da njih niko nespominje.*
- 12:13 *Znaci nisi zadovoljna?*
- 12:16 *Nisam zadovoljna.*
- 12:20 *I nemislis da je vlada Srbije neutralna sta se tice zlocina uradeni u prethodnom ratu?*
- 12:28 *Ne.*
- 12:30 *Vucic nije htjeo komentarisati o Karadzicu ili pojedinacnim presudama zato sto to nesmatra da je njegov posao. Sta mislis o tome?*

12:47 *Kako nije njegov posao. Naravno da je njegov posao, on je predsjednik drzave vec koliko vremena. On nije bio tad predsjednik, ali jeste sad. A i da nije predsjednik, da je neka 10. osoba, valjda ima misljenje o tome. Javna licnost treba imati neko misljenje i izjave.*

Presenting Vucic's statement about the situation in the region to Bill Clinton

14:22 Sta mislis o tome?

14:32 *Neznam sta hoce da objasni. Bosanci hoce da pobijede Srbe u Bosni, posto ima Bosanaca vise.*

14:36 Da, te Srbe iz Republike Srpske.

14:39 *A sa druge strane Bosanski Srbi hoce da pobijede Bosnjake, ako dobiju pomoc od Srbije?*

14:46 Da.

15:00 *Upravu je.*

15:05 Znaci slazes sa tim da je takva situacija gdje nikome nista nemozes objasniti?

15:13 *Ali neznam sta bih on volio objasniti, ali slazem se sa tim da je takva situacija.*

Presenting Vucic's statement about the demand for legal consequences of the Srebrenica massacre

17:34 Sta mislis o tome?

17:39 *Nisam zadovoljna.*

17:41 Sto?

17:43 *Zato sto se treba priznati to, jer mozda bih to bilo tim jadnim ljudima neka osveta. Mozda bih im bilo lakse, da svi saznaju sta je bilo.*

18:15 Vucic govori da ti sto su icinili to u Srebrenici su neki ljudi, ali sto citava Srpska mora kazniti radi toga? Tu su neki generali bili odgovorni za to, i sto sad treba citava republika kazniti se?

18:37 *Pa sto nebi citava Srpska za to placala? Nije samo u Srebrenici. Radili se to po citavoj Bosni. Ako hoce neki mir sa Bosancima, onda moraju prihvatiti istinu sta su uradili.*

Presenting Vucic's statement about the importance of having good relations between Serbs and Bosniaks

- 20:08 Sta mislis o ovoj izjavi?
- 20:18 *Kao sto sam rekla na pocetku oni zive dole zajedno i oni moraju zivjeti jedno sa drugim. Iako to neko nece, ja mislim da je on upravu da se moraju pomiriti sa tim sto se desilo.*
- 20:50 Znaci odnosi izmedu Bosnjaka i Srba su od kljucnog znacaja? I jesi li zadovoljna sa ovim rijecima?
- 21:12 *Jesam.*

Final questions regarding Vucic

- 21:17 Poslije sve ovo sto si procitala o Vucicu, kakav ti je sad utisak o njemu?
- 21:26 *Dobar. [Unclear] Pametan, koji ima interesa da ujedini Bosance i Srbe.*
- 22:15 A o njegovoj politici koji ima prema Srebrenici?
- 22:20 *Mislim da je isto upravi, ali mislim da netreba to forsirati na buducnosti, jer to ce doci samo od sebe, ako se mozda neke stvari promjene.*

Preperation for part 3

- 22:47 Ti mislis da je Dodik jedan od losiji?
- 22:52 *Da, to sam cula o njemu.*
- 22:55 A sta si to cula?
- 22:58 *Da hoce da makne sve muslimane iz Bosne.*
- 23:05 Znas li kakav je njegov politicki stav o Srebrenici?
- 23:08 *Ne.*

Presenting Dodik's statement about the Srebrenica massacre being completely politicized

- 23:25 Sta mislis o ovome?
- 23:30 *Mislim da je on obicni konj.*
- 23:35 Sto?

- 23:36 *Zato sto on uopce neprihvaca sta je bilo u Srebrenici '95. Kao da nevjeroj da je to bilo, pa ignorise*
- 23:58 *Znaci neslazes se sa tim da treba jedna mjesovita medunarodna komisija?*
- 24:04 *Ne. Netreba to niko nista odrediti. To se zna sta je bilo. Sto treba neka 10. Komisija se napraviti i jos medunarodna.*
- 24:20 *A mislis li da je mozda kvalifikacija genocid jedan ispolitizovan slucaj, sto se tice Srebrenice?*
- 24:31 *Kako mislis to? Nerazumijem.*
- 24:35 *On misli da je to radi Srba..*
- 24:44 *Ali nije to nista protiv Srba, ili Muslimana, Hrvata. Srbi su to uradili, i da predsjednik Bosne to nece da prihvati da je to tad bilo. Koliko, 20 godina posle?*
- 25:16 *Koje onda druge opcije mislis da ima da bih Srebrenica postala mjesto pomirenje i mjesto potpunog razumjevanja.*
- 25:29 *A sto mora Srebrenici postati to? Nerazumijem, ko je to rekao?*
- 25:37 *On kaze da samo na taj nacin moze to postati mjesto pomirenja.*
- 25:43 *Srebrenica nikada nemora biti mjesto pomirenja, niti treba biti. Nikad se netreba zaboraviti sta je tamo bilo.*

Presenting Dodik's statement about the Resolution of Srebrenica

- 26:33 *[Rereading the statement out loud] On je predsjednik Bosnjaka. Gdje je ovo normalno da predsjednik.. Argh, on kao predsjednik nebi trebao ovo govoriti. Trebao bih braniti svoju zemlju i trebao bih se boriti da se to prihvati, da je bio genocid. Jelde najveći genocid poslije 2. Svjetskog Rata?*
- 27:12 *Da.*
- 27:15 *Nerazumijem da se to 20. godina poslije jos toliko..*
- 27:24 *Znaci ti se slazes sa time da zbog jednog slucaja krivica tog dogadaja se treba kolektivizirati?*
- 27:42 *Da.*
- 27:44 *Znaci citava Srpska trebala za taj jedan dogadaj..*

27:51 *Srbija bih to trebala platiti. Kao zemlja trebala bih da pokaze tim ljudima, sto su izgubili bracu, da stoje zajedno kao sto prica predsjednik ili pokazati tim ljudima da im je zao toga sto se desilo.*

Presenting Dodik's statement about the lies behind the Srebrenica massacre

[Not transcribed, as it was not recorded]

Presenting Dodik's statement about the accepting the term genocide against both Serbs and Bosniaks

28:55 *Kakav ti je utisak ove..*

28:57 *Mislim da laze. Samo laze. Laze, laze, laze. Kako ga nije stid ovako pricati o ljudima, koji su izginuli i koje i dan danas nemogu naci? On govori da je i toliko i Srba ubijeno na tom prostoru. Jeste, malo morgen. I sta kaze na kraju? [Reading statement]. Jeli i on normalan? Kakav genocid sa obe strane, budalo jedna.*

30:05 *Znaci ti se neslazes sa tim da se trebaju pojedinciti Srpske zrtve sa Bosnjackim?*

30:23 *Ja neznam da li je bilo Srpski zrtvi, zato neznam, jer nisam o tome cula, ali mislim 99 % da nije bilo. Posto su Srbi vodili rat, i Srbi su napadali muslimane u Bosni tada i oni su ubili te ljude.*

Presenting Dodik's statement about the Resolution as a factor that could destabilize the region

31:37 *Nerazumijem kako predsjednik Bosne i Hercegovine moze nesto ovako da izjavi. Da je samo potrebno pomirenje. Da, potrebno je pomirenje, ali kroz to da se prihvati sta je bilo u Bosni i Srebrenici. Neznam kako on misli da ce doci do toga da ce to donjeti vise problema u Bosni. Mozda ce cak to pomiriti ljude i cak bih mozda bilo lakse tim ljudima koji su pogodeni tog slucaja. Mozda bih im bilo lakse, ako se prihvati.*

32:32 *On je rekao da bih donjelo do vise problema, zato sto bih se situacija destabilizovala.*

32:40 *Ma sta me boli briga.*

Presenting Dodik's statement about the fear of muslims

33:10 *Ma mislim da sere.*

33:18 *Sa cime se neslazes?*

33:24 *Sa svemu.*

- 33:30 Nemisli da bih Britanci dogovorili se o toj Rezoluciji..
- 33:50 *Ne, koji bih to predsjednik rekao te zandje tri linije javno.. Koji bih to predsjednik tako rekao? To samo kaze neka neskolovana budala, i sta on ima protiv muslimana? Da on nije predsjednik Bosne i da nezivi tu...*
- 34:20 Dakle nemisli da mozda ima neka druga motivacija iza..
- 34:25 *Nemislim. Ali kako on misli sa ovakvim izjavima pomiriti ljude?*

Presenting Dodik's statement about the trial against Karadzic and the neglect of jailing Bosniak generals

