

2011

Franjo Tudjman's and Slobodan Milosevic's Operational Code and Leadership Trait Analysis

Arian Spahiu
West Virginia University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Spahiu, Arian, "Franjo Tudjman's and Slobodan Milosevic's Operational Code and Leadership Trait Analysis" (2011). *Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Problem Reports*. 4794.
<https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/etd/4794>

This Dissertation is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been brought to you by the The Research Repository @ WVU with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this Dissertation in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you must obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/ or on the work itself. This Dissertation has been accepted for inclusion in WVU Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Problem Reports collection by an authorized administrator of The Research Repository @ WVU. For more information, please contact researchrepository@mail.wvu.edu.

Franjo Tudjman's and Slobodan Milosevic's Operational Code and
Leadership Trait Analysis

Arian Spahiu

Dissertation Submitted to the
Eberly College of Arts and Sciences
at West Virginia University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy in
Political Science

R. Scott Crichlow, Ph.D, Chair
Robert Blobaum, Ph.D
Robert DiClerico, Ph.D
Robert D. Duval, Ph.D
Joe D. Hagan, Ph.D,

Department of Political Science

Morgantown, West Virginia
2011

Keywords: Operational Code Analysis, Leadership Trait Analysis, Political Psychology,
Yugoslavia, Franjo Tudjman, Slobodan Milosevic
Copyright 2011, Arian Spahiu

ABSTRACT

Franjo Tudjman's and Slobodan Milosevic's Operational Code and Leadership Trait Analysis

Arian Spahiu

Franjo Tudjman of Croatia and Slobodan Milosevic of Serbia played a prominent role in the Yugoslav politics and European politics during the 1990s, but the literature on them has advanced confusing interpretations of the two leaders whose political actions affected international politics. This dissertation is the first attempt at developing replicable measures of their psychological characteristics to inform our understanding of the role these two leaders played in Yugoslav and European politics. This dissertation examines the role of Tudjman's and Milosevic's psychological characteristics through at-a-distance analysis of their speeches, for Tudjman to the Croatian Parliament in the 1990s, and for Milosevic to different audiences. Specifically, this dissertation measures Tudjman's and Milosevic's operational code and five leadership traits associated with their operational code: conceptual complexity, distrust, need for power, belief in one's ability to control events, and in-group bias. Through this analysis this dissertation clarifies the controversies in the descriptive histories written on Tudjman and Milosevic, and advance a more precise understanding of their approach to politics and foreign policy.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I want to thank my mentor and friend, Eugene R. Kole, OFM, Conv., D. Min., for his patience and guidance during the time I spent attending graduate school. This dissertation would have not been possible without his unconditional love and support. I want to also thank the members of my dissertation committee for their guidance, advice, and help in completing this research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1: Introduction	1
The Aim of the Dissertation.....	4
Dissertation Plan	10
Chapter 2: Yugoslavia: a Literature Review of Different Perspectives of its Collapse ...	12
Different Approaches to Studying the Disintegration of Yugoslavia.....	21
The Realist Perspective (International Politics).....	22
Economic Perspective	25
Institutional Perspective.....	28
The Leadership Perspective	33
View From the Inside (Domestic Politics Argument)	40
Summary of Chapter	43
Chapter 3: Franjo Tudjman and Slobodan Milosevic in the Context of Yugoslavia	48
Franjo Tudjman.....	49
Slobodan Milosevic	56
Summary of Chapter	64
Chapter 4: Theory and Methods	65
Operational Code Analysis	69
Leadership Trait Analysis.....	70
Data	72
Chapter 5: An in Depth Analysis of Franjo Tudjman’s Operational Code and Leadership Trait Analysis	73
Who Was Franjo Tudjman?	76
Nationalism	78
Leadership Style.....	80
Attitudes Regarding Conflict and Cooperation.....	82
Tudjman and Milosevic	86
Operational Code Analysis	88
Hypotheses	92
Results of Operational Code Analysis	93
Leadership Trait Analysis.....	95
Conceptual Complexity	95
Results of Leadership Trait Analysis	97
Distrust.....	98
In group Bias.....	100
Summary of Chapter	102
Chapter 6: An in Depth Analysis of Slobodan Milosevic’s Operational Code and Leadership Trait Analysis	105
Who was Slobodan Milosevic?.....	109

World View.....	113
Attitudes Regarding Conflict and Cooperation.....	117
Nationalism.....	118
Leadership Style.....	120
Operational Code Analysis	124
Hypotheses.....	126
Results of Operational Code Analysis	127
Leadership Trait Analysis	131
Results of Leadership Trait Analysis	133
Conceptual Complexity	133
Distrust and in-group Bias	134
Belief in one’s Ability to Control Events and Need for Power	136
Summary of Chapter	137
Chapter 7: General Conclusions.....	140
Bibliography	143
Appendix: Systematic Procedures for Scoring Operational Code Indices	155

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Franjo Tudjman's Operational Code Indices	93
Table 2	Basic Operational Codes of Other Leaders	94
Table 3	Franjo Tudjman's Leadership Trait Measures	97
Table 4	Slobodan Milosevic's Operational Code Indices	127
Table 5	Slobodan Milosevic's Leadership Trait Measures	133

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

The idea that psychological characteristics of leaders affect foreign policy behavior has attracted considerable attention in international relations. A leader's view of the world, and his/her decision-making style, take on particular significance in the literature of foreign policy analysis (Hermann 2002; Malici and Malici 2005; Robison 2006; Stevenson 2006; Schafer and Walker 2006; Walker and Schafer 2000). The argument is that political beliefs and personality traits of leaders act as mechanisms in determining a leader's view of the world, his/her place in it, and his/her approach to political goals. In order to study a leader's view of the world and his or her personal characteristics, researchers have developed sophisticated at-a-distance content analysis techniques of political statements. Two of the most widely used techniques are Operational Code analysis and Leadership Trait Analysis. Operational code analysis was first introduced by Nathan Leites (1951) in the study of the bargaining behavior of the Soviets after the end of the World War II. The operational code concept has been refined over the years. It is measured through a sophisticated automated technique called, Verb in Context System (VICS). VICS is used to generate numerical data on political beliefs through the analysis of the content of political statements. Similarly, Leadership Trait Analysis is another at-a-distant content analysis technique which has its own coding schemes which help create numerical data on leadership traits.

Research has shown that personal characteristics of leaders affect their governments' foreign policy behavior (Holsti 1970; McLellan 1971; Johnson 1977; Walker 1977, 1984; Winter et al 1991; Walker, Schafer and Young 1998, 1999; Crichlow

1998, 2006; Schafer and Crichlow 2000; Walker and Schafer 2000; Hermann 2002; Malici and Malici 2005; Robison 2006; Stevenson 2006; Schafer and Walker 2006). The personal characteristics of leaders inter-relate to form a leader's orientation toward the world. The leader's orientation toward the world, then, affects his/her foreign policy behavior. Operational code analysis is a useful tool in measuring a leader's core foreign policy beliefs. It includes matters such as: What is the essential nature of political life? What are the prospects of realizing one's core values? Does one have the power to shape the world around them? Is policy most effectively pursued through cooperation or conflict? Such beliefs touch on one's basic understanding of the political world, and how one wishes to interact with it, and are likely to shape the actions a leader pursues in the international arena.

In this dissertation I aim to expand this systematic literature by measuring the foreign policy orientations of the key figures in the former Yugoslavia. Toward this end, I measure operational code and the leadership traits of the Croat president, Franjo Tudjman, and the Serb (and Yugoslav) president, Slobodan Milosevic. Specifically, the dissertation examines the impact of key facets of their operational code and five additional personal characteristics: conceptual complexity, distrust, in-group bias, need for power, and the belief in one's ability to control events. To achieve these aims, this dissertation utilizes the computerized content analysis systems VICS and Leadership Trait Analysis (LTA). By studying the personal foreign policy orientations of these two leaders we will gain a more precise understanding of their proclivity for particular foreign policy behaviors, and how their leadership style stemmed from their own personal characteristics.

Expanding this individual-level foreign policy analysis literature to these two leaders is important because scholars who have studied former Yugoslavia have, explicitly and implicitly, highlighted the prominent role of these two men in the politics of the former Yugoslavia during most of the 1990s (see Owen 1995; Silber and Little 1996; Holbrooke 1998; Kearns 1998; Zimmerman 1999; Ramet 2005; Judah 2009). The existing literature has discussed the impact of these two leaders' personalities in the former Yugoslavia's dissolution (see Gagnon Jr 2009; Glenny 1996; Holbrooke 1998; Jovic 2009; Judah 2009; Ramet 2005; Zimmerman 1994). However, these studies have been largely qualitative in nature. To date no systematic study has tried to quantitatively measure if the reigning perceptions of these two leaders' foreign policy preferences and their leadership traits, such as ingrained nationalism or need for power, are indeed accurate. The lack of quantitative research on the two leaders has diminished our ability to fully understand these two leaders' and their sometimes contradictory political behavior. Clarifying their political behavior, especially as it relates to their foreign policy behavior will give us new insights into the political profiles of these two leaders, which in turn may help us shed new light into the literature of the former Yugoslavia.

This dissertation does not advocate that a systematic study of all of the personalities involved in the politics of the former Yugoslavia during the 1990s is the best approach to the study of the former Yugoslavia; it posits that by studying the psychological (cognitive structure and personality traits) characteristics of Tadjman and Milosevic, we will learn more about these two leaders' propensities toward foreign policy behaviors and their perceptions about their place in the world. It may also become

evident if their personal orientations have influenced their approach to political action, and hence their state's policies.

The Aim of the Dissertation

This dissertation builds upon the previous studies and argues that a systematic quantitative study of Slobodan Milosevic's and Franjo Tudjman's psychological characteristics as they pertain to their foreign policy behavior should give us more insight into the political profile of these leaders and how they may have influenced the former Yugoslav politics. This dissertation focuses on the individual political belief sets that appear to shape one's behavior in international relations. Specifically, this dissertation studies Franjo Tudjman's and Slobodan Milosevic's perceptions of the world, their approach to political goals, and their view of others in the international system. The literature on Tudjman's view of the world, notably his view of the political environment, and his personality traits is contradictory (see Sadkovich 2005). With respect to his view of the world, some have criticized him (see Rados 2005) for being too cooperative and others have noted his conflictual nature (see Hudelist 2004). Similarly, some have written about Tudjman's pragmatic approach to political goals (see Rados (2005), and others (see Banac 1993) have emphasized his intolerance to dissent and his lack of preparedness to deal with crisis. To date, a systematic quantitative study of these assertions remains to be studied. This dissertation attempts to ameliorate this gap in the literature through a systematic quantitative study of Tudjman's operational code indices and leadership traits.

I seek to do the same with regard to Slobodan Milosevic. In addition to studying his perceptions of the world, his approach to goals, and his view of others, this

dissertation tries to bridge gaps in the literature on him as well. Specifically, there are debates in the existing literature about his political aspirations, his nationalism, and his motivation for power. Many scholars (see Judah 2009) have written about Milosevic's need for power as his main motivation in achieving his political goals. Similarly, scholars have also noted the role of nationalism in his political behavior. This dissertation systematically measures Milosevic's need for power and nationalism and tries to ascertain the extent these personality traits affected his political behavior. Besides the two aforementioned personality traits, this dissertation measures additional traits that are believed to correlate with these leaders' political behavior in order to get a more complete understanding of their leadership style. This dissertation hopes to shed some new light into the political behavior of these two leaders through a systematic quantitative study.

The literature on the role of cognitions in foreign policy behavior was introduced by Nathan Leites in 1951. Leites' framework was subsequently refined over the years by different scholars (see Holsti 1970; McLellan 1971; Johnson 1977; Walker 1977, 1984; Winter et al 1991; Walker, Schafer and Young 1998, 1999; Crichlow 1998, 2006; Schafer and Crichlow 2000; Walker and Schafer 2000; Hermann 2002; Malici and Malici 2005; Robison 2006; Stevenson 2006; Schafer and Walker 2006). Nathan Leites' (1951) framework, specifically its portion on the character (operational code) of the Soviet Politburo, was expanded by Alexander George (1969) and Ole Hoslti (1970).

In his analysis, Alexander George (1969, 196) reinterprets "various components of the so-called code and [restructures] it into a more tightly knit set of beliefs about fundamental issues and questions associated with the classical problem of political

action.” Bearing in mind the cognitive limitations to rational decision-making, George (1969) approaches the study of belief systems strictly from the cognitive perspective, and establishes the casual connection between a leader’s philosophical beliefs and political action. Similarly, Ole Holsti’s (1970) analysis helped revive the interest in studying the role of leadership characteristics in the foreign policy behavior of leaders (see Walker 1990). Throughout the years since Leites’ (1951) groundbreaking study, the research on operational code analysis was further refined. An automated content analysis technique called the Verb in Context System, developed by Walker, Schafer and Young (1998), and the statistical software *Profiler Plus*, developed by Social Science Automation Inc., has made the coding of large texts more accessible, in addition to eliminating problems with validity that’s present in the manual coding of texts.

In addition to studying the belief structure, by studying the personality traits of leaders we get a better understanding how leaders may select, interpret, and utilize information in foreign policy decision-making. In her study of the role of personality traits in foreign policy decision-making, Hermann (1980a, 1980b, 1984a, 1987b, 1988, 1993, 2002) identified 7 leadership traits which can help determine a leader’s leadership style in foreign policy decision-making. The seven traits are: 1) the belief in one’s ability to control events, 2) the need for power and influence, 3) conceptual complexity (ability to differentiate things and people in one’s environment, o structural vs. superficial differentiation), 4) self-confidence, 5) the tendency to focus on problem solving vs. maintenance of the group, 6) distrust 7) and in-Group bias (see Hermann 2002). The examination of these seven traits provide the researcher with valuable information on

they way political leaders respond to constraints in their environment, process information, and about the motive behind their actions (see Hermann 2002).

For example a leader's scores on conceptual complexity and self-confidence tells us about the leader's level of abstraction -- how they integrate different sources of information before making a decision and how open they are to those different sources of information (Driver 1977; Hermann 1984a; Snyder 1987; Tetlock 1991; Suedfeld 1992). Empirical evidence shows that political leaders differ in their ability to differentiate contextual information based on their conceptual complexity trait. For example, research has shown that leaders who score higher in conceptual complexity, relative to their self-confidence score, are generally more pragmatic and responsive to other members of the group and other ideas as well as other sources of information. These leaders are more sensitive to situational cues and act based on what they sense is acceptable under current conditions (Hermann 2002). Hermann argues that these types of leaders are more likely to organize collegial decision- making structures.

It is also important to note that this dissertation does not try to establish a casual link between these leaders' psychological characteristics and foreign policy events in the former Yugoslavia. This dissertation instead constructs precise measurements of these leaders' political belief structure (operational code analysis) and their decision-making style (leadership trait analysis) in order to systematically determine their basic approach to foreign policy decision-making. This is in itself a valuable topic of study as the literature on these leaders, while noting their importance as individual political actors, is in parts opaque, and at times contradictory. For example with regard to the literature on the two leaders, Franjo Tudjman and Slobodan Milosevic, the current work (see Butkovic

and Grakalic 1991; Baric 2002; Bekavac 2002; Hudelist 2004; Holbrooke 1998; Rados, 2005) has advanced competing interpretations about their political profile. With respect to Franjo Tudjman, the literature is divided between those who think that he played a supporting role in the former Yugoslavia's disintegration (see Sadkovich 2006), and those who think that his political beliefs, his view of the world and personality traits, especially nationalism, played a direct role in the events leading to former Yugoslavia's collapse. To date the literature on Franjo Tudjman remains contradictory, especially as it relates to his approach to political goals, his leadership style, and his view of the world. The domestic literature on the Croat leader comes from historical and journalistic sources, and this literature, although rich in information, is sometimes considered to be biased (Sadkovich 2006). As Sadkovich (2006) notes, most of the literature from the Croatian sources may reflect the biases of the authors', most of whom were at some point associated with Tudjman in some capacity. Similarly, the literature from Yugoslav sources during early 1990s is considered to reflect the media propaganda of the war (see Sadkovich 2006).