- 35:28 *Zato sto on, umjesto da prihvati da je Karadzic dobio 40 godina, sto bih trebao dobiti zivotnu kaznu, on gada nazad ljudima. On se nepomiriju sa tim da je to tako, nego samo napada ljude, muslimane.*
- 35:47 On isto govori da niko neprica o Srpskim zrtvama, da bih trebao biti..
- 36:05 *Kakve ba Srpske zrtve? Cuti bogati. Nema pojma o cemu on prica.*
- 36:18 Znaci s time se neslazes. A sta kazes za Haski Tribunal, da li on mozda ne vodi racun o nekim Srpskim zrtvama?
- 36:35 *Pa zar ne vodi? Ja mislim da oni vode racun na sve zlocince. Ako ne vode o Srpskim to je onda zato sto nema Srpski zrtvi.*

Presenting Dodik's statement about both sides having crossed the rules of war

- 37:28 *Pa ko je koga napao u ratu? Jeli on bio tu kad je bio rat u Bosni? Je li on zna da su Srbi napali Bosance, muslimane, da su htjeli njih da izgone? I zato nije bilo sa dvije strane, jer su se ljudi morali braniti. Zar on nije predsjednik Bosne? Sto brani Srbiju?*
- 37:57 On je iz Republike Srpske..
- 38:00 *Onda Republiku Srpsku.*
- 38:08 Sa cime precisno se neslazes u njegovo izjavi?
- 38:12 *Rekla bih sa niscim. Nista sta taj covjek kaze.*
- 38:30 Znaci ti kritikujes.. Nisam sigurna jesam li snimila malo prije, pa da ponovimo. O Haskom Tribunalu si rekla da su oni sigurno neutralni da ako ne vode racun o Srpskim zrtvama to je zato sto ih sigurno nema.
- 38:53 *Da, da.*

Presenting Dodik's statement about what should be written about Srebrenica in books in Srpska [Not transcribed, as it was not recorded]

Final questions regarding Dodik

- 39:03 Kakav sad imas utisak od Dodika?
- 39:12 *Puno gori. Gori nego sto je bio.*
- 39:19 A o njegovoj politici prema Srebrenici?
- 39:22 *Pa i o njegov politici prema toga i muslimanima i citavoj Bosni.*
- 39:30 A je li ima nesto posebnost sto te iznenadilo?
- 37:36 *Nije me nista izenadilo. Samo me vise nervira.*
- 39:43 A nema nista s cime bih se slozila sa njime?
- 39:46 *Ne.*

Closure

- 39:48 Kakav ti je cijeloukupni utisak o Srpskoj politici prema Srebrenici? Mislim na oba predsjednika.
- 40:06 *Mislim da bjeze od svoje odgovornosti. Oba dvojica. Samo na svoj nacin.*
- 40:20 A moze li se sta uciniti da se promjeni situacija vezano za Srebrenicu?
- 40:33 *Da, da kao normalni ljudi trebali bih to prihvatiti da su njihova braca ubijali muslimane.*
- 40:46 Kakvu buducnost vidis uvezi odnosa između Srba i Bosnjaka?
- 40:50 *Istu kao zadnji 20 godina. Da zive zajedno, nekome malo lakse nego drugima, ali da moraju zivjeti zajedno.*

Appendix 4: Transcription of Interview Esma

Transcription of the interview with Esma

To begin with the informant was informed about their right to take a break, quit the interview, skip questions, anonymity etc. and about the structure of the interview guide and the overall purpose of the project.

Introduction to Part 1

- 04:12 Malo smo vec pricali o tome, ali kakav je tvoj generalni utisak o politici u Bosni?
- 04:23 *Generalni utisak.. nije dobro. Nije dobro. Sad sam pomenula, omladina ide, nema posla. Svak samo sebi trpa u dzep. Svi politicari, a nemisle na omladinu, nemisle na penzionere one sto idu po kantama traze hrane i sto ima tih toliko nemocnih, sto nemaju sta jesti i bolesni. A oni samo misle na svoje dzepove i na svoju familiju. Na to sam ogorcena.*
- 05:06 A tvoj utisak generalni o politici u regionu na Balkanu?
- 05:10 *Pa nadam se samo da bih doslo do toga da omladina bih preuzela. Posto SDA nemoze izadi na kraj sa dva neprijatelja. On je sam. A ovo su sve neprijatelji i SDS i HDZ. To su dva neprijatelja udruzila se i sad SDA uvijek pobijaju. Nesto sto bih SDA stvorila, a nemoze proci kroz dva tijesna vrata da bih oni nesto iscistili. I nemocni su, ali nesto se i neslazem. Popustaju previse Dodiku i onome Colicu. U tome se neslazem, ali opet ja nedam na SDA i na Bosnu. To je moja domovina. Tu smo se rodili, ohranili i sto se kaze "Za Bosnu zivimo svi".*
- 06:36 A kakav utjecaj imas o odnosima izmedu Srba i Bosnjaka?
- 06:44 *Imam utisak da nasi politicari nisu ekstremno onih ljuti da oni kazu istinu, i onaj Bakir da kaze Dodiku "Dosta je vise!" Ili on nemoze ili nece ili je on nako tih, a Dodik samo 'tap-tap-tap' [read: talks a lot] I sve ostvari ono svoje. A nasi samo "Eto hajd, necemoli kako ono.." Mekahni su u tome smislu. Nisu ono agresivni pa da kazu "E ovako je pa..!". E ko je god se tako prosuo, on je zbrisan iz stranke. Nedaju Srbi, nedaju oni da iko ide prednjima. Boje se otece im Srpska Republika. Eh, u tom smislu, znas.*
- 07:45 Sta znas o Srebrenici?
- 07:53 *Znam da je to jedno.. uh, tesko mi je [tearful]. To je ona jedna velika grehota, veliki pokoj bio o tome narodu. Ali samo sto me boli, sto to negiraju Srbi i nece da priznaju da je bio genocid. Da priznaju da je bio genocid, nestalo bih Srpske Republike. Onda bih sve ipak islo bih uredu. Srbija pomaze Srpskoj Republici i gura ih naprijed. Nasih nemogu boriti se i Srbijom i Srpskom, ovim predsjednicima. Nasi su stvarno u tisnjacu velikome. A sto se tice Srebrenice, ona je platila sve za sva vremena. Za sva vremena. Toliki narod poubijan, poklan, popaljen, na sve nacine najbrutalnije, silovan, sve.*

Nemogu ti to pricati. Na kakav nacin nije vise Srebrenica platila. Ali opet nepriznaju da je genocid bio, nego eto gradanski rat bio. Kao da smo mi samo sebe poubijali. Nisu Srbi to uradili. I njihova tri covjeka kad poginu ili 7, oni naprave paniku kao da je poubijeno cijeli svijet. Ali sto smo se mi branila, oni su napali nas, ali oto nece nikada reci. Samo kazu da su oni napadnuti, a mi smo ih napali. Sto je greska.

09:59 Kakvu buducnosti vidis sta se tice odnosa Bosanaca i Srba u vezi Srebrenice?

10:08 *Slabu. Slabu buducnosti vidim. Zato sto nemaju oni prava nikakvoga. Maltretiraju ih i danas dani. Maltretirali su i prije, a sad pogotovo, jer sad i onoga smjese onoga Mustafica.. kako se zove onaj sto je bio predsjednik. Neznam kako mu je ime, zaboravila sam. Njega smjese, stavise Srbina, i sad opet Srebrenica tapka uvijek u mjestu. Nikuda neide dalje da moze dihati, da moze nesto ciniti. Oni je drze u rukama i sad Srbi opet, posle sto su ubijali ljude njihove, djecu, muzeve, rodake, sve. E sad jos i stisnuli i nedaju im da idu dalje. Slabu vidim. Slabu buducnosti vidim, a na to sam ljuta najvise na te vlasti koje dodu iz vana i nevide oto sto je bilo. Dokazano i Srebrenica tolika genocid toliki.. da niko nije kaznio tu Srpsku Republiku i te Srpske vukovodioce, te vode. Da ih kazne, onda bih bilo drugacije sve.*

Introduction and preparation for part 2

12:12 Imas li kakva pitanja ili komentara?

12:16 *Ja bih pricala o tome cijeli dan. Tolika je to steta na nas i Bosni, ali svi tamo nece da vide sta je tamo pred njima. A da vide sta je pred njima, onda bih bilo se drugacije. Isto te vanjski sto dodu da naredivaju u Bosni, a oni samo saradivaju sa Srbima. Bosna nikome nista. Eto, to me ljuti.*

[Short break]

14:31 Znas li ko je Vucic, Aleksandar Vucic?

14:36 *Znam, on nije Vucic, nego je veliki vuk. Veliki je on lopov.*

14:53 Znas li kakav je njegov politicki stav vezano za Srebrenicu?

14:58 *On je pravo onaj tihi lopov. Muti. Muti vodu onu bistru.*

15:14 Kako mislis tihi lopov?

15:20 *Zato sto ima masku i pred Srebrenicom i pred Bosnjacima sve fino prica, a vamo javno kaze „Ja zivim za Srpsku Republiku“. Onda sve ti je jasno sta je on. On je samo jedna velike smetnja u zivotu. Sad neznam kako bih ti drugacije izrazila. Veliki politicianar, sto god ne vodi nicemu dobro ni Srbskoj publici, nit Bosni. A platit ce on taj ceh. Moze mu se odbiti to od glavu.*

Presenting Vucic's first statement which was about the Resolution and UN's Security Council

- 21:32 *To je sta sam ja tebi sad rekla da je to Rusija pobila i sad za njega je to super, sto nije prihvatila. Da je prihvatila, i on bi dobio po nosu sto podrzava Srpsku Republiku. Dodik bih izgubio Srpsku Republiku, i nama nema Srpske Republike, ostala bih Bosna i Hercegovina. A i Vucic bih dobio po nosu, zato sto podrzava to.. koja nije ni priznata. Samo eto sto se nastalo nad genocidu. Zato sto je bio genocid nad muslimanima, tako je postala Srpska Republika. Oni se sada toga drze, i ako to izgube, oni su propali, ako priznaju da je bio genocid. Zato nikad priznati nece. Koliko god mogu oni ce kopati crte i drzati se samo da nepriznaju genocid. Ako priznaju nema Srpske Republike, zato sto je postala nad genocidu. Oni su poubijali taj narod i sami proglasili Srpsku Republiku. Sta god, samo Srpska Republika. Nista vise. To je to.*
- 23:05 Ali.. je li se slazes sa tim da Savet Bezbednosti nije pokusala..
- 23:20 *Nije to realizovo. Nije uradio nista. Slazem se da nije nista uradio. On je predlozio, ali ovih ga odmah poklopili i nedaju, i on se tako usutio. Niej nista ucinio o tome. Znas, da je ucinio onda bih drugacije sve bilo. Bosna bih ostala Bosna. Nestalo bih Srpske Republike, i onda bih krenula Bosna kako treba. Ali ovako samo je drze u saki i nedaju im.*
- 24:22 A jesi li zadovoljna ovim rijecima presidenta Srbije?
- 24:25 *Ne. Ne, ne.*
- 24:27 A sto ne?
- 24:29 *Zato sto se on mjesa u Srpsku Republiku i on podrzava taj genocid isti, a vamo u Srebrenici eto mir i sve to. Nece da kaze pravu istinu, zato ga nepodrzavam. Sto je dvolican.. prevarant. Puno laze.*
- 25:10 A da li se slazes ili neslazes s tim da samo ljudi sto zive na balkanu trebaju da rjesavaju svoje probleme i politicke sukobe u regione, ili bih trebala vanjska pomoc?
- 25:23 *Nama treba pomoc da samo to spreći, samo da se ukine Srpska Republika. To bih sve pokrenulo naprijed. Ali oni se drze te Srpske Republike, i njima je samo Srpska Republika sve. A vamo sve nek propada, nek narod poumre od glad, nek nema penzija, nek nema penzioneri sta jesti, nek propadaju u skolima, nek omladina ide iz Bosne. To njih nista nije briga, samo nek imaju Srpsku Republiku. To je sve velika, velika ta steta sto je ta Srpska Republika proglasena.*
- 26:33 Bili ti rekla da ima podjednika na ovim prostorima, ili smo svi zrtve kao sto je Vucic rekao?

26:40 *Zrtve su samo muslimani. Bilo je i Srba i Hrvata zrtava, koji su izgonili. Ali oni su samo izgonili sto su napadali muslimane. Muslimani koliko su mogli, toliko su se i branili. Ako su koga ubili, braneci se, to je to. Muslimani nisu isli nicijim kucama po [selama]i ostalim mjestima, kao sto su Srbi dolazili navece pa ubijali u kucama narod i popalili, bombe postavljali i to. Nasi nisu. Mozda su tamo isli gdje su dolazili do ti kuca, jer iz ti kuca pucali su na nasu vojsku. Ti su Srbi svi imali municije. Svi Srbi u [selu] su imali Svaka kuca je bila obiljezana u dva sata po nocu. Svaku noci kamion ide i koja kuca je god obiljezana, neki znak imala na sebi. Oni u vrecu stave oruzije i kod vrata ulazni. A muslimanski kuca bilo tamo u [selo] i od jednog covjeka zena je gledala tamo kako kamion ide i samo stane kod Srpske kuce i ostavi oruzije. A nasima je sve oduzeto bilo i vlastiti pistolj, puske, i nasi cim sto su se mogli branuti, oteli od nekoga pusku, ako je neko dosao i napao ih. Ako su njega ubili ili svezali, pa oteli mu oruzje. Mi smo bili nemocni sa njima se boriti. Ali oni su nas napadali, nismo mi njih.*

Presenting Vucic's statement which was about the attack on him

30:45 *Sad da ti kazem o Vucicu. Vucica nije niko napao od muslimana. Vucicu je dosao jedan fudbaler narucen, to je bilo u novinama, obucen u crnom, pa da nas narod opada pod vlastitim i vanjske vlasti. Da se napadne Vucic, pa da kazu „Eto muslimani napali Vucica, a napao ga je iz Srbije Srbin, a nije musliman. Zato on pruza ruku pomirenja, a on je veliki lopov. On je gori nego Karadzic i Mladic. Dokazano je, pisalo je skoro da je dosao neko iz Srbije koji je bio fudbaler valjda. Da je on dosao obucen u crnoj uniformi i vikao „Allahu Ekber!“ da samo se ocrne muslimani i da taj genocid, sto se poklanja zrtvam, a da se to prekine. To je sve programirano uradeno.*

32:47 *Znaci niste zadovoljni sa ovim i mislite da je rekao id drugih namjere?*

32:56 *On jedno prica a drugo radi.*

Presenting Vucic's statement which was from the Conference in Srebrenica

33:55 *Sta mislis o ovoj izjavi?*

33:58 *Pa to je sve ta ista skola njegova politicka. Jedno prica, drugo radi. Njima je stalo do Banje Guber u Srebrenici i sto je bio onaj.. kako se zvao.. i sto je bio onaj predsjednik musliman.. Oni su namutnili onda Srbina da on komanduje Srebrenicom. I zaboravite te vi koliko je naroda pobijeno kao da muslimani budu tolike budale i da zaborave na tolike mrtve zrtve sto su poginuli. I da oni njemu pruze sad ruku „Eto, mi cemo se pomiriti.“ Necemo ganjati da je bio genocid, da necemo ganjati da je Srbija uradila to. Jer on se boji Srbije. Da je prosla ona tuzba u Hagu, sto je bila, Srbija bih dobila po nosu i to posteno i Republike Srpske bih nestalo. Zato se on boji i miri uvijek*

muslimane i Srbe, a vamo podrzava Srbe, „Vi samo svoje cuvajte i radite tako, a mi cemo njija polako ubijati. On je veliki lopov.

35:40 On je taj dan rekao da ce dati 10 miliona maraka Srebrenici i da se mogu koristiti bez ikakvih obaveza i da su za svijuu, i Bosnjake i Srbe. 2 miliona su odmah spremni da se prebace. Sta mislis o tome?

36:12 *Davao je on to, ali zato sto ima tamo Srba. Davao je samo zato sto imaju oci i da ne traze dalje, kao „Sad cu te pomilovato poslije sto sam te istukao. Nemoj nikome reci.“ Eh, to je to, znas. Ali dosta naroda je svjesno toga sta oni rade. Jedno rade, a drugo misle.*

Presenting Vucic's statement regarding the trial against Karadzic

38:52 Sta mislis o ovoj izjavi? Jesi li zadovoljna?

38:57 *Eh, nisam zadovoljna sa time. Zato sto oni nikada nedaju kazati da je i Mladic i Karadzic zlocinci. Onda to kazu da su zlocinci, da su naredili toliko da Mladic poubija u Sarajevu. On bih nama bio uhvacen kao zlocinac. I onda to kazu, da su zlocinci, Jer ako Karadzica osude, Karadzic ce povuci jos njija, sto su krivi. Oni su ubili Milosevica u onome.. to je dokazano da je Milosevic ubijen u Hag, samo zato sto Milosevic voli lanuti. On bih volio reci sve, sto je god znao. A da je Milosevic rekao, sta se sve radilo bilo bih jos pola Srbije sve u Hag.*

40:25 Znaci ti zelis da Vucic direktno kaze da je Karadzic to uradio?

40:32 *Da, da jesto uradio, on je to ucinio. Dok god on je to neprizna za mene nije ni nula ona..*

40:38 Tebi nije dovoljno samo reci da Srbija osuduje svaki zlocin..