As noted earlier, the personal characteristics I am examining have been found to relate to foreign policy behavior. By studying the personality traits of political leaders one can make assumptions about their political behavior in international politics. The literature on Leadership Trait Analysis (LTA) has shown that leaders with different personality traits interpret the world differently, and therefore, act differently in different environments (Sudfeld and Tetlock 1977; Hermann 1980, 2002, 2003, Dille and Young, 2000, Preston 2001, Thies 2004, 2009). For example, leaders who are goal driven tend to interpret the political environment more based on their belief set, attitudes, and motives,

rather than from other external influences (Hermann et. al. 2001). Similarly, leaders who are high in need for power, low in conceptual complexity, distrustful of others, and nationalistic, tend to be more aggressive in their foreign policy behavior (Hermann 1980). These leaders have difficulty changing their preferences as new information comes in. Research suggests that differences in these personality traits impact foreign policy decisions (Driver 1977; Hermann 1980; Hermann and Hermann, 1989; Stewart, Hermann and Hermann 1989; Winter et al. 1991).

The personality traits should give us more insight into Tadjman's and Milosevic's motives, decision style, leadership style and their view of the world. The personality traits are selected on the basis of the biographical data. For example, the research on Franjo Tadjman is vast on the role of Franjo Tadjman's nationalism and distrust of others in his political behavior (Owen 1995, Silber and Little 1996, Holbrooke 1998, Kearns 1998, Zimmerman 1999, Ramet 2005). By studying his in-Group bias trait in relation to his distrust of others trait, we will get a better understanding of whether or not Franjo Tadjman's nationalism played a considerable role in his political decisions and his leadership style. Additionally, by measuring Franjo Tadjman's conceptual complexity, we will get a better understanding on Franjo Tadjman's openness to other sources of information and whether or not his score on conceptual complexity may have mitigated his nationalism trait. This is particularly important since he is considered to have suppressed dissent (Banac 1992)¹.

This dissertation measures Franjo Tadjman's and Slobodan Milosevic's operational code and leadership traits by analyzing their prepared speeches (to the

¹ For more information on the discussion of Franjo Tadjman's personality traits as it relates to his foreign policy behavior please refer to chapter 5.

Croatian parliament for Franjo Tudjman) and spontaneous remarks (for Slobodan Milosevic)². Once their belief sets are measured, it will then explain how they may have affected their foreign policy behavior. Furthermore, this dissertation will investigate whether changes occur in their belief set and personality set overtime. I argue that the understanding of Yugoslavia's collapse, and especially the wars that followed, would be incomplete without taking into account the two main personalities involved in its dissolution -- Franjo Tudjman of Croatia and Slobodan Milosevic of Serbia. The understanding of the role of these leaders' personal characteristics specifically as it pertains to the unfolding of the crisis is crucial in understanding why they acted they way they did during the crisis³.

Dissertation Plan

The organization of the dissertation is as follows. It opens with a review of the literature on the former Yugoslavia. This portion (Chapter 2) of the dissertation discusses the role of different factors -- international, economic, institutional, leadership, and domestic politics -- in Yugoslavia's disintegration as explained by authors who have studied the topic. It notes that there is something of a whole in this literature relating to the personal effects of Tudjman and Milosevic given their frequently noted outsized role in the politics of the era. The third chapter of the dissertation reviews the broad literature on Tudjman and Milosevic, it discusses how they rose to power and cemented their rule, but also what we do not know about them, and competing interpretations of their political

² In order to ameliorate the problem of the lack of speeches by Slobodan Milosevic, and because of their typically short length which limited their usefulness as a data source, I used Slobodan Milosevic's radio and tv interviews from the period of 1991-1999. The purpose is to add more years in the analysis to Slobodan Milosevic's study. While the literature on this is not definitive, studies have shown that there is very little difference between spontaneous and prepared remarks (Renshon 2008).

³ For more discussion on the hypotheses please refer to pages 99 and 133 respectively.

orientations. Chapter 4 lays out the theory, the key concepts of the research methodology and the scientific method. Chapters 5 and 6 are a study of these two leaders' beliefs and personality traits as they relate to their view of the world and leadership style during the events of 1991-1995, and beyond. Through quantitative analyses (based upon at-a-distance coding of the psychological traits of Tudjman and Milosevic) I chart how their personal characteristics and decision-making style were key to their effectiveness as political leaders, and how their cognitions played an important role in the development of the Yugoslav wars of the 1990s.

CHAPTER TWO

Yugoslavia: A Literature Review of Different Perspectives of its Collapse

The recent wars in the former Yugoslavia have often invoked the belief that the region never changes. The fact that WWI started in Sarajevo was tied symbolically to the wars of 1991-1995 (see Ramet 2002), and as Kaplan (1994) argues, very few analysts foresaw Yugoslavia's violent break-up. Similarly, Christopher Cviic, too, (1995, 823) argues that the "political earthquake which shook Yugoslavia in 1991...should have come as such a surprise even to informed international opinions." Cviic (1995) contends that Yugoslavia's slow demise was not decoded due to the nature of questions we asked. To Christopher Cviic (1995) the failure of scholars to predict the former Yugoslavia's dissolution represents a failure of social sciences in general.

The United States and European observers had for years wondered about the prospects of Yugoslavia's survival after Tito's death. Considering the changes that were sweeping the world and particularly Eastern Europe in the late 1980s, the disintegration should not have been entirely unexpected. Indeed, the Central Intelligence Agency's Report on Yugoslavia in early 1990 predicted that Yugoslavia would fall apart within 18 months because of ethnic tensions and because of irreconcilable differences between the republics, especially between the two northern republics of Slovenia and Croatia and Serbia (Cviic 1995).

Some domestic observers predicted the former Yugoslavia's collapse, but they were few in between. One of those observers who predicted the country's collapse was Milovan Djilas. Djilas' prophetic statements are illustrated in Robert Kaplan's book, *Balkan Ghosts*. Kaplan echoed Milovan Djilas' (a former Yugoslav functionary who

later became a dissident) prophetic statements in 1981 that Yugoslavia will disintegrate through war (Kaplan 2005, 74-76). Kaplan writes that according to Djilas, the Yugoslav system “was built only for Tito to manage. Now that Tito is gone and our economic situation becomes critical, there will be a natural tendency for greater centralization.....but this centralization will not succeed because of...bureaucratic nationalism built on economic self-interest” (Kaplan 1994, 76). Dragovic –Soso (2004, 179) notes, “the Slovenes feared that any departure from the ‘confederal’ structure would reduce them to a minority in the federal unit and lead to their constantly being outvoted in federal institutions.” The Serbian position differed markedly from the Slovene position. The Serbs did not envision themselves outside the federal structure which is why they began calling for the re-centralization of the country, which according to them, was abandoned in the 1974 constitution. That is why the Serb intelligentsia tried to re-conceptualize a ‘third’ Yugoslavia by rejecting the communist, workers self-management ideology in its entirety, and by proposing a new, federal Yugoslavia with a more centralized system (Dragovic-Soso 2004). According to Dragovic-Soso, the dissolution of Yugoslavia did not appear to be imminent to the Serb intelligentsia, as was evident in the political platform issued by them in 1988 called the ‘Contribution to the Public Debate on the Constitution of 1988.’ According to Christopher Cviic (1995) the attempt of the Serbs to roll-back the federation to pre-1974 era (back to the 1941 era), upset the Croats and the Slovenes.

One recent perspective argues that Yugoslavia’s disintegration was a logical consequence of political decisions taken by the Yugoslav elite (Jovic 2009). Jovic (2009, 15) argues that the Yugoslav elite, particularly Josip Broz Tito’s ideological vanguard,

Edvard Kardelj, based their decisions largely on the “withering away” ideology. This ideology contributed to the weakness of the federal system which caused Yugoslavia to collapse in 1991 (Jovic 2009). It would be unfair to presume that the communist leaders deliberately destroyed Yugoslavia. Instead, Jovic (2009) argues that it was their political actions during most the 1960s and 1970s that weakened its federal structure. To this extent, Jovic (2009) contends that Yugoslavia was destroyed from within and not from the outside.

Dejan Jovic (2009, 13) considers the role of ideology to be key in Yugoslavia’s demise, that is, “the complex system of beliefs and ideas that influenced the Yugoslav political elite so much.” To Jovic (2009) the role of ideology in Yugoslavia’s collapse has been overlooked. Ironically, the Yugoslav political elite built Yugoslavia under the impression that its communist ideology was a better interpretation of Marxism compared to that of the Soviet Union. This different form of socialism contributed to the weakening of the institutions and the legal system, which in turn reduced the central government’s authority to govern (Doder 1977). The concept of workers self-management developed by Edvard Kardelj in 1974 was essentially an anti-statist concept. Because socialism was promoted as the only source of identity among the Yugoslavs, and as socialism began to disintegrate in the late 1980s, so did Yugoslavia. The state began to slowly ‘wither away’ because it could not protect its citizens anymore. The weakening of the central authority created a political space which the leaders of Croatia and Serbia later effectively manipulated for selfish political reasons (Jovic 2009, 13-15).

Even according Nenad Popovic (1968), a former Yugoslav functionary, the old communist elite -- Tito and his closest collaborators – used anything at their disposal to

consolidate control of the country, even is it meant using disruption and illegal pressure. According to Popovic (1968) the creation of this new, privileged class ran contrary to the true tenets of communism. In fact, Popovic (1968) argues that the Yugoslav version of communism was almost a carbon copy of Stalinism. And, just like in the Soviet Union, this new version of communism led by Tito, created a new class of rulers, who in their bid to consolidate their power, created a system which became inherently biased toward the society which it claimed it represented. Yugoslavia's version of communism became a vehicle of power for the "new class" of rulers. Popovic (1968) argues that those who established Yugoslavia in the name of equality achieved the power status which created inequality.

The contradictory sources have advanced different interpretations of the role of these two leaders' role in the former Yugoslavia's collapse, with Slobodan Milosevic attracting most of the attention. The literature on the two leaders' is closely linked with the collapse of the former Yugoslavia. Much of this literature has used different theories to explain the former Yugoslavia's dissolution, with the leadership approach attracting less attention. For example, in his study of the causes of Yugoslavia's collapse, V.P Gagnon Jr., (2010) posits that Yugoslavia's collapse was a result of three interrelated processes: 1) forces towards reform of the Yugoslav state, 2) the conflict over the future of the SKJ (The Communist Party of Yugoslavia), and 3) the shifting of meanings of ethnic and non-ethnic labels which defined political action in terms of these differences. According to V.P Gagnon Jr. (2010) Yugoslavia did not collapse naturally; it was strategically destroyed by the political elite with different interests in mind. The conservative elements pursued the policy that included the exacerbation of grievances

between different ethnic groups. Conservatives pursued a strategy of political violence in order to demobilize the forces of reform in the country.

V.P Gagnon Jr., argues that in order to get a more complete understanding of the role of the elite in Yugoslavia's demise one needs to take into an account the "intra-elite process" and how they affected the violent destruction of the country (Gagnon Jr., 2010, 25). The inefficiency of Yugoslavia's existing political and economic system prompted the ruling Communist Party of Yugoslavia to consider enacting reforms. The reformist called for the loosening of the communist party's power in economic matters. Furthermore, the reformist disagreed about the best way to reform the country. Some advocated for the reduction of the federal power and others for the reduction of the power of state republics as the best way of reforming the system (Gagnon Jr., 2010, 25-27).

The conservatives were the members of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia whose power was directly threatened by these reforms. They favored a strong central power and for the party's central role in the formulation and implementation of economic and political policies. The elites' power was determined by their position vis-à-vis the proposed changes in the state and party power. The greatest supporters of the reformists were the urban, educated middle class (Gagnon Jr., 2010). According to Gagnon Jr., (2010), the reformists managed to gain significant influence by late 1960s. By the beginning of the 1970s, the conservative movement, headed by the secret police in the party structures, managed to convince Tito that too much freedom during the 1960s created feelings of nationalism in Yugoslavia and threatened the policy of *unity and brotherhood*. The liberal movement was the strongest in Croatia but by 1972, it was subdued by Tito. However, in his attempts to strike a balance between republics, notably

between Serbia and Croatia, Tito's decision to quell the spring uprising in Croatia, was soon accompanied with the enactment of the 1974 federal constitution, which further decentralized the system. During the 1980s, the reformists were most vocal in Serbia but by 1989, the conservative movement, headed by Slobodan Milosevic, established its control over the system firmly (Gagnon Jr., 2010, 29-30).

To Gagnon Jr., (2010), the year 1989 marked the culmination of the reformist struggle but also of the beginning of the resurgent conservative movement headed by Slobodan Milosevic in Serbia and Franjo Tudjman in Croatia. Slobodan Milosevic's attempts to destabilize the liberal movements in Slovenia and Croatia proved unsuccessful. However, he was successful in destabilizing Montenegro, Kosovo, Vojvodina and Bosnia and Herzegovina. By 1990, the decentralization of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia (SKJ) was complete. Slobodan Milosevic formed a new political party; the SPS (The Socialist Political Party) with the help of Serbian supporters from Kosovo.

In a related study, Basta (2010) contends that most studies have focused narrowly at the role of the SKJ's (Communist Party of Yugoslavia) leadership in Yugoslavia's policy of ethnic relations to explain the process of decentralization in Yugoslavia. The author argues that this explanation ignores an important part of the puzzle -- the elite were more concerned with the increasing power of bureaucratic socialism, and not with reforms. An anti-statist doctrine was developed in response to this concern. A non-ethnic explanation is an important part of this analysis. The author posits that the federal changes, culminating with the 1974 constitution, were a natural extension of Yugoslav

anti-statist doctrine and not as a result of ethnocentric reasons, as other has argued (Basta, 2010, 93-95).

In contrast to Basta (2010), V.P Gagnon Jr. (2010) posits that the elite played the crucial role in creating a political space – vacuum -- that led to the adoption of the specific policies of ethnic mobilization in the individual republics, but mainly in Serbia and Croatia. This new political narrative of ethnic mobilization helped catapult a brand of new leaders into the Yugoslav political scene. According to this interpretation, the emergence of nationalist leaders in Croatia and Serbia was a natural occurrence. For example, Vladislavljjevic (1994) suggests that the rise of Slobodan Milosevic was an episode of normal party politics in a socialist state; that the outcome of the power struggle between Milosevic and Ivan Stambolic (his former mentor), was decided through the process of institutional politics. Milosevic managed to build enough political power, and he did that by using the already available institutional resources to challenge Stambolic's power successfully. This conflict was conducted according to normal party rules in a socialist state, and Milosevic won. According to the Vladislavljjevic, Slobodan Milosevic personal characteristics were appealing to the voters, but his rise to power was in part due to his skill as a politician (Vladislavljjevic, 1994).