40:50 *Ne, ne, ne. Drugo je pricati ja osudujem, a drugo je reci „Hej, vi ste ovo uradili i trebalo bih vas kazniti.“ A ne „Hej, bio je zlocin i eto hajte oprostite.“ Ne, to trebas uoci kazniti i reci „Kaznite ih, oni su zlocinci i treba ih kaznuti.“ To bih bilo sve uredi. Pa sta su radili u Albaniji samo, i eno onda u Hagu da mogu uveli bih Srbina na ubeza, ali sto nepase, nepase mom. Zato sto nece nikada da kazu sta su oni radili u Kosovo tamo koliko je nase vojske.. to je kad sam ja bila mlada.. koliko je samo iz vojske doslo mladi vojnika mrtvih, sto su oni tamo poubijali u Srbiji, ali dosli vamo u sanducima spakovani, sto su slali tamo da poubijaju muslimane u Kosovu i po Albaniji. To nigdje nepise, ali zato se njima sad vraca. Njihovi se sami sad ubijaju, sad se sami vjesaju, ubijaju, bacuju se sa spratova i ubistva. Svaki dan nema da nema u Srbiji ubistvo. Covjek ubio zenu, ubio djete, ubio mati, ubio oca.. Sve ima se vraca. Bog dragi ce kad tad dati pravdu. To je to sto on nece da prizna, da ej Karadzic bio zlocinac, tako isto nece da prizna da je Mladic bio. Poslali Mladica u Srbiju da se*

ljeci, a oni bih njega ubili da Mladic nekaze jos za nekoga. Ubili bih ga sigurno, pa ga sad vracaju u Srbiju, da neide u Hag da tamo on rekne za jos nekoga. To je lopovluk, veliki lopovluk.

43:20 On je izjasnio da nije htjeo komentarisati o pojedinacnim presudama, posto to nesmatra da nije njegov posao.

43:33 *Laze.*

43:35 Mislis li da treba vlasti ulaziti u pojedinacne..

43:39 *Pa on treba.. Nece da komentarisati zato sto nema sta komentarisati, kad nema prava reci ono sto nije. Nemoze reci sada da nije bio genocid, da nisu zlocinci. On ako to rekne, onda on nije nista. Ubit ce i njega i odnjat ce ga u Hag Srbi. Zato nemoze reci da je to to.*

Presenting Vucic's statement about the situation in the region to Bill Clinton

45:07 *Pa da, to ti je to. Zato sto on je za Srbe. Neki dan kaze u televiziji „Ja navijam za Srpsku Republiku“ kad je bio otvor one ceste za Doboj. „Ja zivim za Srpsku Republiku.“ Eto, sve je rekao. Sto nekaze „Zivim za Bosnu i Hercegovinu,“ jer Srpska Republika je u Bosni? Ali eto on hoce da Srbima svojim pomaze, i hoce da njih ojaca da ne bih izgubili Srpsku Republiku. Sad se zakuhalo tamo u Banja Luci. Sad lahko moze biti da Dodik gubi smjene i da nestane. Ako bude to tako, moze lahko biti da nestane Srpske Republike.*

46:10 A jeli mislis da je upravo da je takva situacija gdje nikome nista nemozes da objasniti?

46:20 *Ne, nije to upravo. Svakome se moze reci ono sto je on uradio. Treba mu se reci i treba on da zna, sta je uradio da nebih ucinio dalje iste greske, da se opet ratovi stvaraju. Da je osudeno onda onoga rate '41. Da su osudeni oni sto su bili cetnici, nebi rata bilo vise, ali nikada se nije bilo osudeno, i onda zato svake 50. godine izbija rat.*

Presenting Vucic's statement about the demand for legal consequences of the Srebrenica massacre

49:45 *To ti je taj isti scenariji, sto on pravi. „Nemojte vise to govoriti o Srebrenici. Umanjite to, pa ce se zaboraviti i biti pomirenje, pa cemo ici naprijed. Nemojte samo dirati u to, ako to dirate onda prijetete izbaciti ce Srpsku Republiku“. On se toga samo boje Srpske Republike. Jer ako ima se Srpska Republika izmakne iz ruku, oni su propali da nikada dna neće imati. Onda bit ce zlocinaca koliko jos. „Mi cemo otici u Hag. Onaj ce privuci onoga „Eh, ti si oto i oto radio.““ Mi sada imamo Karadzica i Mladica, Milosevic je umro. Eh, sada ko ima jos? Nema vise. Mi neznamo za jos. Ima oni*

generala. Posto mi sada osudujemo Karadzica i Mladica, oni sada Orica treci put osuduju za istu stvar, a za istu stvar oslabada ga narodu sud. Sad oni tuzivaju sud. Sad moze im doci preko nosa, zato sto sud osudivaju i Hag. Znaci nista njima nije vrijedno. Nicemu nista vise nevjeruju, samo sami sebe lazu. „Zato nemojte vise spominjati, umanjite vise taj genocid u Srebrenici. Zaboravite na to, pa cemo onda biti dobri.“ Gdje to ima logike? Samo glupo pitanje i glupa prica njegov.

52:05 On je jednom u jednom intervju rekao, da se mora pricati o Srebrenici i o zlocinama tamo.

52:17 *Jeste on to, ali to ti kazem. On sad ce to reci, samo da zamaze nama oci, da mi nevidimo dalje. Onda ce kasnije, kad ovi njega „Sto si to rekao? Samo malo sutite, ja sam to morao samo da malo poravnam zemlju, ali sad cu ja opet u napad. Nemojte vise spominjati. To je bilo i proslo. Nemojte vise za taj isti scenariji.“ U tome smislu on to radi. Ima dvije variante sto godi on. On je ona rogata svinja. To ide u jednim smjerom mislima, a drugo radi. Takvi su oni.*

Presenting Vucic's statement about the importance of having good relations between Serbs and Bosniaks

54:50 Sta kazes nad to?

54:55 *Znam, za to sto sada Bosna i Hercegovina ide ka Europskoj Uniji. A oni nemogu ici dok ne priznaju i Kosovo a i vamo genocid. A on ce sada i Srpska Republika sljepa se uz Bosnu. A ako ide Bosna, mora i Srbija. Oni sad pruzaju ruku Bosni, a vamo se drze za Srbiju i Srpsku Republiku da povucu tu medunarodnu uniju u Europsku Zajednicu. Vids sama sta govori. Jedno govori samo iz interesa. On ima interes taj da to prica. I on smisli sta ce pricati da utisi muslimane, a i Srbima da nebi mu sta zlo ucinili. Ja necu da pricam o tome. Nema se sta pricati kad je dokazano da covjek javno nazvao policiju u Srebrenici „Ja sam to uradio. Nemojte ganjati nikoga.“ Oni su hvatali svakoga oko Srebrenice da vide ko je napao Vucica kao organizacija, a policajac obican. Policajac je to uradio. „Pa ko je? Policajac iz Srbije.“ Znas onda sta se radi. Sve smisljaju samo da iz daleka dodi i nesto ubaci.*

56:53 **[This part is not translated, as it is irrelevant, as the direction of the interview changed to talking about different TV programs]**

58:42 Znaci ti mislis da kad god on sebe prestavlja nesto sto bih bosnjaci voljeli cuti, to je ustvari..

58:48 *Laz.*

58:55 Ali on kaze ovo i Srbima u Srbiji i Republikoj Srpskoj?

- 59:00 *Isto je, ali sve on njima kaze, „Ja sam morao i vas pomjesati, da i vi budete kao krivi, ali da operem i vas i Sebe. Ali moram malo napasti i vas i moram napasti malo Bosnjake. Samo da sebe opere, jer i njemu se radi o. Jer vec njegovi prvi Srbi iz Bosne i vako negdje gdje je intervju da bude ono.. kako se ono zove, gdje ima dosta omladine. Uglavnom kazu da nije Vucic, nego je veliki vuk. Samo misli na sebe. Srbi govore. Eto a pogotovo i nasih govore.*
- 1:00:08 On je rekao da odnosi između Srba i Bosnjaka su od ključnog značaja za budućnosti?
- 1:00:14 *Da, jeste.*
- 1:00:16 I ako bih bila druga politika se vodila, to bih bila katastrofa.
- 1:00:21 *Dabome bila bih katastrofa. Za njija bih bila katastrofa. Zato on sve ide nebili nekako sve da pomiri, da muslimani se nebune, da oni mogu raditi sta hoce. On je lopov na svoju ruku.*
- 1:00:50 Imas li jos neki komentar ili neko pitanje? Inace idemo dalje.
- 01:01:05 *Da se pita oni Srpski sestara i pojedini Srba koje su.. Vucic bih davno odgovarao za take te svoje bezmislice sto radi u rukavicima. Jedno prica, drugo misli. Ali srbski oni kolo sestara sto dodu u Srebrenicu i zale majke i priznaju genocid i sve to. Zato njih ganjaju po Srbiji i tamo one Srbske kolo sestara. Da mogu, poubijali bih ih, ali imaju oni neku zastitu i sta ja znam. A sta se tice Vucica, on se samo boji, jer podrzava Dodika. Dodik, sta god hoce uraditi u Banja Luci, prvo ide pitati Vucica, pa onda vamo postavlja pitanja. I njegovi ovih iz Banje Luke to kazu. A Vucic ide u Rusiji, i to je to kolo.*

Preperation for part 3

- 01:03:02 Znas li kakav je Dodikov politicki stav vezan za Srebrenicu?
- 01:03:06 *Nikakav. On niti hoce da prizna Srebrenicu, niti hoce da prizna genocid. To je bio gradanski rat. Eto, kao da smo mi sami sebe poubijali. Zato sto nema karaktera, nema postenja, brzobrazan, lopov, prevarant. Neznam, sta bih jos dodala.*

Presenting Dodik's statement about the Srebrenica massacre being completely politicized

- 1:04:27 *Zato sto stiti i Mladica i Karadzica, ali i Mladic i Karadzic su stvorili Srpsku Republiku. Oni se docepali Srpske Republike i sada nedaju. Glavu ce dati, a Republike nedaju. Drugo, oni su sve to komponovali to sto je bilo na pijaci i po Sarajevu bombardovali. Oni su sve to glumili i prikazivali tamo u Hagu, ali nije im to pomoglo. Nije moglo to Srpskoj Republici izadi, zato sto su im dole bili predstavnici sa stranih zemalja, koji su bili u Sarajevo. I vidjeli su dosta toga, odakle su granate*

ispaljivali i tako. On je sam navo to. Doslo je i sa muslimanske strane. On je poubijo sve to sto je svedoka bilo i sto je god medunarodni zajednica snimali. Oni su to sve poubijali, i kao oni su to sami sebe poubijali. On je jedna ona okrugla nula, nije ni covjek. On je zvjer.

1:06:30 On kritikuje kvalifikaciju tog dogadaja kao genocid. Misli da je to iz politicki razloga umirito. Zato zeli jednu objektivnu medunarodnu komisiju da procijeni sta se desilo u Srebrenici.

1:06:49 *Ja, da on dovede jos iz Rusije profesionalci koji ce to realizovati. Da Rusija kaze „Nije to bio genocid,“ i da njih podrzi. A sto ovi svi kazu da jeste, oni ce sve i medunarodnu zajednicu i muslimane i bosance i hrvate. „Ne, on nije to pocinio ni Karadzic ni Mladic. Sami sebe Muslimani poubijali.“ Zato Dodiku nema mjere koje.. brzobrazluk pravi. Sta on sve laje i prica kao Seselj.*

Presenting Dodik's statement about the Reseolution of Srebrenica

1:08:45 *E, zato sto on sve proubija da „mi nismo krivi, da smo sami sebe ubijali.“ To samo drzi Mladica i Karadzica. I on ce umrijeti da neda da je on zlocinac. Nece to priznati nikada, jer ode Srpska Republika. On je dobio tu Republiku na dlanu, zato sto je poubijao te muslimane. Zato je i sam sebi proglasio Republiku, e sad vamo ucijenili Alija Izetbegovica, Allahramehtelja. „Ili potpisi mir i koliko smo zauzeli, a ova Srpska Republika je nase.“*

Presenting Dodik's statement about the lies behind Srebrenica

1:10:20 *Padabome. Moras drzati na cemu si. Oci vide i narod i vlasti i sve sto su uradili, ali oni to nece da dokazu da je to bilo. Samo sto je lopov i brzobrazan, i sto on neda na pravo nikoma, samo je on najpametniji, a najveći budala na svijetu. On nemoze da zivi kao insan.*

1:11:08 On kaze da zbog jednog dogadaja, bosnjaci zele da kolektiviziraju tu odgovornost

1:11:15 *Ali zbog tog dogadaja u Srebrenici, da mi trazimo odgovornost od njija.*

1:11:25 Jer mislis da se treba kolektivizirati, mislim da bude citava Srbija kriva, ne samo neki ljudi sto su to ucinili?

1:11:38 *Ne citava Srbija, bilo je i Rusa dolazili su tu pa pravili genocid i Srbija, haman cijela Crna Gora, pa iz Srbije. Svi su dolazili samo da pomognu bosanskim Srbima taj genocid, da urade to sto su uradili. Sve iz Vojvodine, iz Srbije, sa Kosova, sve dolazili Srbi da to urade.*

[Small interruption]

- 1:13:34 Znaci ti smatras da.. Imaju neki ljudi sto su to ucinili u Srebrenici, i nezele da to bude kolektivna nad Republiku Srpsku
- 1:13:58 *Nemoze biti kolektivna, posto dosta je Srba bilo, sto i danasnji dana u Sarajevu zivu i ostali tamo lojalni nasoj Bosni i svom narodu bosanskome, sto nisu htjeli ici u Srpsku vojsku da ubijaju taj narod i svoje tamo.*
- 1:14:31 Ali sa kolektivnom rijec se misli na vlasti.
- 1:14:37 *Vlasti su sve iste. Svi su krivi. Svi, generalno. Svi vlasnici i majori, kapetani i vojska i oni svi kolektivno. A oni su dovlacili jos naroda, a kolektivini su oni svi krivi.*
- 1:15:07 I vlasti?
- 1:15:08 *I vlasti. Sva vlada samo jedno sto negira o to sto on govori, Dodik, oto bih sve prestalo. Svi drze se samo te.. Njima je samo Republika Srpska na pitanju. Oni svi penzioneri u razlicitim gradovima u Srpskoj traze po kontainerima sta ce jesti, a nece na Dodika, samo zato sto je njima Dodik dao njima Republiku. Oni sad imaju tu svoju drzave i drze je kao mali dijamant. A da samo otkriva Dodika, pa da on bude smjenen i dode do priznjana da je genocid bio, ode Srpska Republika kao da se jaje razbije. Kolektivno su svi krivi. Vojska i svi ti njihovi.*

Presenting Dodik's statement about the accepting the term genocide against both Serbs and Bosniaks

- 1:17:15 Sta kazes o ovome?
- 1:17:17 *Kazem da je samo velika budala. On samo hoce da se uporedi ova vojska, koja je bila nauruzana i ubijala ovaj narod, sto nije bio nauruzan. Njihove vojnici, ako su bili poubijani, dolazili i napadali. Vojnik je vojnik. Kad pogine nikome nista, ali sto je on civile ubijao? Oni su bili civile i po kucama po razlicitim gradovima. Gdje je to? Sta su tude radili? A on samo govori da su Srbi, zato sto su Srbi napadali. Ako je ko pogino, „Pogino je Srbin tude, hajmo sad iznaciti te hiljade toliko muslimana sa tolike hiljade Srba. Pa gdje to more? To nemoze ni budala uraditi. A on svojom pameti glupom moze svasta raditi. Necemo se zdvojiti, nece to prihvatiti niko.*

Presenting Dodik's statement about the Resolution as a factor that could destabilize the region

- 1:19:44 [This part not transcribed as the informant misunderstood the text]
- 1:20:56 Ali on kaze da Rezolucija o Srebrenici bih unosila vise problema nego pomirenja.
- 1:21:05 *Laze on to. Zato sto izmedu Srba bih donijela ta Rezolucija da se dokaze to. Onda bih Srbi bili gotovi, prescurilo bih. Zato on neda da to dode do pomirenja, da se to prizna.*

A ako se prizna, onda su Srbi gotovi. Jer on uvijek ima u mislima da cemo mi Bosnjaci popustiti i priznati da nije bio genocid, a to nesmijes, nemozes od onih grobova uraditi. Nesmijes od Boga od grehote. A oni to uvijek ganjaju da se to prizna, gdje ces to priznati? Nemozes, valjda bih bio lud priznajuci da nije bio genocid, a jeste.