Vladislavljjevic (1994) argues that party leadership in Serbia during much of the 1980s was experiencing a gradual change in leadership, with the younger generation slowly assuming posts that were previously occupied by the older, more conservative leaders of WWII. Ivan Stambolic and Slobodan Milosevic became the new faces of the communist party, and this new generation of leaders was more pragmatic in comparison to the older generation; they advocated gradual changes, with Slobodan Milosevic

arguing that the recentralization of the government's authority was the best way in dealing with every day problems, including those of nationalist sentiments in Kosovo, Slovenia, and Croatia. The Kosovo crisis of 1989 is a perfect example of how institutional politics (intra-party politics) played a crucial role in settling political disputes in a socialist state, and Milosevic was a master at winning political battles (Vladislavljjevic 1994, 190-195). The weakening of the central government could also be explained in terms of a conflict between different collections of interests. The decentralization of the federal system was a result of the reformists' success in winning crucial political battles (Basta, 2010, 96-99). In a series of constitutional amendments starting in 1967 and culminating with the 1974 constitution, the Yugoslav state was transformed.

To Dejan Jovic (2004), the end of the Cold War signaled a new beginning. This new beginning caused major institutional changes, notably in Eastern Europe, but it also affected the context in which the newly emerging states began developing separate identities. The interpretation of past historical narratives took on a different meaning. The collapse of the state in Yugoslavia (Jovic analyzes Albania, too) opened "space to new interpretations of history" (Jovic 2004, 101). The old political elite could not survive in the newly created narrative space. According to Jovic (2004) the post-communist transition in Yugoslavia altered the way ethnic groups interpreted their place in the new world, with nationalist narratives becoming the official ones. In a different study, Jovic (2009) delineates Yugoslavia's construction, and eventually its demise, as a direct result of the policies of the communist elite; the policies of the 'withering away' state.

To Flere (2003), a sociologist by training, much of the literature on Yugoslavia's dissolution from domestic scholars, reflects the bias of the individual authors. For example, Croatian academics (see Sadkovich 2006 and Tomac 1992) see the destruction of Yugoslavia as a result of Serbian aggression, whereas Serbian academics (see Vujacic 1996, 2004), emphasize the role of different historical narratives (and perceptions of state) between Croatia and Serbia as alternative explanations to the conflict. Flere (2003) argues that Yugoslavia served as a nation-building institution for the different nationalities. The author argues that a sociological approach of the structure of relations between ethnic groups and their interpretation of the history of ethnic relations as summarized in the scholarship of scholars of different nationalities may help us understand the role of sociological factors in Yugoslavia's destruction.

Some scholars have tried to explain the causes of Yugoslavia's collapse by placing it in the context of the forces of modernization. For example, to sociologist John Allcock (2000) contends that Yugoslavia's dissolution is best understood within the context of the forces of modernization and globalization that were sweeping Eastern Europe at the time. Allcock (2000) argues that the region of Balkans had embarked in the same socio-economic processes of modernization as the rest of the Europe. What makes Allcock's study unique is its socio-economic approach to the crisis. He argues that it was the socio-economic differences in Yugoslavia, which were inherited from the earlier stages of its historical evolution, which created the conditions for its collapse. According to Allcock (2000), Yugoslavia disintegrated because of these inherent structural differences between individual republics.

As mentioned earlier, few scholars predicted the former Yugoslavia's violent dissolution. Starting in 1980, the more affluent republics of Slovenia and Croatia began calling for more political and economic autonomy, if not outright independence from Yugoslavia, and Kosovo, the poorest region in Yugoslavia, sensing changes after Tito's death, started demanding full republic status within the federation (Jovic 2009). But much research, and this dissertation, argues that Yugoslavia did not collapse solely because of the changes that were sweeping Eastern Europe at the time. Other factors such as institutional, economic, international, domestic, as well as the role of different personalities in the region, contributed greatly to its demise.

Different Approaches to Studying the Disintegration of Yugoslavia

Yugoslavia collapsed as a result of different factors. The recent literature on Yugoslavia is organized around several perspectives. These perspectives are: 1) the international politics perspective; 2) the economic perspective; 3) the constitutional or institutional perspective; 4) domestic perspective, 5) and the leadership perspective. Many prominent analysts of the Yugoslav crisis organize their arguments around these five perspectives: the institutional, realist (international politics), economic, domestic politics, and leadership perspective. As a result, the causes and consequences of Yugoslav breakup, too, are organized around these four different arguments (Vujacic 2004, 168-180). The review of this literature should give one some background information about the former Yugoslavia and give evidence to the need to expand the literature with a systematic quantitative study of the psychological characteristics of Tudjman and Milosevic, which this dissertation intends to do.

The Realist Perspective (International Politics)

The realist argument derives from the international relations theory. Barry Posen (1993) was the first to use realism to explain Yugoslavia's violent destruction. According to Posen (1993) the weakening of the central authority during the late 1980s, created an environment of mistrust – a security dilemma – between ethnic groups in the region. The weakening of the central government's authority caused the different ethnic groups to refer to past historical experiences to try and understand each other's intentions. In the case of the former Yugoslavia, historical narratives between the three ethnic groups had not been peaceful (see Ramet 2005). According to Posen (1993) the resulting anarchy created the conditions for violence. Depending on the military capabilities of the emerging states (e.g Croatia, Slovenia, and Bosnia and Herzegovina) the response to the emerging conflict is either offensive or defensive in nature. Posen (1993) argues that when there is a history of mutual antagonism between the ethnic groups, the parties have reasons to fear each other's intentions. In the case of Serbia, the NDH Nazi government of Croatia in WWII served as a sufficient reason for Serbia not to trust Croatia. These images of past historical experiences became a sufficient reason for Serbia to wage an offensive war against Croatia (Posen 1993).

According to the international politics perspective Yugoslavia's disintegration was facilitated by the collapse of the bipolar system and the emergence of the new international order. Yugoslavia's strategic importance between East and West did not survive the collapse of the bipolar world (Jovic 2009). In essence, the international politics argument contends that both Yugoslavias' -- the 1918 Yugoslavia and the 1945 Yugoslavia -- were created as a result of the nature of the balance of power within the international order. When the bipolar world collapsed in 1989, Yugoslavia lost its

strategic position with the West and as a result it could not attract political and economic support the way it once did (Jovic 2009, 26-28). Drawing from what he refers to as “Yugoslav domestic debates” Jovic (2009, 26-27), cites the words of former general of the Yugoslav National Army (JNA), Veljko Kadijevic, who exclaimed that the collapse of the socialist system left Yugoslavia susceptible to outside influence from the West, which helped increase the nationalist tendencies of Slovenia and Croatia to separate from Yugoslavia.

According to Kadijevic, the new world order was the ultimate danger for Yugoslavia’s independence and survival (Jovic 2009). Similarly, Susan Woodward (1995) posits that Yugoslavia did not collapse as a result of ethnic hatred or because of the death of Tito: Yugoslavia disintegrated as a result of the diminishing geo-strategic importance, which caused internal turmoil within the federation itself. Christopher Cviic (1995) argues that, although there are many reasons why Yugoslavia disintegrated, the most plausible explanation could be that bigger nations (the U.S) and its main protector, the JNA, came to reject it, at least in the current (pre1990) form. Additionally, the glue that kept Yugoslavia together, Tito, died in 1980, and soon after that, Yugoslavia’s economic and financial woes led to its disintegration.

Eskridge-Kosmach (2009) explains the important geo-strategic importance that Yugoslavia occupied in the United States foreign policy doctrine during most of the 1960s and 1970s. The United States of America understood Yugoslavia’s importance in their efforts to weaken the Soviet Union’s Eastern European block and used Yugoslavia toward this end. As a result, Yugoslavia enjoyed great U.S economic support from the

U.S, which in turn helped westernize the country and the development of the positive attitude of the Yugoslav population toward the U.S.

Veljko Vujacic (2004) considers the realist argument to be empirically under developed in its assumptions. For example, according to Vujacic, Posen fails to take into account the context of ethnic relations, specifically of the relations between Croats and Serbs and Serbs and Moslems in the former Yugoslavia. Additionally, the realist approach does not factor in the interpretation of those ethnic relations by the intellectual and political elites at critical junctures in history (Vujacic 2004, 170-171). According to Vujacic (2004), the realist argument does not take into account the role of institutional factors (institutional conflict) in the disintegration of the former Yugoslavia. Nor does it explain why many Serbs made the ideological shift from Marxism to ardent nationalism (Vujacic 2004). Similarly, the realist argument ignores the role of history, economics, and leadership in the region.

What makes the realist approach important in the analysis of Yugoslavia's causes of collapse is that it presents the purest form of explanation. It prioritizes the state's national security over other factors such as ideology, history, institutions, or economic interdependence. The realist school of thought places its importance in explaining the relations of state in the anarchic world, and toward this end, it has contributed significantly in the understanding of conflict and its causes (Mearsheimer, 2001; Morgenthau 1948; Waltz 1979). However, this dissertation notes that the realist perspective, or the international relations perspective about Yugoslavia's collapse is only one of the disciplines that has attempted to explain Yugoslavia's dissolution. The next session will deal with the Economic perspective.

Economic Perspective

The economic perspective emphasizes the role of economic forces in the former Yugoslavia's collapse. John Lampe's (1995) study of Yugoslavia's economic history is perhaps the best example of how economic factors played a role in Yugoslavia's dissolution. To Lampe (1995, 315) causes of Yugoslavia's demise can be traced by looking at its economic policies of 1965-1988 which, according to the author, caused the decline of the social sector and an increase of foreign debt from 4 billion dollars in 1972 to 20 billion dollars in 1982. The decline in the social sector was accompanied with an increase in the cost of living which by late 1970s caused an increase in retail prices which brought down production and consumption in the former Yugoslavia. John Lampe argues that the successors to Tito failed to restructure the economy and meet international obligations in repaying the loans. The increase in economic woes and a lack of strong leadership prepared the ground for the emergence of nationalist leaders in the republics of Croatia and Serbia. The league of communist of Yugoslavia (LCY), too, started feeling the strain of the socio-economic crisis by mid 1980. LCY's legitimacy began to decline with surveys indicating that 30 percent of LCY's members rating it as poor. JNA's manpower and budgetary allocation had fallen by one third by mid 1980s due to the budgetary cuts in order to face the growing economic debt (Lampe 1995, 315-339).

Susan Woodward's 1995 study is another example of the economic perspective. Woodward argues that Yugoslavia's disintegration is best understood in the context of global economy. Woodward's book, *Balkan Tragedy*, suggests that changes in the international system, specifically the economic recession of the 1970s, became a major problem for the Yugoslavs that led to heavy borrowing. By using unemployment as a

measure to explain the effects of economic factors in the former Yugoslavia's disintegration, she argues that the decline in the standard of living drove the country to war. According to Woodward (1995, 48) Yugoslavia's response to the crisis was ineffective because the federal authorities made minor adjustments, mainly by "shifting investment from manufacturing to industries requiring government intervention." Woodward shows how the rate of unemployment rose dramatically in the 1980s which, according to her, caused the erosion of the middle class in Yugoslavia, and the republics faced an "unequal distribution of the burden of austerity" (Woodward 1995, 56). These difficulties led to suspicions of ethnic bias. Elites exploited these fears for personal interests. The oil shocks of the 1970s, too, exacerbated Yugoslavia's borrowing behavior, eventually leading it to accumulate high debts. In effect, the rise in unemployment and the oil shocks of the 1970s caused the rise in feelings of nationalism among ethnic groups, which then caused the country to disintegrate.

Sabrina P. Ramet (2005) considers Woodward's explanation to be too simplistic. Ramet contends that the rise of unemployment cannot be considered as the main cause to Yugoslavia's problems, although the uneven regional development affected the Yugoslav government's legitimacy to deal with important political issues in the region.

Additionally, Ramet (2005) argues that the oil shocks cannot be considered as the defining moment that led to Yugoslavia's heavy borrowing. Elsewhere, Christopher Cviic (1995) writes how Woodward's study, although large in volume and rich in statistical data, adds very little to the study of the region, especially with regard to the nature of its dissolution after 1991. To Cviic (1995, 825) [the book] "instead of

explaining the situation it confuses, and reads rather like apologia for the hard-pressed Yugoslav army generals in Belgrade.”

Among other observers who have emphasized the role of economic factors in the former Yugoslavia’s dissolution is also Dijana Plestina (1992). Plestina (1992) looks at the communist economic policy in Yugoslavia from 1945 to 1990 and its effects in the definition of political relations between individual republics in the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (SFRJ). According to Plestina, the northern republics had better economies with less unemployment, whereas the rest of the republics, Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia, and Kosovo, lagged behind in all economic indicators. This uneven regional economic development, coupled with Yugoslavia’s excessive foreign debt, aggravated the political relations between the republics.

In her subsequent study released the same year as the *Balkan Tragedy*, Susan Woodward’s (1995) *Socialist Unemployment*, provides an additional explanation about Yugoslavia’s demise rooted in economic theory. According to Woodward, the decline of standard of living and economic opportunities in the 1980s caused feelings of unrest among the middle class. Woodward (1995, 364) contends that unemployment impaired “the country’s ability to continue to manage” the country’s economic problems. Economic problems exacerbated the already sensitive relations between the republics, with the pressure coming not from the domestic factors, but from the international creditors. The continuing failure of the League of Communist of Yugoslavia’s (LCY) leadership to ameliorate the economic problems created a political context in which nationalism became the main ‘demobilizing’ factor (Woodward 1995).

Sabrina P. Ramet (2005) contests Woodward's book, *Socialist Unemployment* calling it openly revisionist. According to Ramet(2005, 57) "given Woodward's scheme for understanding the evolution of economic policy in postwar Yugoslavia -- the reform of 1965, the crushing of the liberals in 1971-1972 (by Tito)" and the "constitution of 1974 -- cannot qualify" as a "defining moment" (Woodward's term) to the former Yugoslavia's unemployment problems. The prominent Yale historian, Ivo Banac, (1992) and Sekulic et. al. (1993) have also argued that Yugoslavia's demise was to a certain extent a result of the uneven regional economic development between the republics, with Kosovo being the most underdeveloped region in Yugoslavia, followed by Macedonia and Serbia, but these authors also emphasize the role of history and ideology in the region's violent break-up.

The use of the economy to explain the Yugoslav conflict is under-developed. Scholars have yet to use political economy for studying the role of economic policies of production and their relationship with the domestic politics institutions. The economic perspective discussed here has added an important dimension in the causes of the former Yugoslavia's dissolution. The next section discusses the role of institutions in the former Yugoslavia's break-up.

Institutional Perspective

Much of the scholarship on the former Yugoslavia prior to its violent collapse has focused on the role of institutions, specifically on the role of the structure of government institutions in the country's collapse. This strand of research has focused on major organizational and constitutional changes that occurred from 1963 to 1974 (Carter 1982; Banac 1984; Ramet 1984; Woodward 1989). In 1963, Yugoslavia drafted a new

constitution, followed by 42 amendments from 1963 to 1971, and culminating with the drafting of the 1974 constitution (Woodward 1989). These changes were intended to improve political participation and influence reform in the state and party organs.

According to Woodward (1989), the purpose was to remove the influence of the party in the economic and political matters, and at the same time increase the role of individual republics in the formulation and implementation of their own policies (Woodward 1989).

To this day, most of these scholars do not agree how to treat these changes; whether as part of deliberate systemic changes carried out by Tito and the Communist Party of Yugoslavia (KPJ), or as ad hoc changes that caused former Yugoslavia's decentralization. In fact, these scholars disagree on how to treat these changes: decentralization or democratization (Woodward 1989).