Presenting Dodik's statement about the fear of muslims

- 1:26:38 Mislis li da Britanci mozda samo podrzavaju dogadaj u Srebrenici kao genocid samo zato sto se boje muslimana?
- 1:26:58 *To je samo Dodikov um. Britanci su sve vidjeli sta su radili Srbi od tih Bijeli Sljevova i po Sarajevu. Oni znaju to i nedaju prekosebe, a on mrzi britance. Ona iz Britanije kad je dosla rekao je o toj predsjednici iz Britanije.. nema sta nije govorio, kakva je ruzna, pjesme o njoj pjevao. Zato mrzi je, sto je ona priznala. Dokazano je. Tih vojnici su isli u Hag i prikazivali sta se radilo u Sarajevu i Srebrenici. On sad mrzi njih, i njih poredi kao da se oni boje muslimana i da ce njih poubiti musimini i vikati „Allahu Ekber.“ On to samo tako namece gluposti.*

Presenting Dodik's statement about the trial against Karadzic and the neglect of jailing Bosniak generals

- 1:30:03 *Gdje ce biti procesuiranje, kad nije ni kriv? Imao je svoj narod i oslobadao je svoju zemlju. Sta ce procesuirati? Zasto? On nije isao nikoga napadati. Nije dosao u Srbije pa da je poubije pola.*
- 1:30:32 Mislis li da mozda Haskom Tribunalu izostaju neke zrtve, posebno Srpske zrtve?
- 1:30:40 *Ne, on osuduje zrtve svih naroda. A Srbima neodgovara nijedan iz Haga. Nijedan onaj sudija iz Haga odogovara Srpskoj. Sviju su napadali „Onaj je iz odande, onaj odavde.“ Pa moraju dokazati, kad imaju dokaze sve i svjedoke, da je Karadzic, Mladic i Milosevic kriv. Svi oni redom sto su krivu, moraju proglasiti. Imaju dokaze. A gdje ce dokazi biti za Dudakovic, kad Dudakovic nije dosao i pobije pola Banja Luke. Ako je pobije, pobije je tamo gdje [unclear]. Sta hoce on? Mislim njima je to sve uoku zato sto se njihove procesiraju da su krivi, a nasi nisu. A nemogu biti krivi, kad nisu. Zato mrze Hag.*

Presenting Dodik's statement about both sides having crossed the rules of war

- 1:33:23 *Nije bilo samo na jednoj strani. Bilo je ubijeni i tamo i vamo, ali ko je kriv za ubistvo? To se treba dokazati. Ko je kriv, ko je poceo to? Nije to Bosanski narod kriv. Kriv je Srpski narod zato sto je digao to i sam poceo rat. Nikad nece da kazu, nego mi smo,*

muslimani su poceli rat. Oni nece da kazu da su prvi poceli rat, a ko je poceo prvi u Sarajevu? Nisu muslimani, nego Srbi.

1:34:00 *Rekla si da ima i Srpski i Bosanski zrtvi? Mislis li da se trebaju i Bosanski komandanti i generali kaznuti?*

1:34:26 *Ne, vojska vojsku kad ubija je na terenu. To nije nikad bilo osudivano. Vojska vojnika kad ubija nema osude, ali ima kad ja bacim granatu u hrpu naroda. To je osudivanje. Ali kad dva vojnika pucaju u jednog i drugog i sad ko ce tu prvi ubiti jedno drugoga nema osude. Ako je doslo do jedne kuce pa poubijali tamo naroda sto ima, to je osudivanje.*

Presenting Dodik's statement about what should be written about Srebrenica in books in Srpska

1:38:10 *Zato on nece nego cirilicu i da u skolima dode taj top da uci djecu. Onda su trazili i nasi da dode i hodza da uci, ali posto nase djece malo ide, tako da je to sve propalo.*

1:38:42 *Ali on prica o tome da je Federacija htjela da se uvede u skolima u Republikoj Srpskoj da djeca uce..*

1:38:54 *To on nije dao. To ja znam. Neda posto podrzava Republiku Srpsku i kao nije ona kriva nista, ako to prizna onda je gotov. Zato nece da prizna i da se pise historija. Sad da pise „Karadzic, Mladic, svi oni su bili zlocinci. I Dodika cak, i njega bih uvrtili i jos neke sto su bili u Hagu i odrzavali kazne. Sve bih bilo upisano, ali on to nece. Prije bih umro.*

Closure

1:40:20 *Kakav ti je cijeloukupni utisak o Srpskoj i Srbijanskoj politici u Srebrenici, posle sve ovoga sto si cula od Dodika i Vucica?*

1:40:35 *Svi oni pricaju isto pojedino, osim onih pojedini kolo sestara sto su prizali genocid, ali se nesmiju objasniti. Ode im glava. Jedino kolo sestara dodu za 11. Juli i predaju cast zrtvama i majkama podrsku daju. I njima svaka cast, jer i oni znaju sto su dosla njihova djeca u Bosnu i izgunila. Jer bilo je ili ces braniti, pa ces dobiti toliko i toliko para, kucu, imaje, zemlju, fabriku. I onda su opljackali sve nase fabrike i imanja. Sve je oslo za Srbiju i to su ti isti vojnici sto su dolazili is Srbije i oni nedaju da kazu da sada on nije zlocinac i da to nije radio. To mogu samo pricati djeci u skoli, oni prvacicima, a ne velikima. Pojedinama mozes dokazati da je bio genocid, a pojedini ce umrijet i nece to priznati.*

1:42:33 *Moze li se sta uciniti da se promijeni situacija?*

- 1:42:40 *Samo može jedino da nestane Srpske Republike i da oni pokonje se onda Bosni i da kazu „Nasa je Bosna i Hercegovina država.“ Ali Dodik kaže da Bosna i Hercegovina nikad nije ni postajala. Neće da je prizna, i da se ista zove Bosansko. Sta god je Bosansko nije njegovo.*
- 1:43:25 *Kakvu ti budućnost vidiš za Bosnu i Hercegovinu, Srpsku Republiku i Srbiju u vezi Srebrenice?*
- 1:43:30 *Nikad se to pomiriti neće dok god oni sami ne priznaju genocid i nepoklone se žrtvama što leže tamo. Onda će se učiniti nešto.*

Appendix 5: Transcription of Interview with Ibrahim

Transcription of Interview with Ibrahim

To begin with the informant was informed about their right to take a break, quit the interview, skip questions, anonymity etc. and about the structure of the interview guide and the overall purpose of the project.

Introduction to Part 1

- 02:33 Kakav ti je generalni utisak o politici u Bosni i Hercegovini?
- 02:40 *Moj utisak je da politicari u Bosni, vecina, samo gledaju svoj interes, svoje licne interese, interese svojih najblizih prijatelja.*
- 03:05 A o politici u regionu?
- 03:06 *Slicno. To je u pet deka.*
- 03:11 Kakav ti je utisak odnosa izmedu Srba i Bosnjaka?
- 03:37 *Izmedu ljudi su dosta dobri. Ali Srpska politika, Dodik naprimjer, zavada narod jos uvijek poslije 20 godina poslije Daytonu. On idalje zavada narod.*
- 04:00 Sta znas o Srebrenici?
- 04:03 *Znam puno.*
- 04:05 Cuo si sta se desilo 1995? Kad si prvi put cuo za to?
- 04:13 *Tu kad se desavalo tih dana. Pratio sam. Cuo preko televizije i radia. Preko medija, kad su javljali o tome.*
- 04:26 Kakav ti je stav sto se tice toga?
- 04:30 *Kakav ce biti stav. Cijeli svijet zna da je to bio genocid, osim onih koji nece da znaju, koji lazu, iznose lazi.*
- 04:40 Je li znas za ikakvi politickim debata vezano za Srebrenicu?
- 04:55 *Trenutne debate? Da, ja to pratim cesto.*
- 05:07 Kakvu buducnost vidis izmedu odnosa Bosnjaka i Srba?
- 05:16 *Ja mislim da ce biti sve bolje i bolje, ali treba da sidu sa vlasti oni koji zavadaju, a to ce se desiti da li na sljedecim izborima 2018 ili nekim drugim, ali to je nemino da se desi.*

Introduction and preparation for Part 2

- 05:46 Sta mislišo Vucicu?
- 05:50 *Za vrijeme rata bio je osoba u teskoj zabludi. Vrlo inteligentan, pametan, ali u zabludi. Nasjeo je na politiku Slobodana Milosevica i jos gori od Vojislava Seselja i takvih, A sad neznam jeli ono sto prica.. sve je ok, a moze li se vjerovati? Vrijeme ce pokazati.*
- 06:26 Jeli znas za njegov politicki stav o Srebrenici?
- 06:30 *Ja znam, ali i mislim da ce on biti prvi od svih tih glavni politicara, koji ce priznati genocid u Srebrenici. Svi oni priznaju da se desio zlocin, a nece da priznaju da se desio genocid. On se boji da ce izgubiti sljedece izbore, ako to prizna. Posto ima jos puno Srba koji nece da priznaju da je bio genocid. Samo radi toga, ali on ce biti prvi, ja sam ubijeden, da ce on biti prvi politicar na visokom rangu koji ce to od Srba priznati da je bio genocid. Dodik je rekao prije 10 godina, kad je dosao na vlast, da je bio genocid, a onda sve kako je kasnije postao sve veci i veci nacionalista i od Seselja i Milosevica i svih tih..*

Presenting Vucic's statement about the Resolution and UN's Security Council

- 09:35 Sta mislis o toj izjavi?
- 09:40 *Izjava nije potpuna, zato sto nije priznao genocid.. Sve je dobro receno, ali nigdje ga ne spominje, jer je Srbija i njihova vojska ucestvovala u genocid i njihove paravojne jedinice i sve vojne sluzbe.. Svi su oni znali sta se tamo desava, a nista nisu uradili da sprece.*
- 10:15 A kako si zadovoljan sa ovim rijecima?
- 10:21 *Relativno ne u potpunosti.*
- 10:26 A jeli se slazes sa tim da ljudi sto zive na Balkanu trebaju da se brinu o pomirenju?
- 10:33 *Trebaju, normalno da trebaju.*
- [Informant asks about an earlier question and adds that he considers Alija Izetbegovic as one of the best and most honest politicians]**
- 11:27 A da li se slazes sa tim da samo ljudi sto zive na Balkanu trebaju se brinuti o tome, vise neko neki internacionalni agent?