Carter (1982) argues that the organizational changes occurred in response to the economic growth in Yugoslavia and were intended to improve economic efficiency. The move for changes was carried out by the leadership within the KPJ (the Communist Party of Yugoslavia), specifically within the faction comprised of liberal thinkers and economic managers. According to Carter the resulting changes are seen as a result of institutional conflict within the party structure that was spilled over into the federal system and he believes the changes were a result of the forces of democratization. Contrary to Carter, Ramet (1984) argues that the organizational and constitutional reforms were carried out with the intention of delegitimizing the liberal movement; they were done with the intention of strengthening the party's grip in the economy. The process of change is seen as a process of decentralization and not as a result of the forces of democratization. The changes were done in order to establish a balance between the two dominant republics in

the federation -- Croatia and Serbia. However, the changes weakened Serbia's grip in economic and political matters by devolving the power to other entities in the federation (Woodward 1989). The intensification of the conflict between the republics and institutions in Yugoslavia was a result of the uneven economic development between the republics which led to the rise of nationalism (Ramet 1984).

To Vujacic (2004) this perspective's most prominent advocate has been Valerie Bunce (1999). Bunce (1999) has studied the institutional causes of the demise of the socialist system in both the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia (her analysis includes Czechoslovakia, too) and her insights on the institutional causes of the demise of the former Yugoslavia are invaluable. According to Bunce (1999) the factors that contributed to the violent demise of the former Yugoslavia were: the decentralization of the federal power; the relationship between the republics and the federal state; and the relationship between the military and the party (Vujacic 2004, 172-173). The early decentralizing reforms in the federal Yugoslavia, beginning with the 1974 reforms, which gave Kosovo and Vojvodina equal rights in the federal system, weakened the federal structure, well before the crisis began in 1989. These policies were later used by the nationalist leaders for the dismemberment of Yugoslavia. Additionally, Bunce (1999) argues that important historical narratives between ethnic groups on the former Yugoslavia favored selective interpretations of these institutional causes, leading to the bloody break up. Vujacic (2004) stresses the role of cultural differences between Serbs and Croats as important variables in understanding the former Yugoslavia's break-up.

Ivo Banac (1984) believes that the causes of the institutional conflict can't be found in the differences of culture between Serbs and Croats (Ottoman/Hapsburg). To

Banac (1984) causes of conflict can be seen as a result of ideological differences of territorial rule between the Croats and Serbs. Historically the region of Yugoslavia was never “territorially constituted” and that territorial claims were based on ideology, so rivalry was inevitable Banac (1984, 69). According to Banac, the concept of Yugoslavia did not mean the same for both states when the first Yugoslavia was created in 1918. Banac believes that Serbia’s secularized ideology of the 18th century created the ground for conflict between the Serbs and Croats. This secularized movement was led by the Serb linguist, Vuk Karadzic (1787-1864), who became the principal language reformer and who argued that the region inhabited with people who spoke the *stokavian* derivative were really all Serbs. This included Croats and Bosnian Muslims. To Banac, the Serbs never really accepted Tito’s Yugoslavia. Banac argues that during Tito’s war against the Germans, the weakest support for his movement was in Serbia. The Serbs in Serbia (not in Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina) saw little advantage in Tito’s concept of Yugoslavia as a federal state. Tito had to liberate Belgrade from the Germans and the Serb Chetnik forces of Draza Mihailovic in order to create a new base of support in Serbia. He had Draza Mihailovic executed. To Banac, Tito’s first period of rule was to dull the Serb campaign for dominance in Yugoslavia. Tito believed in the process of decentralization, something the Serb elites in Serbia were strongly opposed (Banac 1984, 143-147).

Meier (1995) offers an expanded institutional explanation to Yugoslavia’s disintegration. To Meier, the institutional conflict between the Yugoslav communist leadership and between the republics, as well as between the JNA (Yugoslav National army) and the rest of the republics in the federation, is what caused Yugoslavia’s

collapse. Meier (2005) puts Milosevic at the apex of his argument, arguing that the institutional conflict between the republics and Belgrade, specifically with regard to economic reform, by Slobodan Milosevic and Ante Markovic created the political circumstances for the rise of other nationalist leaders in the country. As Meier (1995) notes, Yugoslavia's efforts for macroeconomic reforms were met with skepticism by the most affluent republics in the federation -- Slovenia and Croatia. Both republics objected on the grounds that the macro-economic reforms put forth by the Branko Mikulic government in 1988 opened the door for more administrative interventions of the central government. Even Ante Markovic's political restructuring of Yugoslavia under the umbrella of economic reforms was met with furious opposition in Serbia and Slovenia. The Slovenes argued that Markovic's program had centralist provisions which they vehemently opposed (Meier 1995, 107-110).

Elsewhere, Dejan Jovic (2009) contends that the economic policies of Ante Markovic's government were moving Yugoslavia out of the financial crisis. According to Jovic (2009) the inflation rate of 56 percent in 1989 fell down to 17.3 percent in January of 1990. The inflation rate fell further down to 2.4 percent by April of 1990. Industrial productivity had also increased during this time, but the three main leaders of the Yugoslav republics at the time -- Milan Kucan of Slovenia, Franjo Tudjman of Croatia, and Slobodan Milosevic of Serbia -- rejected the European Community's offer for a political compromise in return for economic support (Jovic 2009, 15-17).

The institutional perspective delineates the role of institutional conflict at both the state and federal level as a casual explanation to the former Yugoslavia's eventual demise. Meier's (1995) narrative is especially important in this regard because it

documents the conflict between the different interests, at the national and state level, as the root cause of the collapse. Banac's injection of ideology as an intervening variable in the institutional explanation is also worth noting. In the end, the institutional conflict adds valuable information in our understanding of the cases of Yugoslav conflict. The next section discusses the role of leadership in the former Yugoslavia's dissolution.

The Leadership Perspective

Dejan Jovic's (2009) study of Yugoslavia's disintegration from the perspective of leadership, specifically from the perspective of political events, political ideas, and political concepts, and how they influenced the perception of the political actors who preceded Yugoslavia's disintegration, is an important study. In particular, Jovic tries to understand the political elites' actions in response to political events inside and outside Yugoslavia by understanding the meaning of their intentions through the study of their interactions during these important events. According to Jovic (2009) it was Edvard Kardelj, the Slovene, and Tito's ideological vanguard who played the most pivotal role in this process. Edvard Kardelj believed that Yugoslavia's existing communist structure was not conducive in creating a Yugoslav nation. Kardelj believed that Yugoslavia survival could be guaranteed in a form of a loose federation of the republics and that further decentralization of the system was necessary to keep it functional. According to Jovic (2009, 174) "Kardelj's main argument linked the anti-statist ideology with the identity and sovereignty of Yugoslavia," and it was done by advancing the concept of workers self-management. The decentralization of Yugoslavia as a result of the 1974 constitution was essential for Edvard Kardelj's concept of worker's self-management to work. But, as Meier (1995, 6) notes, the 1974 constitution was "a pastiche of imprecision

and contradictions.” The 1974 constitution was created with economic reforms in mind, and to this end, it was an ideological concoction which attempted to democratize the system, but at the same time, help the Communist Party of Yugoslavia maintain primary control over its decision-making, mainly through administrative control. In the 1980s, during the period of financial crisis in Yugoslavia, the very notion of self-management, with significant administrative intervention, became a major point of contention between the two republics of Croatia and Slovenia.

Some have suggested that being a Yugoslav meant different things for the different ethnic groups in the federation. Dejan Djokic (2007) writes that ‘Yugoslavism’ as a concept of state building was understood differently at different times by different leaders, and thus it is important to trace it from its beginnings in 1918 to its demise in 1992 (1992 being the year Slovenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Croatia declared their independence). The concept of ‘Yugoslavism’, according to the author, experienced a metamorphosis, with first being a strong and ideologically driven endeavor which recognized no differences between the three major tribes, Serbian, Croatian and Slovenian. Later, the concept took a different meaning with a more separate notion geared toward the separate interests of the members (Djokic 2007, 3-5). In tracing the evolution of Yugoslavism, Djokic, argued that the creation of Yugoslavia’s constitution in 1918 became a matter of dispute between the Croats and the Serbs, with the Croats favoring a decentralized constitutional arrangement, whereas, the Serbs favoring a centralized constitution. In the first Yugoslavia (1918), the Serbian argument prevailed, but only as a result of the Croatian boycott at the constituent assembly.

The 1920s and 1930s became an internal argument between the Croat decentralists and Serbian centralist, with both sides having a markedly different view of Yugoslavia (Djokic 2007, 142-145). On October 3 1929, the country's name is officially changed to the Kingdom of Yugoslavia and is organized according to 9 *banovinas* (provinces), meant to convey Yugoslav oneness as one, and a unitary state, without ethnic divisions. The October 3, 1929 changes were done to appease the Croat's increasing demand for decentralization, but as Djokic notes, the county remained as centralized as it had been during the 1920s. Christopher Cviic (1995) contends that the first Yugoslavia (1918-1941) was essentially a Greater Serbia in everything but in name.

Jovic (2007) on the other hand, explains the evolution of Tito's Yugoslavia (1945-1989) from the perspective of the differences of opinions between Josip Broz Tito and Edvard Kardelj, the architect of the 1974 constitution, which, according to Jovic (2007), lay the ground for Yugoslavia's collapse. According to Jovic (2007) Kardelj's views of Yugoslavia changed dramatically in the 1960s, with Kardelj having a more anti-statist ideology. According to the author, Yugoslavia withered away as a result of the changing of this ideology. The founding communists believed that a new Yugoslavia, the post WWII Yugoslavia, was to be markedly different from the pre WWII Yugoslavia, which they believed was very centrist and ruled by the Serb bourgeoisie. A new and decentralized Yugoslavia was the answer to the pre-WWII Yugoslavia. The older generation of Yugoslav partisans, including Kardelj, believed that the state should wither away to become a truly socialist state, something even Marx envisioned.

In her interpretation of the personal accounts of some of the important leaders of Yugoslavia, Ramet (2005) finds how each of the functionaries she studied argued for

different reasons behind Yugoslavia's dissolution. For example, Dizdarevic, the former president of the presidency of Bosnia and Herzegovina from 1980-1982, considered the economic deterioration and the rise of Slobodan Milosevic as the two crucial factors that led to Yugoslavia's collapse. According to the Croat, Davorin Rudolf, the situation in Croatia was not as tense as many portrayed it to be in the early 1990s. Rudolf argues that despite Belgrade's beliefs, moderates still defined the mainstream politicians in Croatia (Ramet 2005). These moderates were the one's who did everything in their power to avoid war with Serbia, but that wasn't enough. In her other book, *The Three Yugoslavia's: State Building and Legitimation*, Ramet (2006) posits that the one of the main causes of Yugoslavia's disintegration was the lack of political legitimacy in Yugoslavia. Meier (1999) attributes the war to the suppression of liberal and democratic values of equality by Slobodan Milosevic's administration. The decline of democratic values is what caused ethnic tension and led to Yugoslavia's violent breakup. Meier's account is especially important because of his intimate knowledge of Yugoslavia. Having been a journalist for German newspapers on Yugoslavia for over 20 years, Meier had a close understanding of the causes and consequences of Yugoslav breakup, which in his opinion, were institutional in nature.

Veljko Vujacic (1996, 774) believes that because the Serbs occupied the dominant position in Yugoslavia that created a sense of "social-psychology" among the Serb elite. This sense of social-psychology occurs when a dominant group may develop a sense of historic mission for the preservation of what they perceive to be their creation. Therefore, it is not surprising that Serbs identified themselves strongly with Yugoslavia compared to other groups. Vujacic argues that the position of Serbs in Yugoslavia as the dominant

nation did not cause the Serbs to develop a “particularistic political nationalism” (Vujacic 1996, 774). The nationalism in Serbia was a result of other peripheral nationalist movements in Croatia and Kosovo. In response to the argument that nationalism started with Serbia with the publication of the SANU (Serbian Academy of Arts and Sciences) memorandum in 1986, Vujacic posits that the SANU memorandum was a defensive stance by the Serbian elite, but under conditions of ethnic polarization, these initially defensive stances turn into an offensive stance. With the decline of KPJ’s political legitimacy and with the increasing threat of ethnic polarization new political coalitions were formed. As a result, the old ruling class was threatened. Such was the case with the JNA which jumped to protect the borders of Yugoslavia (Vujacic 1996, 775-776).

Veljko Vujacic (2004, 178) argues that placing the blame solely on the Serbs amounts to a version of “Serbian exceptionalism thesis” in which the “Serbian problems”, both in the past and present, were the main culprit to the demise of Yugoslavia. To Vujacic (2004), this form of explanation lacks empiricism and is not scientifically grounded.

Some scholars, such as V.P Gagnon (2004) have attributed Yugoslavia’s disintegration to the policies of the emerging elites in the former republics. According to Gagnon (2004), these elites reconstructed a new political space without taking into account the historical complexities of social relations in the former Yugoslavia. In order for the nationalist leaders to de-legitimize the liberal movement in Yugoslavia, they organized their political support through ethnic lines, thus inciting ethnic fears.

According to Gagnon Jr., the violent conflict in the former Yugoslavia was provoked by Slobodan Milosevic in his attempt to reconstruct a new political vacuum where ethnicity became the predominant mobilizing factor. Such policies of national mobilization are

done by invoking images of the past, and in the case of Milosevic and Serbia, this was done with the help of the media. But, according to Gagnon, the elite in Serbia failed to take into account the complexity of social relations in the federal Yugoslavia. The elites began mobilizing their political power around ethnic differences, thereby creating a political context where violence became justified.

Elsewhere, Vujacic (2004, 179) argues that Gagnon Jr., interpretation is incomplete because it fails to explain “why the elite appeals to Serbian nationalism were credible to the masses.” According to Vujacic (2004), Gagnon Jr., does not explain why alternative forms of Serbian nationalism failed to capture the masses. In his own study of Milosevic, Vujacic (2004) argues that Milosevic was a populist leader who possessed the ability to appeal to various social constituencies in the communist Yugoslavia, and that made him a charismatic leader. But, elsewhere, Bozic-Roberson (2005) who studied Milosevic’s rhetoric in his speeches concludes that Milosevic politicized ethnicity for political reasons. According to Bozic-Roberson (2005) this form of ethnic nationalism is what caused the wars in the former Yugoslavia. In contrast to Vujacic, Bozic-Anderson believes that Milosevic’s rhetoric was much simpler and was used as a political tool to influence public knowledge. Toward this end, Milosevic was a nationalist leader.

Lukic and Lynch (1996) argue that Slobodan Milosevic possessed the determination to preserve Yugoslavia, and in case he could not do that, forge a new state with Serbia as its dominant power. To cope with the challenges coming from Croatia, Slovenia and Kosovo, Milosevic used the policy of street demonstrations, suppression, and public mobilization to de-legitimize his opposition (Lukich and Lynch 1996). According to Becker (2005, 9) Milosevic became the dominant leader of Yugoslavia by

arguing that interests of Serbs in Yugoslavia “needed to be satisfied if the disintegration of Yugoslavia was to be prevented.” Becker (2005, 9) believes that under Milosevic’s guidance “national egoism, the continuous Kosovo and socio-economic crises and the fear of many Serbs or decline was heightened to an explosive mixture that led to the destruction of Yugoslavia.” Similarly, Morus (2007) argues that Slobodan Milosevic used “mytho-historic allusions” of ethnic differences in his rhetoric to mask modern problems, thereby normalizing ethnic violence, and as noted previously, Gagnon Jr., (2004) attributes the demise of Yugoslavia to Milosevic’s policies of ethnic mobilization.