- 11:33 *Pa trebaju naravno, ali mi nemozemo nesto... Oni trebaju normalno da pomognu, da smjene neke, da podrze i to tako. Licemjerna je politika medunarodne zajednice puno u Bosni bila pocetkom pa dosad.*
- 12:00 Slazes li se s tim da nema pobjednika? Da su svi zrtve?
- 12:06 *Od zemalja koje su ratovale pobjednik je samo Hrvatska. Ona je oslobodila sve svoje teritorije, ja ne govorim sada na koji nacin. Mislim da smo ipak mi pobjednici jedini u Bosni, mada smo najvise zrtvovali, ali smo ipak dobili svoju drzavu bez oruzja i bez icega.*

Presenting Vucic's statement about the attack on him

- 14:47 *Podrzavam tu izjavu, ali ako je iskrena. Moras pokazati djelima. Moras Dodika sputati kad on prica. A ti mozes na njega utjecati, uvijek moze na njegovu politiku da ga smjeni za godinu dana najmanje, da ga nema nigdje. Mora biti iskren. Podrzavam to, ali mora da bude iskren. To ce vrijeme pokazati koliko je iskren.*
- 15:15 A sta mislis o napadu nad njega?
- 15:19 *Nije uredi, a ko je to izveo, jos se uvijek nezna. Tu su mozda i ubaceni ljudi, i oni koji nerade za Bosnu.*
- 15:42 Da li se slazes sa tim da se treba ruka pomirenja..
- 15:46 *Potpuno se slazem. Ali nesmije se zaboraviti, ali on hoce da mi zaboravimo.*

Presenting Vucic's statement which was from the Conference in Srebrenica

- 16:14 *Izjava je odlicna, ali ako je iskrena. Ali netrebamo zaboraviti proslost. Samo oni to hoce da zaboravimo. On nekaze nikad u njegovoj izjavi.. samo fali ta rijecenica "Nesmiemo zaboraviti proslost". Oprostite sve, ali nesmiemo zaboraviti.*
- 16:35 Znaci ti se sa vecinom slazes..
- 16:37 *Slazem se sa svim, osim sa tom rijecenicom sto nije i to rekao.*
- 16:40 I da se treba gledati u buscnost?
- 16:43 *Naravno.*
- 16:48 Spomenuo si da su ulozili 5 miliona Eura. Sta mislis o tome?

- 17:08 *Mislim sa trebaju dati 50-100 miliona Srbija, a ne samo 5. Sta su oni samo zla nanijeli, ali i to je dobar napredak i dobar pocetak.*
- 17:24 Kakav utjecaj mislis li da ce imati na odnose izmedu Srba i Bosnjaka?
- 17:32 *Pa ako se naprave bolji zivot u Srebrenici, sigurno ce biti i bolji i odnosi, jer vecina politicara kad nemogu nesto da naprave dobro u Bosni, oni samo pricaju o.. oni zastrašuju svoj narod, posebno Srbi i Dodik. On strasi svoj narod i naravno da odnosi nisu vise, bili malo losiji nego sto bih trebali da budu.*

Presenting Vucic's statement regarding the trial against Karadzic

- 18:18 *Ta je poruka, za one koji manje znaju, dobra, super. A oni, koji znaju situaciju, to je toliko previse licemjerna, da bih se njemu ne bih moglo vjerovati. Sa tim on potvrđuje ono sto sam govorio o svakom, "Je li iskren"? Izgleda da nije. Oni hoce da izjednace, jer Tadeus Mazavjetski, nekadasnji za ljudska prava poljak, sad je on pokojni. On je rekao taj Mazavjetski da su Srbi napravili 90 % u Bosni zlocina, Hrvati 6-7 % i Bosnjaci samo 2-3 posto. Sad Vucic sa tim zeli da izjednaci. Zato nisam siguran da mu moremo vjerovati jos, dok on to ne pokaze. Jer on hoce da Hag kazni isti broj i Bosnjaka i Srba, a tako i ovaj Bosansko-Hercegovacki sud, a ne mozes kaznjavati ljude koji su nevini.. Oni bih htjeli to, oni samo izjednjicavaju. Mazavjetski je tad rekao prije 15-20 godina, kad je bio onaj glavni covjek u svijetu za zlocine i ljudska prava, on je tad rekao da su napravili 90 % zlocina, i sad oni hoce da izjednace. Nemozes to, zato hocemo mi Bosnjaci samo istinu. Ja prvi trazim to.*
- 20:07 A sta je to sto ovu poruku cini licemjernu?
- 20:10 *To sto hoce da izjednaci. Hoce da svi sudi osude 10 Bosnjaka i 50 Srba. To je nepravda, jer mozda Bosnjaci su ucinili samo one zlocine.. pojedinci su to radili. To su cinili pojedinci kojima su nekima sve pobili tamo u Srebrenici pa doce da se osvete Srbima vamo. A njihova politika je bila od Milosevica od Karadzica genocidna. U tome je razlika, a to nece nikad da kazu, da priznaju. Njihove namjere su bile genocidne, a kod nas nikad nisu bile genocidne. Politika bivse Srbije sa tadasnjih Milosevića i general Mladica Crne Gore i Srbije je imala namjere genocidne, a nasi nikad. U tome je razlika i to je dokazano. A nasi nikad nisu htjeli da poubiju jedan narod ili jedno selo..*
- 21:45 Znaci nesmatras Srbiju kao neku neutralnu zemlju?
- 21:48 *Ne nikad. Oni su sve oruzje dali njima..*
- 21:53 Ali sta se sadanasnje Srbije tice..

- 21:56 *Nije neutralna, mada Vucic pokusava. Ja njemu u necem dajem podrsku, ali mora biti iskren. Mora dokazati. Nemore takve izjave davati, kao sto je sad tu dao. Ona moze izgledati dobro nekome, sto vako nezna situaciju, ali nije dobro, zato sto mi znamo da to nije tako bilo.*
- 22:21 *On nije htjeo komentarisati o Karadzicu ili o drugima predsudama, posto nesmatra da je to njegov posao. Sta mislis o tome?*
- 22:30 *Pa zato sto se boje, i to je isto licomjerno. Zato sto se boji reakcije na narednim izjavama glasaca. Posto naroda jos ima mozda 30-40 % ili mozda 70 % Srba za koje je Karadzic heroj, za koje je Ratko Mladic heroj. To su ratni zlocinci dokazani.*

Presenting Vucic's statement about the situation in the region to Bill Clinton

- 23:28 *Bosnjaci nikad nemaju.. oni su tolerantan narod. Uvijek bili i zato su.. to je bio 11. genocid nad njima, kad bih se vratili u historiju zadnji 200 godina..*
- 23:46 *Znaci ti se neslazes?*
- 23:47 *Neslazem. Bosnjaci nikad ne zele, mozda neka manja vecina, ali to je daleko manje od, i koji je uopce nebitan, da sa nekim vlada. Nego hocemo samo da budemo ravnopravni u koliko nas ima, toliko i da imamo i vlasti, kao sto je svugdje u svijetu. Demokratski, hocemo demokratiju. A Srbi hoce da vladaju kao sto su naucili zadnji 70-80 godina pred rat. Naucilu su da ima, naprimjer 20-30 %, a da imaju vlasti 90 %. E to vise nemoze.*

Presenting Vucic's statement about the demand for legal consequences of the Srebrenica massacre

- 25:34 *On samo spominje zlocine, nigdje genocid ne spominje. Opet je malo licemjerno. Izgleda ovako odlicna, ali moras reci genocid. Sto izbjegavas tu rijec? A sta je Willy Brandt rekao nakon koliko 10 godina poslije rata? Izvinio se i priznao. To mi ocekujemo od Srba, nista drugo. Bosnjaci samo zele istinu da historiacari dokazu i utvrduju. Da se pristanu fakte, sto su se desile. Sud i historiacari trebaju odlucivati o pravnim posljedicama, ali nesmije se stavljati pod tepih. Bosnjaci su stavljali pod tepih cesto, pa im se desio 11. genocid. Genocid je bio u cijeloj Bosni, ne samo u Srebrenici.*

Presenting Vucic's statement about the importance of having good relations between Serbs and Bosniaks

- 27:50 *Dobro, malo na pocetku je zbunio, ali dobro. Opametio se. Samo ne smijemo zaboraviti. Mnogih Bošnjaci su već zaboravili.*
- 28:09 Je li se slazes?
- 28:11 *Slazem se 95%.*