A different strand of research has tried to disseminate the role of the warring parties involved in the conflict in order to ascertain the degree of their culpability in Yugoslavia’s dissolution. One of such author’s is Sir. David Owen. Owen (1995) employs a more relativist approach to the study of Yugoslavia, arguing instead that all three parties were responsible for the outcome of the war. Owen’s main argument revolves around the Dayton peace accord, which he argues was inferior to the Vance-Owen plan of 1992. The plan conceptualized Bosnia and Herzegovina within the current borders but divided among ethnic cantons (ten cantons) and with Sarajevo to be administered jointly by the three warring sides. The Croats were supportive of the plan, with Serbia initially agreeing to but changing the mind in the spring of that year, and Izetbegovic being completely against the ethnic division of Bosnia and Herzegovina (Owen 1995, 131-132). According to Owen, the United States had a poor understanding of the Vance-Owen plan, advising Izetbegovic not to accept its provisions. Owen argues that peace in Yugoslavia would have been achieved earlier but the major differences in the personalities of the three leaders—Milosevic, Tudjman, and Izetbegovic—proved to

be a major obstacle to peace. By contrast, Warren Zimmerman (1994) the last American ambassador to Yugoslavia, suggests that Yugoslavia may have not disintegrated in the manner it did if it wasn't for Slovenia's utter indifference. According to Zimmerman, Slovenia's lack of support played into the hands of Milosevic. By this logic, Slovenia's indifference makes them as culpable as Franjo Tudjman in Croatia and Slobodan Milosevic in Serbia. Zimmerman has no respect for Franjo Tudjman but considers Milosevic to have been more tolerable than the Croat leader.

Domestic Politics Arguments

According to Mansfield and Snyder (2002) nationalist politics in democratizing countries may lead to international military disputes through three inter-related mechanisms. One of the mechanisms is nationalist outbidding. According to this mechanism, both old and new elites may bid for popular support by advancing bold nationalist policies. This can result in a second mechanism, blowback from nationalist ideology. Based on this mechanism, the "Nationalists may find themselves trapped by rhetoric that emphasizes combating threats to the national interest because both the politicians and their supporters have internalized this worldview" (Mansfield and Snyder 2002, 532). The final mechanism is logrolling. The logrolling tactics between the domestic political interests – military and other protectionist groups – may increase the prospect of interstate conflict (Mansfield and Snyder 2002).

The work of Mansfield and Snyder (1995; 2002, 2002) shows that countries undergoing democratic transitions are more likely to start wars than are stable regimes, whether democratic or autocratic in nature. The relationship between democratization,

nationalism, and war is particularly evident in a number of emerging states in the early 1990s, including the states of the former Yugoslavia.

This section discusses the views of social scientist from the territory of the former Yugoslavia. What makes these writings interesting is their understanding of the forces of change that were taking over their country during the early 1990s and what makes the Serbs unique in this view are the historical experiences. Serbia was historically squeezed between the Ottoman Empire and Austro-Hungary and Serbs developed a strong sense of national consciousness through this long process of national struggle (Vujacic 1996). Milosavljevic (1996) posits that the real ideas that defined Yugoslavia's dissolution are rarely mentioned. These ideas are implicit, but what makes them unique is that they were backed with political action. The two documents, the SANU of 1986 in Serbia and Slovenia's National Program of 1987 presented a unique challenge to the federal authorities because irreconcilable ideas were, for the first time, argued by the intellectuals in both republics. SANU memorandum and Slovenia's National Program argued about Serbia's and Slovenia's grievances in Yugoslavia; for the first time since Tito's death in 1980, the national question became a hot topic. But, according to Milosavljevic, both documents -- the memorandum and the national program—were not argued coherently. Both documents sought to define what it meant to be Serb and what it meant to be Slovenian in the federal Yugoslavia, and the reasons were different for both republics. According to Milosavljevic explicit demands for tackling real issues in Yugoslavia were never met with political action; whereas the implicit demands -- the demands in the SANU memorandum and Slovenia's National Program -- were met with specific political action. The implicit demands were the demands that called for a stronger Serbia and for

Slovenia's secession from the federation. These two documents changed the political debate by shifting it from the real issues to the issues of nationalism. According to Milosavljevic, the debates between the SANU intellectuals and Slovenian intellectuals caused "national homogenization" (Milosavljevic's term) in both republics, Serbia and Slovenia. The term 'Yugoslavia' began to be used in a form of 'relativization' (Milosavljevic's term). The implicit demands were eventually met with political action -- the two referendums for war in 1991 and 1992 in Serbia (Milosavljevic 1996). The domestic nationalism argument suggests that this ideology of nationalism successfully mobilized nationalist sentiments in the two republics and helped framed domestic policy.

The domestic politics argument extends beyond nationalism to things like institutions. To Ljubomir Madzar (Who Exploited Whom? 1996) the SANU memorandum contained the belief that there was widespread abuse by each republic in the federation. According to Madzar, each republic in Yugoslavia emphasized their own individual losses by discounting other party's grievances as irrational. Madzar argues that these grievances were eventually politicized by the leadership in all of the republics; this politicization was done for personal reasons. But what caused Yugoslavia's dissolution was the weakness of the federal structure which eliminated any kind of transparency in formulation of political and economic policies. This lack of transparency caused feelings of discomfort. The unequal distribution of wealth among republics caused the federal structure to finally disintegrate.

Of course domestic politics arguments include other perspectives, such as the economic perspective. Madzar (1996) believes that contrary to the popular belief, the SANU memorandum was in actuality an economic document. SANU started with the

premise that the problems with the economy lay in the ineffective political system. It argued that without redefining the political system the current economic crisis would not be averted. SANU's arguments consisted of fixing the political and economic system within the framework of the socialist system, which Madzar considers to have been a miscalculation (Madzar 1996, 178-180). To Madzar, SANU evaluated the 1980s economic crisis without argumentation. The SANU members failed to understand the real reasons behind the political problems-- the fiscal policies of the 1970s.

Nevertheless, the argument is that the SANU memorandum was apolitical document which later became a primary mobilizing platform for the Serbian leader, Slobodan Milosevic. To the Yale historian, Ivo Banac (1992), the SANU memorandum was Serbia's effort to take charge of political developments in the region. Banac (1992) argues that the memorandum became a mobilization platform for the newly emerging politician, Slobodan Milosevic. Slobodan Milosevic's rise began in Kosovo where he put the Kosovar communist leadership in the defensive. Slobodan Milosevic encouraged Albanian stereotypes as part of his political goals. According to Banac (1992, 152), Milosevic's intention was "the political and national homogenization" of Serbs in Yugoslavia.

Summary of Chapter

At the epicenter of the domestic politics argument – nationalism, institutional, and economic -- is the role of Slobodan Milosevic as the primary manipulator in the development of policies in the former Yugoslavia during the late 1980s. Others (see Tomac 2003) have argued that domestic nationalism in Croatia and Slovenia was a reaction to the nationalist policies of Milosevic in Serbia as outlined in the SANU

memorandum. This dissertation will measure quantitatively and systematically Milosevic's and Tudjman's nationalism. This should help shed new light into this discussion – whether nationalism was an ingrained personality trait or a political maneuver used by these two leaders to accumulate power. As others have already stated (see Ramet 2002), Milosevic was at the center of the former Yugoslavia's disintegration. Milosevic became involved in illegal political developments in Yugoslavia, especially after the publication of the SANU memorandum and after his promotion to the party chief of Serbia's league of communists. Taking into account, the historical, cultural and political factors in assessing Yugoslavia's demise, Ramet argues that still, even in the newly created political vacuum, leaders are the ones who play the pivotal role in the crisis. In this case, Slobodan Milosevic reconstructed a new political context where Serbia's grievances in the SANU memorandum became the predominant mobilizing factor. In retrospect, the nationalism in Croatia by Tudjman was a response to the nationalist threat coming out of Serbia. However, nationalism was present prior to the 1990s.

Sekulic et al. (1994) argue that the common political agenda of Yugoslavism created and implemented by the communist leadership failed to eradicate nationalism. Instead, the economic and political competition in an increasingly weakened federal structure re-ignited ethnic competition for resources. Sekulic et al (1994) use social science polling data from 1984 to 1989 to illustrate their point and conclude that despite the liberal thinking of the youth in that period, the forces of liberalism and modernization put forth by the communist leadership failed to stop the rising nationalism among the different republics. In this explanation, too, leadership plays a role in the outcome of the

crisis. The integrative processes of state identity formation failed in the former Yugoslavia due mostly as a result of uneven regional economic development, which set the stage for nationalism (Sekulic et al. 1994). The worker-self management, the primary organizing body of the Yugoslav economy, started looking after local interests rather than the interests of the Yugoslav state which, in addition to the 1974 constitution, contributed to the decentralization of the political and economic federal power. The weakness of the federal control over the economy further weakened the LCY's (League of Communist of Yugoslavia) ability to set policy agenda. The distress of the federal system provided political opportunities for ambitious politicians, Slobodan Milosevic in Serbia, and Franjo Tudjman in Croatia who started promoting national pride over the idea of Yugoslavism (Sekulic et al. 1994).

Denitch (1996) by using Yugoslavia as a prism to examine the role of nationalism in newly emerging states argues that Yugoslavia disintegrated as a result of the increasing role of nationalism of the Serb leadership in Serbia. Denitch concludes that the JNA (Yugoslav National Army) became a rogue institution that was later employed by the nationalists in Serbia for their political reasons. Once Yugoslavia began to disintegrate, the JNA realized that its existence could only be secured if they became an active participant in the process of disintegration. According to Denitch (1996) the JNA was largely unsuccessful in the wars but it still managed to cause a great deal of problems. Denitch's (1996) argument is that the institutional weakening of Yugoslavia, coupled with the emergence of the army's active role in the disintegration of Yugoslavia, together with the failed "market self-management" economy of Yugoslavia, threatened democratic

development. These conditions led to the emergence of nationalism, which according to Denitch, is the main reason for the war.

To Doder (1993) Tito's policies of liberalization after the 1958 separation from the Soviet style policies, led to the revival of Croat nationalism in Croatia. The 1960s saw a movement which attempted to revive old Croatian symbols of WWII, something the Serbs in Belgrade found exceptionally dangerous and offensive. In 1972, Tito is forced to crush the Croat movement, eventually replacing it with his own party loyalist. To Doder (1993) the 1974 constitution marked the end of a federal Yugoslavia, where the republics became voluntary units within the new federal structure. Tito's formula was effective while he was still alive. After his death in 1980, the newly created federal unit was a federation only in name. The collapse of the communist ideology in 1990 marked the end of Yugoslavia and was replaced with new political rhetoric of ethnic particularism, eventually leading to the rise of nationalist politicians bent on de-legitimizing each other's aspirations. Most of those in Serbia began advocating constitutional changes as a way of righting the wrongs done over the years of Tito's rule. In 1987, Slobodan Milosevic rode this new wave of political nationalism and became the populist leader no-one saw coming (Vujacic 2004). Acting upon the newly perceived nationalism in Serbia, Franjo Tudjman, the Croat scholar, turned politician, formed his own political base which catapulted him and his party, the HDZ, into the top of the Croatian leadership. The nationalist parties swept the power in the first multi-party elections in Yugoslavia, with SPS and Milosevic in Serbia, HDZ and Tudjman in Croatia, and SDA and Izetbegovic in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

This chapter shows that the disintegration of Yugoslavia was a result of multiple factors. The disintegration is attributed to institutional factors, economic factors, and leadership factors, domestic and economic factors just to name the few. The preceding chapter shows that the violence in Croatia and Serbia was mostly due to the policies of the ruling elite who sought to mobilize their population for own political interests. The newly created political context in Yugoslavia in 1991 created the conditions for the emergence of nationalist leaders like Tudjman and Milosevic. The role of these two leaders in the breakup is yet to be empirically ascertained. The immediate goal of this dissertation is the study of Franjo Tudjman's and Slobodan Milosevic's psychological characteristics. The next chapter outlines the literature on Franjo Tudjman and Slobodan Milosevic and then it proceeds by laying out the research questions.

CHAPTER THREE

Franjo Tudjman and Slobodan Milosevic in the Context of the former Yugoslavia

This chapter reviews the relevant biographical literature on Franjo Tudjman of Croatia and Slobodan Milosevic of Serbia in the context of the former Yugoslavia. In this dissertation, the two leaders are assumed to occupy the central position in their respective governments, and therefore, were in the position to affect policy-making directly. This discussion precedes the analysis portion of the dissertation by introducing the reader to how these way leaders rose to power, cemented their rule, and how they may have directed political development in the former Yugoslavia. The former Croat president, Franjo Tudjman, is a complex person to understand. Some biographies of him exist, but they are written in Croatian, and often considered to reflect the authors' personal biases (Sadkovich 2006). The same can be said about the literature in the English language (e. g. Kaplan 1991; Banac 1992 & 1993; Zimmermann 1994; Cockburn 1995; Owen 1995; Binder 1997; Holbrooke 1998; Kearns 1998). According to Sadkovich (2006) this literature is considered to be heavily influenced by media propaganda propagated by the Serbian regime during the crisis in the former Yugoslavia. The lack of reliable and accessible sources has confounded our understanding of this intriguing political leader whose political choices affected Yugoslavia's disintegration and the wars that followed. As a result, questions remain about Franjo Tudjman, his political beliefs, motives, and his decision style. These questions have not been answered. Clarifying them would offer the possibility of understanding how Franjo Tudjman's personality and political belief set may have influenced his approach to political goals.

Similarly, the literature on Milosevic has advanced confounding conclusions about the leader. Specifically, there is a lot of literature out there which disagrees about the role of Milosevic's nationalism and need for power in his rise to political prominence. To date, no systematic study has tried to determine Milosevic's proclivity to politics, especially to foreign policy behavior. Holbrooke (1998) considered him to be a difficult negotiator, and others have noted his lack of strategy on dealing with foreign policy issues (see Judah 2009). It is the aim of this dissertation to bridge this gap in the literature.

Franjo Tudjman

Franjo Tudjman was a scholar and an outspoken critic of Yugoslavia's communistic regime. Tudjman would, early on, come in direct conflict with the Yugoslav regime in Belgrade. He is labeled a Croat nationalist by Belgrade. Indeed, this label would follow him deep into his presidency and would continue to haunt him until his death in 1999. Several scholars have noted that Tudjman's main goal in life was the creation of a Croatian state (see Glenny 1996; Rados 2005; Sadkovich 2006). He spent most of his adult life—from his years in the Yugoslav army, to his days as a director of the institute of Croatia's history of workers' movement, to his days as a political dissident, and all the way to his election as the first president of independent Croatia—advocating for the rights of Croats in the former Yugoslavia (see Hudelist 2004 and Rados 2005). This goal led him to pursue courses of action that eventually lead to the separation of Croatia from the former Yugoslavia (SFRJ). His nationalist tendency made him a target of the Yugoslav secret service and Tudjman was regularly monitored by them. In 1971, he was arrested on charges of an anti-Yugoslav conspiracy.

Rados (2005, 8-13) argues that after his arrest, Tadjman became increasingly detached from politics. It is believed that this experience made him wearier of Belgrade's intentions about the interests of the Croats in the SFRJ. After his arrest, his political activity takes the form of secret meetings with other Croat dissidents (Rados 2005, 8-13). Here, it is implied that Tadjman's worldview experienced a slight transformation, so we would expect that Tadjman's political preferences would also experience a change. According to two of the leading figures of the student movement in the spring of 1971, Drazen Budisa and Ivan Cacak, Franjo Tadjman was not particularly active in politics prior to 1971. Tadjman was a member of the parliament of the Socialist Republic of Croatia from 1962-1967. He spent most of his time in the 1960s meeting important personalities who later helped him in his bid to Croatia's independence from Yugoslavia. Ivica Rados (2005, 6) writes that during the 1960s Franjo Tadjman met with Josip Manolic, Stipe Mesic, and others who "thirty years later, played a key role in the unraveling of the Yugoslavia and in the adoption of those important decisions for Croatia." To Drazen Budisa, Franjo Tadjman was an important political figure. Budisa notes how Tadjman's conditions in prison were more tolerable from the rest of the prisoners and that was because of his stature as a former general of the JNA. On the other hand, Ivan Cacak contends that Franjo Tadjman was not a "first tier" leader in Croatia prior to 1971 (Rados, 2005, 8). Cacak argues that Franjo Tadjman was not unimportant but that he was less inclined to act on his beliefs prior to 1971 (Rados 2005, 6-9).

Franjo Tadjman's political activity after 1972 takes the form of secret meetings with other Croat dissidents. Stipe Mesic recalls how they met frequently with Franjo

Tudjman to discuss politics. It appears that Franjo Tudjman remained politically active. In 1972, he writes a political platform on the basic programs of the Croatian National and Socialist movement, which later became the platform for his own political party, the Democratic Union of Croatia, or HDZ. Because of his political activism, he continued to be monitored by the Yugoslav secret service. Tudjman's displeasure with the Yugoslav authorities became public in the 1977 interview by a Swedish news agency during which he details his grievances about Croatia's unfavorable position in the Yugoslav Federation. During this interview, Franjo Tudjman defends Croatia for being anti-fascist during WWII (Rados 2005, 8-11).

After the death of Josip Broz Tito in 1980, and with the emergence of Serb nationalism in Belgrade, and especially after the publication of the SANU memorandum of 1986, Franjo Tudjman becomes more directly involved in politics. In the late 1980s he travels to Canada and the U.S with the goal of gathering sufficient political and financial support from the Croat émigré community. Andrija Hebrang remembers how Tudjman correctly anticipated the wave of democratization in that hit Eastern Europe in the 1990s and that his trips out West were a preparation for the eventual takeover of Croatia. Cicak, too, argues that Franjo Tudjman believed that he was the most important person in Croatia and that he was destined to become Croatia's leader (Rados 2005, 11-20).

Franjo Tudjman had a clear vision for himself and Croatia. Philosophically speaking, Franjo Tudjman believed that every nation regardless of its size has the natural right to self-determination and that history was full of such examples. The late 1980s were the years he slowly matured into a leader. It was during autumn of 1988 that he resolved his political concerns and after careful thinking he decided that the best

approach to Croatian politics was the realization of statehood through pragmatism – by first establishing a legitimate political party (Hudelist 2004, 633-636). The Croat émigré community agreed and Franjo Tudjman received substantial financial backing from them. Zdravko Tomac (1992) argues that with HDZ Tudjman’s envisioned the formation of a nationwide and massive social movement in Croatia which would encompass not only the Croats in Croatia but also the Diaspora. Tomac (1992) was impressed with Franjo Tudjman’s maturity as a politician. He saw in him as a man who believed that he was destined to play an historic role in Croatia’s road to nationhood. Misha Glenny (1996, 63) suggests that the support was close to “\$ 4 million for the HDZ election campaign.”

Most western writers—whose writings were heavily influenced by the media of the old Yugoslav regime—consider him to have always been a Croat nationalist (e. g. Kaplan 1991; Cockburn 1995; Binder 1997; Kearns 1998; Vujacic 2003). Tudjman has always denied these accusations. Ivica Rados (2005) invokes Tudjman’s anti-fascist past as a partisan in the war for national liberation as an example of his anti-fascist stance. Rados (2005) writes that Tudjman himself declared: “... if I wasn’t for Croatia, they would have acknowledged my anti-fascism” (*Da nisam za Hrvatsku, priznali bi mi antifasizam*) (Rados 2005, 46). In addition to being a statesman, Tudjman considered himself to be scholar -- a historian. His larger than life personality would often times get him in trouble with the communist authorities in Yugoslavia.

Misha Glenny (1996) believes that Franjo Tudjman’s greatest obsession was the creation of a Croatian state. Even the elections in Croatia in 1990 were characterized by an excess of symbols characterizing this obsession. Franjo Tudjman wanted a separate identity from Yugoslavia even if this meant re-introducing the red and white checkered

flag (*sahovnica*). The reintroduction of *sahovnica* to Croatia's Serbs meant the demotion of their status to second class citizens. According to Glenny, Franjo Tudjman's political inclinations were authoritarian but not entirely undemocratic (Glenny 1996). Milan Babic, a professor of economics at the Zagreb University, characterized Tudjman as "capricious and self-willed" (Glenny 1996, 63). According to Milan Babic, Franjo Tudjman consciously blocked Croatia's democratization efforts, especially in the field of economics. In fact, Babic, argued that Milosevic and Serbia had gone further down the road to economic privatization than Croatia, and that's saying a lot considering Milosevic's authoritarian rule (Glenny 1996, 62-63). Dejan Jovic (2006) characterizes Tudjman's rule as authoritarian in style.

Franjo Tudjman's entire life and political career coincided with two fundamental political processes in the former Yugoslavia in the period from 1945-1990. Darko Hudelist (2004, 449) names the first process "the rise and fall of communism," and the second "the rise and fall of Yugoslavia." According to Hudelist (2004) Franjo Tudjman's political philosophy changed very little during and between these time periods. He continued to be a fan of Marxism and a strong advocate of Croatia's rights in the Yugoslav federation. From 1991 he became a key player in Croatia's and Yugoslavia's political scene. Additionally, Franjo Tudjman and Slobodan Milosevic became directly linked with the wars in Yugoslavia, especially as it pertained to the division of Bosnia and Herzegovina (Hudelist 446-456).

In domestic politics, Franjo Tudjman's main justification for his authoritarian rule had come as a result of the difficult period of national liberation (Kearns 1998). The end of the war did little to change him. Some changes occurred in Croatia, such as a key

opposition victory in municipal elections in Zagreb, which briefly reduced HDZ's influence in Zagreb and Croatia (Kearns 1998, 248-250). The national unity generated by the war meant that the opposition parties focused very little in advancing their party's interests. But with the end of the war in 1995, the SDP (Social Democratic party) became Tudjman's biggest challenger in the next elections. Ultimately, however, SDP did not manage to become a serious challenger to the HDZ, not until after Tudjman's death in 2000.

His critics agree that his leadership style was important in leading Croatia during Balkan wars (Rados 2005). Indeed, it is true that he was a cautious politician. He possessed a great ability to understand the environment around him. His "wait-and-see" approach during the first phase of the war (1991-1992) is considered to be an indicator of his superior decision-making ability. It is true that during the first phase of the war, Tudjman pursued a twofold strategy. On one level, he emphasized negotiations as a peaceful way to solving the crisis. His willingness to negotiate with Milosevic in 1991 and with the General of the JNA, Vukovicem in the fall of 1991 for a peaceful resolution of the crisis is hints to his cooperative behavior in the initial phase of the crisis (Rados 2005, 57-58). The reason for this approach was Croatia's lack of preparation to fight a war. On another level, he worked hard building a modern Croatian military (Rados 2005, 57-59). From 1993 to 1995, the military balance tips on Tudjman's favor. In 1995, he gives the order to commence the military operations "Bljesak," and "Oluja."

Tudjman was very distrustful of the media (Rados 2005). James J. Sadkovich (2006, 739), writes that Tudjman may have been a "very complex individual with a deceptively simple obsession, the creation of a Croatian state." He is credited for

bringing about the destruction of the former Yugoslavia. Others maintain that Tudjman was never for the destruction of Yugoslavia; he was for the destruction of communism in the SFRJ (Hudelist 2004). According to Hudelist (2004), Tudjman disliked communism for two reasons: one because he was dissatisfied with Croatia's borders within the SFRJ (Socialist Republic of Yugoslavia), and two, because Serbs, along with Croats, were the constituent people of the Socialist Republic of Croatia. Tudjman believed that Croatia should be exclusively a Croatian state. He also believed that the question of Serbs in Croatia could be solved peacefully by a way of "compassionate transfer of populations" (*humanin preseljenima*) (Hudelist 2004, 681-684). Banac (1993) suggests that Tudjman may have underestimated Slobodan Milosevic. With regard to the war with BiH (Bosnia and Herzegovina), it is believed that he was pushed into that war by the Herzegovina lobby and by Gojko Susak (who becomes the Minister of Defense during his first administration) (Hudelist 2004: 681-684).

Generally, he is thought to have been a complex political figure. To some he is a "revolutionary, statesman, and a scholar" (Rados 2005, 6). To academics he is largely dismissed as a not serious scholar (Sadkovich 2006). To Ivica Racan, the leader of the social democrats, Tudjman is an important figure in the history of Croatia. However, Racan stops short of declaring him a great politician. He argues that in the fight for independence, in the circumstances of war, Tudjman played an important role in the history of Croatia (Rados 2005, 227). Tudjman's personality was perfect for circumstances of war. He may have been a "statesman, but he wasn't a democrat" (Rados 2005, 227). Hrvoje Sarinic, agrees that Tudjman "could have not been a

democrat in the Western European sense,” because he had too much power (Rados 2005, 227).

One of the biggest critics of Franjo Tudjman’s politics is Davor Butkovic. To Butkovic, Tudjman was a great politician in domestic politics, but made many mistakes in his dealings with other nations (Rados 2005). Butkovic describes Tudjman as very courageous (*hrabar covjek*) and one who took responsibility for his actions (Rados 2005). The current president (as of 2009) of Croatia, Stipe Mesic also considers him as a very courageous man. To the jurist and politician, Perica Juric, Tudjman was a “dominant political power in the country. To him the parliament was only a transmission....and Tudjman loved anything associated with power, and power is not only associated with the army, police and his seniority, but money, too, and he loved money” (Rados 2005, 230).

Franjo Tudjman is a complex political figure who needs to be studied further (Sadkovich 2006). The preceding discussion suggests that accounts about him are often contradictory and yield limited understanding of his political behavior. Thus, by utilizing operational code analysis to study his belief system, we could get an improved understanding of his political beliefs and political actions. In addition to enhancing our understanding of his worldview, we would strengthen our understanding of the events that unfolded in former Yugoslavia from 1991-1995. Accordingly, one of the basic research questions of this project is: what is the worldview of Franjo Tudjman?

Slobodan Milosevic

By 1987, it became increasingly difficult for the former Yugoslavia to survive. The deepening of the financial crisis, the stagnant economy, and the ever increasing ethnic tensions in Kosovo and elsewhere, were straining the federal government to a

point of no return. Calls for decentralization in Slovenia and Croatia were met with furious opposition in Belgrade, Serbia. The political landscape was changing. In 1987, Slobodan Milosevic, a former banker and a low level party bureaucrat used his power of patronage to take control of Serbia. Milosevic used the Eight Session of the LC of Serbia to take full control of Serbia and to begin the process of centralizing the federal government in his hands. The Croat and Slovenian politicians began accusing him autocratic tendencies suggesting that he was aiming at destroying Yugoslavia on behalf of Serbia (Ramet 2002, 26-28).

Slobodan Milosevic was born in the town of Pozarevac, Serbia in 1941, just a few months after German forces invaded Yugoslavia. Both of his parents were originally from Montenegro. His father—because of his unhappiness with Pozarevac’s provincial culture—would eventually move back to Montenegro, leaving Milosevic and his family behind (Lebor 2004). Slobodan Milosevic’s formative years were spent living with his mother and older brother Borislav. He was a serious young boy who did not make friends at school. Instead, he opted to take refuge in books (Lebor 2004, 13-14). Several scholars have suggested that to get a complete understanding of Slobodan Milosevic’s personality, one would have to study the personality of his wife, Mira (Mirjana) Markovic, as well. Mira Markovic’s personality parallels that of Slobodan Milosevic’s personality. Slobodan Milosevic met his wife while attending high school in his hometown of Pozarevac.

Mira Markovic is considered to have been a very unusual person. She is described as intelligent but emotionally unstable. Her coworkers at Belgrade University remember her as someone who told sad stories and would often times cry in front of her

students (Sell 2002). Despite Mira Markovic's alleged unsteady personality, she would continue to play an important role in his rise to power. She remained his personal confidante throughout his life, and would later found the political party, JUL (Yugoslav Left). Mira Markovic enjoyed a luxurious life. This was because both of her parents were prominent partisans in the war for national liberation. Her father managed to survive the war—and later had an estranged relationship with his daughter—but her mother was killed a month prior to the liberation of Belgrade by Tito's forces in 1944 (Lebor 2004). The circumstances of her mother's death are disputed. It is believed that she was caught by German forces, and after revealing secrets to them, was later executed by the partisans. This is an account Mira Markovic disputes, arguing that her mother was a loyal partisan and a devoted Marxist believer (Lebor 2004, 17-27).

As far as his political development is concerned, Slobodan Milosevic's rise to power was relatively slow. He seems to have shown little interest in politics and his work resume -- after graduating from Law school in 1963 when he worked in low to mid-level bureaucratic jobs in Serbia -- is a testament to his lack of interest in politics. However, this would later change when he meets Ivan Stambolic (former president of Serbia who is ousted by Milosevic in 1987), his mentor and close friend. Ivan Stambolic played a pivotal role in Milosevic's climb up the communist ladder. Stambolic makes Milosevic the deputy director (Ivan Stambolic was the director) at Tehnogas, a Yugoslav gas company. Later, with Ivan Stambolic's promotion to the president of the League of Communists of Serbia, Milosevic becomes the director of Tehnogas. After his stint as the director of Tehnogas, he would leave to become an international banker for Beogradska Banka, before eventually being catapulted as the head of the League of

Communists of Serbia (after Ivan Stambolic left the post to become President of Serbia) (Post 2004, 180-182). Moreover, Slobodan Milosevic's rise to power is closely linked with the emergence of Serb nationalism in Kosovo, a sentiment which he successfully exploited to gain political legitimacy in Serbia (Lebor 2004, 88-99).

As previously noted, Slobodan Milosevic did not show keen interest in politics until relatively later in life. He did, however, show an aptitude for politics while still a law student at the University of Belgrade. At a time when the Yugoslav regime was debating to change the name of the country from the "People's" Republic to the Federation of the socialist republic of Yugoslavia, Milosevic, who was in attendance at one of the proposed meetings, raised his hand and suggested that the party emphasize the name "Socialist" by putting it in front of Yugoslavia's new name -- the Socialist Federation of the Republic of Yugoslavia. People's Republic of Yugoslavia becomes SFRJ (Socialisticka Federativna Republika Jugoslavije). Milosevic's lack of interest in politics in his early days is corroborated by his wife's accounts of the early years. Mira Markovic contends that Slobodan Milosevic was content remaining an international banker (while employed at Beogradska Banka). However, later events -- beginning in early 1980's--would prove crucial to his transformation from an international banker at Beogradska Banka, to a nationalist associated with the destruction of Yugoslavia.

The Serbian communist party had since 1981 argued for a unified and strong Serbia as a prerequisite for a strong Yugoslavia. The extension of autonomy to Kosovo and Vojvodina, the party argued, had contributed to Yugoslavia's disintegration. Slobodan Milosevic, at the time a member of party argued for a strong and unified Serbia. Ivan Stambolic was seen more as a career politician whose support of Serbian re-

unification was largely formal. Milosevic was seen as a strong leader who was prepared to do anything necessary in pursuit of that goal. In the month after 1987 (the year of the purge of the communist leadership of Serbia) Milosevic had acquired more political power than any other political leader since Tito (Ramet 2002).