Final questions regarding Vucic

- 28:20 Kakav ti je sad utisak o Vucicu?
- 28:25 *Ako je iskren bice zabiljezen u historiji, ma da je u ratu podrzavao zlocin, a mozda je sad dozivio reinkarnaciju ili kako se to kaze. Kako govori ide ka dobru. Vrijeme ce pokazati.*
- 29:00 Sta mislis o njegovoj politici prema Srebrenici?
- 29:06 *Vrijeme ce pokazati, samo da jos prizna genocid. Nista drugo. Sve ostalo je dobro.*
- 29:15 Dobro ali on je sad spomenuo i 1. i 2. Svjetski rat i..
- 29:20 *To je napocetku rekao, i tu sam je rekao da je to malo diskutabilno. Bosnjaci nikad nisu ubijali Srbe, jedino samo ako su bili pojedinci u Hrvatskoj vojsci, borili se. Izetbegovic ima puno nagrada i od Zapada cak je dobio poslije rata nagradu za demokratiju, a oni ga svrstavaju sa Milosevicem i Tudmanom, koji su vec dokazani zlocinci.*

Preperation for part 3

- 30:53 *Zbog njega je 80 % sto stagnira losa situacija u Bosni, najvise zbog njega, a pogotovo zadnji 4-5 godina u Bosni, sto stagnira ekonomija i sve, evo sad pocelo malo.*
- 31:20 Znas li za njegov politicki stav o Srebrenici?
- 31:24 *Znam, prvo je prije deset godina priznao genocid, a zadnjih 6-7 godina negira da je to rekao. Iako ima na snimku i on kaze da je tad bio naivan.*

Presenting Dodik's statement about the Srebrenica massacre being completely politicized

- 32:40 *Neslazem se ni sa jednom sekundom. U svijetu u historiji on je medu top 10 lazova i licemjera.*
- 33: 00 Ne smatras da bih događaj u Srebrenici mogao biti ispolitizovan?

- 33:03 *Kakvo ispolitizovanje?*
- 33:04 *A o tome sto je rekao da je potrebna objektivna medunarodna komisija?*
- 33:08 *Pa jeli sud medunarodni to rekao ili sam ja to rekao? Medunarodni sud je proglasio da je genocid bio, i svi se slozili. Sta ima tu objektivno. Nek se istrazuje idalje, da bih se to dalje radilo. Utvrdice se genocid i u Prijedoru, Zvorniku, Visegradu i u mnogim jos mjestima. Samo se sa tim slazem, da se istrazuje dalje.*

Presenting Dodik's statement about the Resolution about Srebrenica

[Not recorded therefore not transcribed]

Presenting Dodik's statement about the lies behind the Srebrenica massacre

- 35:30 *To sam vec rekao. Hoce da izjednjadi krivicu svima. Laze, nije poginulo 3,500 nego 2,500. I vecina su bili vojnici, dok su oni ubijali civile. Prvo granatiraju pa zarobe ljude koji ne pruzaju otpor i oko 8000 ljudi su ubili od toga je najmanje 7,500 civila ubijenih u Bih,*
- 35:50 *Neslazes se sa tim da se premalo brine o Srpskim zrtvama?*
- 35:55 *Ne slazem se uopce. Hag je pokazao i te da su lagali. Svjedoci kad su dolazili davali su razlicite izjave njihove i Srbi koji su bili tu. Sve je sud dokazao, da to uopce nema veze o genocidu ili o zlocinu nekome velikome. To je jos jedna.. on je najveći lazov na Balkanu, ako ne i prvi.*

Presenting Dodik's statement about the accepting the term genocide against both Serbs and Bosniaks

- 36:00 *Neslazem ni sa tim. Jer Hag je pokazao, kad su uhvatili svjedoke imali su razlicite izjave njihove, Srbi koji su bili tu. Na tome sta ima to? Hag je sve dokazao, da to uopce nema veze o zlocinu nekome velikome. Nego u borbama su izginuli ti ljudi. Samo nije bilo 3,500 nego 2,500 hiljade. To je jos jedna.. da je on najveći lazov na Balkanu.*

Presenting Dodik's statement about the Resolution as a factor that could destabilize the region

- 37:25 *Neslazem se ni truna jednog. Ponovo laz, ponovo ohalost, ponovo dakle ako nema njegove "istine", nemi ni pomirenja. Hoce na lazu pomirenje. Istina je vec dokazana, a oni nek se razmatruju jos, nek se utvrduju. Posto je on Republiku Srpsku doveo do*

bankrota, zivot nikakav. To su sve njegove floske da bih ostao na vlasti. Nazalost jos ima mnogo Srba koji njemu vjeruju.

Presenting Dodik's statement about the fear of muslims

38:07 *Sve on rusi Daytonski sporazum. On je nekoliko puta na Dayton napao, koje nema veze nisacim. Paddy Ashdown, najbolji je bio visoki predstavnik, i radio je. Tad je bila politika iskrenija i bolja prema Bosni. On je smanjivao, mogu reci par stvari. Vojska, on je nametnuo. Oni su htjeli pare, i on je to sve napravio da funkcionise. Htjelo se Srpske tablice, a on uvede neutralne, da neznas odakle je ko. I sve perfektno. Ali te njegove, Dodikove, lazi, to covjek nemoze suvariti.*

39:50 *Ti nesmatras da Britanija bih mogla imati druge namjere?*

39:54 *Ne.*

Presenting Dodik's statement about the trial against Karadzic and the neglection of jailing Bosniak generals

40:10 *Stalno se vracamo na isto, hoce da izjednači. Nasi generali, koji nisu nikad imali genocidnu namjeru, ako je neki pojedinac ubio. Nasera Orica koji je dokazano u sudu i u Hagu i u Sarajevu i opet oslobeden. Sta imas dalje o njemu pricati. Samo hoce da izjednaci, da su svi isti i da su svi jednako krivi. E nemoze. Ma nema pojma o istini*

40:45 *I nesmatras da bi trebao neki Bosnjacki komandant ili general odgovarati za nesto sto se desilo..*

40:51 *Pa odgovaraju. A nemozes odogovarati u Hagu kad su neki oslobođeni, neki.. Jedan je general osuđen na 2 godine, zato sto nije sprecio neke zlocine. A i nemogu odgovorati u Hagu kad Haga vise nema, Hag je ukinut. Sad ima neko drugo. Sad ide na nivou drzava da sudi. Srbija, Hrvatska, Bosna i Hercegovina. Nasa politika nije bila da ikoga unistavamo. Bilo je zlocina, sto su pojedinci ucinili, oteli se kontrole i eto.*

Presenting Dodik's statement about both sides having crossed the rules of war

42:28 *Hag ne sudi ljudima za male zlocine, nitiobicnim vojnicima. Mozda poneki kao Drazan Ardemovic, sto je sam priznao da je ubio 100 muslimana. On je bio njihov svjedok pa je dobio 5-6 godina, ali Hag sudi samo velikim ribama koje su krive, za koje imaju dokaze i optuznice. Suditi ce drzava ako bude trebalo, ali mnogi su vec osudeni. I to je dakle laz. Hrvati su osudeni, a on samo govori za Srbe, sto su osudeni.*

Presenting Dodik's statement about what should be written about Srebrenica in books in Srpska

43:12 *Opet laze. Nisu Srbi bili genocidni, nego ta politika koju su vodili za vrijeme rata. Oni odgovorni ljudi, nije citav narod. Mi nikad negovorimo o citavome narodu. Bilo je i Srba koji su bili u Bosanskoj vojsci. Vecina njih su bili cestiti, al njihova politika Srpska i Srbijanska je opet problem. I ucit ce se, jer u modernoj historiji Sarajevo je grad koji je najvise bio po opsadi. To je dokazano. Zna svak ko je to radio.*

Final questions regarding Dodik

44:18 Sta sad mislis o Dodiku?

44:20 *Sve gori i gori. Sve sam znao isto, svu jednu izjavu. Nista bolji nego sto jebio na pocetku intervjua.*

44:36 I to isto mislis o njegovoj politici prema Srebrenici?

44:40 *Isto sve.*

44:41 Kakav ti je sad cjeloukupni utisak o Srpskoj i Srbijanskoj politici o Srebrenici?

44:45 *Srbijanska politika trenutno zadnji 2 godinu dana ima napredak, ali vidjet cemo koliko je iskrena. Ono sto prica Vucic 90 % se slazem, mozda ima neki stvarcica sa kojim se neslazem. Samo treba to pokazati na djelu. Pokazuje sa jednim djelom.*

Closure

45:20 Moze li se sta ucinit da se promjeni situacija u vezi Srebrenice?

45:25 *Moze, treba se uvesti zakon, kao svugdje u svijetu, da ko negira genocid i ko govori protiv sudski predsuda, najviseg suda u svijetu, treba da bude kaznjen, ako ne zatvorom, onda se treba skinuti sa funkcije. To je jedini nacin.*

45:49 Kakvu buducnost vidiš o odnosima između Bosanaca i Srba u vezi Srebrenice?

45:58 *Medu narodu je to dosta dobro. Rade zajedno, druze se, ali Dodikova politika prije svega sve zakomplikuje. Ja ocekujem dobru buducnost, ako bude jos naroda sljedeci 10-20 godina, jer svi odlaze iz Bosne.*