Slobodan Milosevic's removal of the old communist leadership (Stambolic and his adherents) was followed with another, more complex assault on Yugoslavia. Through, what Sabrina Ramet (2002, 35) calls a "bureaucratic revolution" and with the help of staged street demonstrations, Milosevic moved to consolidate all of Serbia. By January 1981, the new leadership in Serbia had already begun drafting a new constitution which would strip away Kosovo's and Vojvodina's autonomy. Slovenia, Croatia, and Macedonia responded by trying to defend Tito's Yugoslavia but their efforts did not manage to stop his rise to power (Ramet 2002, 35-36). Slobodan Milosevic's strategy was both nationalist and populist. He was a masterful manipulator of public opinion. In his efforts to recentralize Serbia, he restored to grace many Serbian dissidents, including Milovan Djilas and the controversial poet Gojko Djogo (Ramet 2002). The response to Milosevic's rise in Serbia was weak. Milosevic effectively suppressed any form of dissent in Serbia. This political climate in the country as a whole became especially tense in Kosovo, Slovenia and Croatia. Yugoslavia was disintegrating culturally and economically and by 1989, it began to disintegrate politically as well. The political systems of the republics were still operating within the federal constitution; but on the informal level here was a widening gap between the policies enacted by Slovenia and Croatia on one hand and Serbia on the other. Milosevic's prominent rise had a negative effect on the rest of the republics (Ramet 41-42).

To Post (2002) Milosevic was an autocrat who showed a chilling indifference to the sufferings of his people. He had a tendency to externalize his problems and this made him a master of political betrayals. He would often betray those very close to him. In addition to betraying his close mentor, Ivan Stambolic, he is believed to have betrayed Vojislav Seselj, Vuk Draskovic Radovan Karadzic (Post 2004, 182- 184). Radovan Karadzic was the leader of the Bosnian Serbs. He and Milosevic developed a joint strategy to conquer the territory of Bosnia inhabited with Serbs. Milosevic turned on him when Karadzic grew too strong (Zimmermann 1996). Vojislav Seselj, a self-proclaimed Serb nationalist, was supported by Milosevic during the war in Bosnia, but was later betrayed by Milosevic when Seselj became a rival (Zimmermann 1996). Vuk Draskovic was a Serb nationalist of a lesser kind, who was the only one brave enough to challenge Milosevic directly. Vuk Draskovic and his wife Danica were imprisoned and beaten by Milosevic's secret police (Zimmermann 1996). All of these personalities played a role in his rise to power. Although often described as a brilliant tactician, Slobodan Milosevic never managed to achieve that which he planned to achieve -- Greater Serbia (Sell 2002).

To Louis Sell (2002, 124) Milosevic was an autocrat whose "aversion to anything that smacks of genuine democratic choice is one of the most persistent legacies of [his] background." According to Sell, Milosevic was the most resistant in Yugoslavia to allowing opposition parties. In the first multi-party elections of Serbia in 1990, 45 political parties were registered and put on the ballot. There was only one prominent opposition figure, that of Vuk Draskovic, a former journalist who becomes the leader of the opposition as the president of his political party, SPO. Milosevic used everything at his disposal even the police and the army to eliminate his opposition. To this extent, Sell

argues, Milosevic was a very capable politician and an excellent campaigner who understood that moving to the center was the best way for winning votes.

The international community's indifference towards the crisis in Yugoslavia (particularly in the early years of the break up), is important in understanding Milosevic's rise to power. For Louis Sell (2002), the failure of the international community to handle the crisis in Yugoslavia was a result of the revamping of the international order—collapse of the Soviet Union. This alteration of the international order created a political vacuum which contributed to the rise of Milosevic's nationalist policies in Yugoslavia. For one thing, he would defy the international community's efforts to stop the tragic events that would later unfold in Yugoslavia. The outcome of the Dayton Peace Accords is especially important. At Dayton, he confused the international community into believing that he was the solution to the crisis, rather than the cause (Sell 2002). In his return from Dayton in 1995, he is hailed as the peacemaker, rather than a warmonger.

Ronald Wintrobe (1999, 2) argues that "his warlike actions towards other groups like Croats and Albanians are best understood.....as the attempts of a competitive politician trying to survive in a situation where the old basis of power...had disintegrated." Milosevic may have started the process that led to the eventual break-up of Yugoslavia but he could not keep control of it once the crisis unfolded. Although he is generally portrayed as the "butcher of Yugoslavia," many of his closest observers describe him as clever and capable. Milosevic possessed one unique trait. One of his associates observed how Milosevic "decides first what is expedient for him to believe, and then he believes it" (Cohen 2001, 106). He is usually described as a good tactician but lacking a long term strategy. The Bosnian Serb leader Biljana Plavsic describes him

as a very capable person, charming but often times lacking a long term commitment to his policies (Cohen 2001). He was described as being very loyal, especially to his immediate staff.

Veljko Vujacic (2004, 186) writes that “it is commonly stated that Milosevic positioned himself as a Serbian nationalist...” the fact that is often overlooked is his ability to appeal to the strong Yugoslavia sentiments of Serbs and Montenegrins in Yugoslavia. According to Vujacic, his famous speech of 1987, the term “Yugoslavia” and “Serbia” is a codeword for state. Milosevic had to cover simultaneously two constituencies: the Serbian nationalist one, and the Yugoslav one. In this fashion, Slobodan Milosevic was a charismatic leader. He portrayed himself as not only a defender of Yugoslavia but of Serbian national interests as well.

Some analysts suggest that Milosevic’s rise to power was largely an accident. They attribute one moment in his political development as the pivotal moment in his rise to power. On April 24 1987, Slobodan Milosevic, upon Stambolic’s request (Stambolic was then the president of Serbia), was sent to Kosovo Polje to address the Serb population’s growing concern about Albanian nationalism in Kosovo. What transpired during that visit would forever alter his view of the world around him. A crowd of approximately 15,000 people demanded that Milosevic answer their growing grievances against the Kosovo Albanians. It is believed that it is in Kosovo that he uttered his now mythologized remarks: “No one will be allowed to beat you! No one will be allowed to beat you” (Cohen 2001, 63). Cohen (2001, 64) suggests that this meeting “was his epiphanal moment.” A shift in his worldview occurred and Slobodan Milosevic was transformed from a cautious Titoist to a post-Titoist politician who, in 1989 on the 600th

anniversary of the Battle of Kosovo, would unleash the Serb nationalism that would only two years later start Yugoslavia's bloody collapse (Cohen 2001).

Summary of Chapter

The preceding discussion demonstrates that Slobodan Milosevic and Franjo Tudjman are intriguing personalities who merit further systematic attention. It suggests that the accounts about these two leaders are contradictory or opaque and yield limited understanding about their political behavior. By utilizing operational code analysis to study their belief system, we could get an improved understanding of their political behavior. In addition to enhancing our understanding of their worldview, this would also strengthen our understanding of the events that unfolded in former Yugoslavia from 1991-1999.

CHAPTER FOUR

Theory and Methods

In this chapter I will lay out the theory and methods associated with leadership analysis. There are several ways in which we could conceptualize the worldview of these two leaders, as a worldview can be composed of a number of constructs. As many of these have been studied, a brief overview of these approaches is necessary before proceeding to discuss Operational Code analysis and Leadership Trait Analysis, the methodology used in this dissertation. Over the years, several different analytical approaches have taken up the task of linking cognition with foreign policy decision-making. Researchers have studied the link between historical analogies and foreign policy choices (Breuning 2003; Hemmer 1999; Houghton 1996), images (Boulding 1956; Jervis 1976; Cottam 1977, 1994, Herman & Fischkeller 1995; Schafer 1997, 2000; Young & Schafer 1998), conceptual and integrative complexity (Suedfeld and Rank 1976; Wallace and Suedfeld 1988), cognitive maps (Axelrod 1976; Young 1996), and operational code (Leites 1951, 1953; George 1969; Holsti 1970; Walker, Schafer & Young 1998; Crichlow 2000).

In this portion I will go through a few other systems before proceeding to the main discussion on Operational Code and Leadership Trait Analysis. For example, research on analogical reasoning asserts that prior historical events are an important analytical reference in determining foreign policy decisions (Houghton 1996). It is generally accepted that leaders use case-based inferences to make sense of situations in which they find themselves (Houghton 1996; Jervis 1976). Historical analogies help policy makers evaluate the situation by operating as a diagnostic device. Houghton found

that policy makers use historical analogies even in unprecedented situations. Research on historical analogies derives from the theoretical and empirical advances made in cognitive research. It derives from the hypothesis that human beings tend to use shortcuts—heuristics—which allow them to process information more quickly and inexpensively than otherwise believed (Houghton 1996, 524-525). Incoming information is usually matched with a pre-existing schema—in this case, a pre-existing case—which helps us to define the situation. In addition, historical analogies operate as prescription devices. They help us evaluate policy choices, predict the chances of success, and warn us about potential dangers associated with policy choices (Houghton 1996, 525). Consequently, Hemmer (1999) has also found that state interests are affected by the process of analogical reasoning. Lessons of history operate as a cognitive roadmap (Hemmer 1999).

Dyson and Preston (2007) have studied the relationship between two personality traits, conceptual complexity and policy expertise with the usage of historical analogies (sophisticated vs. non-sophisticated) in foreign policy decision making. They have found that leaders with low conceptual complexity used non-sophisticated analogies very frequently compared to the leaders with high levels of conceptual complexity who used more sophisticated analogies (a goodness of fit measure – chi square – showed statistical significance). Also, low conceptual complexity leaders drew more analogies from their own generation and their own cultural context. Leaders with high conceptual complexity drew analogies from wider range of sources (see Dyson and Preston 2007). Interestingly, both types of leaders (low complexity and high complexity) relied on generally available than personally experienced events for their analogies. The authors also found that expert

policy makers (*Policy Expertise Measure*) will draw analogies from their own experience to a greater degree than non experts. Leaders' whose conceptual complexity score is higher (JFK) generated analogies based on deep structural features, whereas leaders' who score low on conceptual complexity (Truman) generated analogies based on superficial features (Dyson and Preston 2007).

The scholarship on the role of personality traits in foreign policy decision-making is vast. Margaret G. Hermann (1980a, 1980b, 1984a, 1987b, 1988, 1993, 2002) has identified 7 traits which, according to her, can help determine a leader's leadership style in foreign policy decision-making: 1) the belief in one's ability to control events, 2) the need for power and influence, 3) conceptual complexity (ability to differentiate things and people in one's environment, or structural vs. superficial differentiation), 4) self-confidence, 5) the tendency to focus on problem solving vs. maintenance of the group, 6) distrust, 7) in-Group bias. These seven traits provide the researcher with valuable information on how political leaders respond to the constraints in their environment, process information, and what motivates them to action (Hermann 2002).

The role of conceptual complexity in foreign policy behavior has been studied extensively. The scholarship on conceptual complexity argues that leaders differ in the way they process information. The research has shown that conceptually complex leaders are more sensitive to environmental changes, whereas conceptually simple people are less responsive to their political environment (Suedfeld & Rank 1976; Herman 1977; Wallace & Suedfeld 1988; Young & Schafer 1998). The measurement of integrative complexity is a cognitive tool used to assess leadership performance. This research studies the level of information differentiation and integration that characterizes the

information processing of a policy maker (Wallace & Suedfeld 1988). At the simple end, policy makers have a low level of information integration and differentiation. At the other hand, they are marked with the ability to integrate other dimensions of information and possess high levels of differentiation (Suedfeld 1978; Wallace & Suedfeld 1988). When confronted with a political decision, conceptually complex leaders seek alternative sources of information before making the decisions. Thus, conceptually complex people are categorized as successful leaders, whereas conceptually simple people are categorized as unsuccessful leaders. In addition, conceptually simple leaders are generally characterized as rigid, simple-minded and belief driven (Young & Schafer 1998).

Another strand of research has looked into the role of perception in foreign policy decision-making. Image theory posits that policymaker's perception of the enemy can significantly influence foreign policy choices (Young & Schafer 1998). Image theory argues that international images affect attitudes and behavior of leaders in crisis situations (Schafer 1997). Kenneth Boulding (1956) first argued about the role that image of self and others have in foreign policy decision-making. Images operate as "cognitive sorting" to make sense of the increasingly complex environment. Images, then, operate as psychological shortcuts. Perceptions of images (self & others) become interpretations of the reality (Young & Schafer 1998). In turn, these perceptions influence policy choices. Elsewhere, scholars have tried constructing cognitive maps as a tool in understanding foreign policy decision-making. In this dissertation I use Operational Code Analysis and Leadership Trait Analysis because of they are the best way of measuring cognition and traits, which is the main thesis of this dissertation.

Operational Code Analysis

Operational code analysis studies leaders' political beliefs as influencing foreign policy behavior. Operational code analysis was first developed by Nathan Leites (1951, 1953) to help U.S. policymakers make sense of the Soviet's negotiation behavior after WWII. Operational code construct has since been modified by Alexander George (1969, 1979) and Ole Holsti (1977). Alexander George and Ole Holsti took Leites work and focused it on a specific set of beliefs associated with political behavior. They turned the operational code construct as developed by Leites (1951, 1953) and turned into a political belief system in which some leaders' philosophical beliefs determine their instrumental beliefs. A leader's instrumental beliefs dictate his/her course of action. Political beliefs, then, become causal mechanisms that determine one's foreign policy choices. In order to assess a leader's political beliefs, George (1979) develops ten questions that are now used as a model in structuring operational codes. The questions are:

The Philosophical Beliefs in an Operational Code

- P-1. What is the "essential" nature of political life? Is the political universe essentially one of harmony or conflict? What is the fundamental character of one's political opponents?
- P-2. What are the prospects for the eventual realization of one's fundamental values and aspirations? Can one be optimistic, or must one be pessimistic on this score; and in what respects the one and/or the other?
- P-3. Is the political future predictable? In what sense and to what extent?
- P-4. How much "control" or "mastery" can one have over historical development? What is one's role in "moving" and "shaping" history in the desired direction?
- P-5. What is the role of chance in human affairs and in historical development?

The Instrumental Beliefs in an Operational Code

- I-1. What is the best approach for selecting goals or objectives for political action?
- I-2. How are the goals of action pursued most effectively?
- I-3. How are risks of political action calculated, controlled, and accepted?
- I-4. What is the best "timing" of action to advance one's interests?
- I-5. What is the utility and role of different means for advancing one's interests?

The five philosophical beliefs represent the worldview of the leader, whereas the five instrumental beliefs represent the best course of action—strategy. The argument is that the leader’s actions are internally consistent with his/her political beliefs.

Operational code analysis, as a tool for studying leadership, has been applied to studying presidents (e.g., Walker 1984; Walker, Schafer & Young 1998; Schafer & Crichlow 2000), prime ministers, secretaries of state and foreign ministers (e.g., Holsti 1970; Walker 1977; Crichlow 1998), committee members, bureaucrats, etc.

Focusing on the philosophical beliefs of operational code construct enables one to determine Franjo Tudjman’s and Slobodan Milosevic’s worldview. To determine Franjo Tudjman’s and Slobodan Milosevic’s worldview, I am going to look at their prepared speeches to their parliaments, respectively. Operational codes can be measured from these comments using software that has been developed specifically for this purpose.

Leadership Trait Analysis

Empirical research shows that the personal characteristics of political leaders affect their government’s foreign policy behavior, and the list of such influential characteristics extends beyond the operational code. For example, in her study of political leaders’ leadership style, Margaret Hermann (1980) has found that personality traits can account for differences in the leaders’ foreign policy behavior. Her data suggests that leaders who are more aggressive tend to have predictable scores on a number of personality attributes – they are more distrustful, more nationalistic, have low conceptual complexity, and are high in need for power. Leaders who exhibit conciliatory behavior, have a higher degree of conceptual complexity, low distrust score, and are relatively low in nationalism and in the need for power trait (Hermann 1980).

In the study of George H.W. Bush and Gorbachev's leadership traits and operational codes, Winter et al (1991) have found that the two leaders differed markedly in their approach to foreign policy. For example, their study suggests that Gorbachev was less interpersonally oriented compared to George H.W Bush and more task oriented than George H.W Bush who was a more interpersonally focused leader and less task oriented. This, in addition to differences between Gorbachev's and Bush's belief in the ability to control events and self-confidence produced differences between these leaders' approaches to foreign policy issues.

Similarly, Stephen Dyson (2007) has shown that such individual-level characteristics can account for Blair's decision to go to war with Iraq. These studies argue that leadership styles of political leaders have an impact on the decision making process of governments, especially if the political leaders occupy an important position of influence in their governments.

To assess Franjo Tudjman's and Slobodan Milosevic's worldview, this dissertation will employ the automated content analysis system VICS. VICS is a technique used to measure a leader's psychological characteristics at a distance (Schafer & Walker 2006). It measures a leader's philosophical and instrumental beliefs using verbs as a unit of analysis, specifically using the degree and intensity of verb utterances. This dissertation utilizes Franjo Tudjman's and Slobodan Milosevic's verbal statements from their respective speeches to assess their psychological dispositions. As a quantitative technique of content analysis, VICS was first developed by Walker, Schafer, and Young (1998) to overcome problems associated with qualitative content analysis. VICS focuses on the verbs uttered by political leaders by presenting a leader's

operational code in terms of numeric indices (Crichlow 1998). The computer software, *Profiler Plus* is used for coding purposes; this is done to eliminate the problems of validity associated with manual coding.

In order to measure individual traits this dissertation also uses the statistical software program, *Profiler Plus*. In measuring Tudjman's and Milosevic leadership traits the focus is on the frequency of words and modifiers associated with each leadership trait. For example, in coding for conceptual complexity the focus is on words that denote leader's high level of differentiation as opposed to the words that denote that a leader's sees the environment around him as generally simplistic. In coding for distrust the focus is on nouns referring to persons other than the leader. In coding for in-group bias the focus is on modifiers that suggest some form of affinity to the leader's own group.

Profiler Plus was used to code for these two traits.

Data

This dissertation uses Franjo Tudjman's political speeches made to his parliaments from the period of 1990-1999, and Slobodan Milosevic's public statements from 1989 to 1999. Speeches are gathered from different sources. For Slobodan Milosevic, this includes the Slobodan Milosevic Freedom Center website (<http://www.slobodan-milosevic.org/hague/about.htm>). Speeches from this website will be selected randomly from a pool of speeches ranging from 1990 to 1999. Other speeches were sampled from his book, *Godina Raspleta*.

CHAPTER FIVE

An in Depth Analysis of Franjo Tudjman's Operational Code and Leadership Traits

The political profile of Franjo Tudjman is disputed. The literature on the former president is scarce, and much of it is contradictory. Much of this literature comes from Croatian sources (Baric 2002; Bekavac 2002; Butkovic and Grakalic 1991; Hudelist 2004; Rados 2005) which may be biased by the authors' personal perspectives. Likewise, while Western scholars have attempted to understand Tudjman (Holbrooke 1998; Kearns 1998; Owen 1995; Ramet 2005; Silber and Little 1996; Zimmerman 1999) much of their work is based on assumptions that remain to be systematically tested, and may reflect the facets of Tudjman that the West has prioritized based on its own priorities. The contrasting views presented by domestic versus international analyses leave us with a hazy understanding of a man who played a key role in both his country's political development and in European politics. In this chapter, I attempt to resolve this controversy by studying Tudjman's psychological characteristics relevant to his decision-making behavior through at-a-distance analysis. Specifically, I measure Tudjman's operational code and three leadership traits: conceptual complexity, distrust, and in-group bias. Through this systematic analysis I seek to settle some of the controversies in descriptive histories, and advance a more precise understanding of his approach to politics and foreign policy.

As I will recount below, the existing literature is divided on both the nature of his core political views and traits, and his leadership style. There is an especially notable

divide over whether personal characteristics such as an ingrained nationalism drove his political behavior, or if instead he was attentive and responsive to other political actors, and conducted a less personal foreign policy. By systematically assessing his world view and personality traits, we will have a more-informed answer to this question, and answers to other disagreements in the literature on this controversial leader.

In order to establish reliable measurements that will clarify our understanding of President Tudjman this research employs at-a-distance measures of his psychological characteristics. These techniques allow us to systematically measure both cognitions and personality traits relevant to foreign policy decision making. To measure Tudjman's foreign policy belief system, this paper utilizes operational code analysis (Walker, Schafer and Young 1998, 1999, 2003). Operational code analysis has been used to measure leaders' core foreign policy beliefs for decades (George 1969, 1979; Holsti 1970, 1977; Leites 1951; McLellan 1971), and in the last decade coding schemes have been developed which allow for more reliable measurements (Walker, Schafer and Young 1998, Schafer and Walker 2006, cite the new book). It conceives of an individual's foreign policy world view as the product of answers to a basic set of questions about the nature and valence of political behavior. The answers to such questions touch on one's core understanding of the political world.

Along with studying Tudjman's beliefs, I will also measure three aspects of his personality using coding schemes associated with Leadership Trait Analysis (LTA) (Hermann, 2003) - conceptual complexity, level of distrust, and in-group bias. Systematically scored personality traits may provide us with key data about both his

preferred policies and his decision-making style that is not captured by examining his cognitions.

For example, consider the effects of complexity. Research has shown that conceptually complex leaders are more sensitive to environmental changes, whereas conceptually simple people are less responsive to their political environment. When confronted with a political decision or situation, conceptually complex leaders seek alternative sources of information before making a choice. Conceptually simple leaders see the world in more simplistic terms and are less likely to consider other sources of information before making a decision (Dille and Young 2000; Hermann 1977, 1980, Wallace and Suedfeld 1988; Young and Schafer 1998). Tadjman's 'score' on this characteristic could help us understand how strongly we should expect his political choices to mirror his personal views, whether he is likely to shift his behavior, and how he will interact with those around him during the process of decision-making.

Additionally, leadership trait analysis literature has shown that leaders' distrust towards others, be they people or institutions, is correlated with certain types of foreign policy behavior (Crichlow 2002; Hermann 2002, 2003; Winter et al., 1991). In particular, leaders who are distrustful of others and score low on conceptual complexity are more likely to exhibit aggressive behavior (Hermann 1980; Winter et al. 1991). One could expect them to quickly turn against cooperative measures and be less willing to rely on or even listen to others. This may also give us some insight into one of the great debates over Tadjman -- just how nationalistic was he (Siber and Little 1996; Stokes 1982; Treanor 1997; Uzelak 1998; Zimmerman 1999)?

A third personality trait may give us even more insight into Tadjman's nationalism and dealings with others. Like distrust, in-group bias is another personality trait that informs us about leaders' motivations toward the world (Hermann, 2002). The literature on foreign policy decision-making has shown that a leader's motivation towards the world affects his country's foreign policy behavior (Hagan 1994, 1995; Herman and Kegley 1995; Hermann 2002; Kelman 1983; Snyder 1991), and in-group bias, along with distrust, can inform our understanding of how a political leader sees, and will deal with, those around him or herself.

This chapter begins with a more extensive review of the literature on President Tadjman. I will review different interpretations of Tadjman relating to his level of nationalism, his leadership style, his attitudes toward international conflict and cooperation, and perceived similarities between President Tadjman and President Milosevic. I will then explain the psychological approach to investigating these questions, and examine how Tadjman's psychological profile, as measured through these techniques, fits with the existing literature. In so doing I do not aim to rewrite history. But I provide evidence that the political portrait of Tadjman that is often painted in the West may be somewhat flawed, and provide data which may be useful in future studies of Tadjman or Croatia politics and foreign policy.

Who Was Franjo Tadjman?

Though he played a crucial role in his country's history and in recent European political history, the literature on Franjo Tadjman is opaque. There are biographies of him, but many are written in Croatian and have not been translated. These are often considered to be biased (Sadkovich 2006). The same is said about literature written on

Tudjman in the English language, though the direction of a bias is usually taken to be different (Owen 1995; Silber and Little 1996; Holbrooke 1998; Kearns 1998; Glenny 1999; Zimmerman 1999). Understanding his leadership becomes more difficult when taking into account the immensity of the self-reported data on Tudjman. He was a historian by training and a prolific writer, and he published almost everything he wrote (Sadkovich 2006). Given the scale of his writings, and his attempts to shape his own image, his writings confuse rather than clarify (Sadkovich 2006).

Of those who have analyzed Tudjman, Sabrina P. Ramet (2005) is a typical example of the scholars in Western Europe and the United States who have highlighted Tudjman's nationalism and behaviors in line with nationalist views. These include his introduction of the new checkered flag "sahovnica" (the symbol associated with the Ustasha government of WWII), and his remarks that he was glad that his wife was neither a Jew nor a Serb. Sabrina P. Ramet (2005) notes that some Western scholars are largely united in painting Tudjman as a nationalist and/or an anti-Semite. This classification of Franjo Tudjman is most often based on Tudjman's policies against the media, the Serbs, and the Bosnian Muslims, but extends to other political acts as well. Ramet (2005) notes that James J. Sadkovich (1995, 2005, and 2006) is the only Western writer who has been a strong defender of Tudjman and his policies during the war with the former Yugoslavia. To Sadkovich, the Western interpretations of Franjo Tudjman are mostly tainted with either personal bias or media bias. According to Sadkovich, Franjo Tudjman merits further study and deeper analysis.

In terms of Tudjman's political orientation it is believed that the views of the writers who had direct contact with the Croat leader may have been influenced by the

negative experiences with Tadjman. For example, Zimmerman (1999), Owen (1995), and Holbrooke (1998) all met Franjo Tadjman during their careers. All paint a negative picture of him. A similar possible bias, but from the opposite perspective, could be attributed to the Croats who have written on the president. Ivan Bekavac, saw Tadjman as a “scholar” (znanstvenik) and a politician who tirelessly studied and researched the question of Croatian sovereignty (2002, p. 13). Nikica Baric (2005, 52) highlights Tadjman’s impressive military career and refers to him as “the former general of JNA, a historian, and later a Croat political dissident.”

As a scholar (historian) and an outspoken critic of Yugoslavia’s Communist regime, Tadjman early on came into direct conflict with the Serbian regime in Belgrade. Bekavac holds that his political views and his political socialization are intrinsically linked with his scholarly inquiries and career (Bekavac 2002, pp. 14-15). Several of his works were highly criticized by Belgrade as having been openly nationalistic and dangerously Serbophobic. Very early in his scholarly career, Tadjman was labeled a Croat nationalist by the Yugoslav regime in Belgrade (something he himself addresses in his book *Horrors of War: Historical Reality and Philosophy*) (Hudelist 2004). This label would follow him deep into his presidency and would remain one of the most common descriptors of him until his death in 1999.

Nationalism

Several scholars have stated that Tadjman’s main goal in life was the formation of a Croatian state (Butkovic and Grakalic 1991; Owen 1995; Silber and Little 1996; Zimmerman 1999; Sadkovich 2006). Tadjman himself said as much. Butkovic and Grakalic (1991, p. 21) consider him to be the first “authentic leader of Croatian people,”

and someone who insisted relentlessly on Croatia's sovereignty. This firm belief made him a controversial figure, and predictably the Serbs labeled him as a dangerous nationalist bent on destroying Yugoslavia (Butkovic and Grakalic 1991). Tudjman spent most of his adult life - from his years in the Yugoslav army, to his days as a director of the institute of Croatia's history of the workers' movement, to his days as a political dissident, all the way to his election as the first president of independent Croatia – advocating for the rights of Croats in the former Yugoslavia (Hudelist 2004). This goal led him to pursue courses of action that eventually lead to the separation of Croatia from the former Yugoslavia (SFRJ).

Franjo Tudjman strongly believed that every people regardless of its size “has the natural and historical right for their place and sovereignty in the human community, just as does a person in the human society” (Bekavac 2002, p. 17). It is inferred that this pro-Croat tenor made him a target of the Yugoslav secret service and Tudjman was constantly monitored. In 1971, he was arrested on charges of an anti-Yugoslav conspiracy after which he becomes increasingly detached from politics (Rados 2005). It is believed that this experience made him warier of Belgrade's intentions about the interests of Croats in Yugoslavia, something he himself confirms in his book *Horrors of War: Historical Reality and Philosophy*.

While prominent in the literature, some scholars do not support the “Croat nationalist” thesis in its entire form. For example, Darko Hudelist (2004) focuses on an intriguing question about Franjo Tudjman's political life which concerns his transformation from a Titoist follower to a strong advocate of Croatia's statehood. Tudjman himself supported this thesis in *Horrors of War: Historical Reality and*

Philosophy (Tudjman 2001). But accounts of this transformation occurred have yielded contradictory conclusions. Hudelist offers two competing theories about this question - the “theory of continuity” and the “theory of discontinuity” (Hudelist 2004, pp. 233-250). The theory of continuity asserts that Tudjman may have been a Croat nationalist throughout his life. On the other hand, the theory of discontinuity suggests that Tudjman’s political transformation from a Titoist follower to a Croat nationalist occurred as a result of political education (Hudelist 2004, pp. 233-250). Tudjman has always maintained that he is a patriot (rodoljub) (Sadkovich 2006). Tudjman himself declared: “... if I wasn’t for Croatia, they would have acknowledged my anti-fascism” (*Da nisam za Hrvatsku, priznali bi mi antifasizam*).

My analysis cannot answer all of these questions or solve all these disputes. But by establishing systematic measurements of personality traits and cognitions associated with nationalism, I hope to be able to shed light on the depth of his nationalism, and help adjudicate this dispute.

Leadership Style

The struggle for a clearer understanding of Tudjman’s personal characteristics is further complicated by conflicting interpretations of his leadership style and leadership effectiveness. Different interpretations of him are due in part to the different beliefs of authors regarding what were or would have been effective policies for Croatia during the conflict. For example, to the Croat journalist Ivica Rados (2005) Tudjman was a great leader, while to the Croat historian Ivo Banac, who has published extensively on the former Yugoslavia, Tudjman was someone who lacked imagination (Banac 1993). Banac is referring to Tudjman’s conciliatory stance toward Milosevic during the first

phase of the war with the Yugoslav forces (1991-1993). Additionally, Banac (1993, p. 20) uses words such as “naive” to describe Tudjman’s leadership abilities during the first phase of the war. During this time period Tudjman was more cooperative with the Serb authorities, especially with Slobodan Milosevic. During his first meeting with Milosevic in Karadjordjevo in March of 1991, Tudjman exhibited perhaps unexpected cooperative behavior. He believed Milosevic’s promise that the dissolution of Yugoslavia would be peaceful (Rados 2005). Such beliefs inform his critics’ assessment.

In contrast to critics like Banac, Andrija Hebrang (2002, p. 134) praises Tudjman for his leadership abilities, and depicts him as not only a “president, political leader, but also a supreme military leader.” Hebrang (2002) admits that Tudjman made mistakes, but he praises him for guiding Croatia from war to statehood. To Hebrang (2002) Tudjman’s mistakes are comparable to the mistakes of other great leaders of the past, such as Bismarck of Germany, Churchill of United Kingdom, and Ataturk of Turkey.

Those who worked most closely with him express a favorable opinion of Franjo Tudjman. They commend Tudjman for being flexible and a good decision-maker (Rados 2005). The consensus among them is that he was a great statesman, but not a great politician (Rados 2005). They saw him playing an important role in leading Croatia through a difficult period, but while a leader he was also cautious, weighing the environment around him before coming to a decision. To his supporters, his “wait-and-see” approach during the first phase of the war (1991-1993) is considered to be an indicator of superior decision-making ability (Rados 2005).

My analysis--the traits and cognitions I measure-- are part of a number of systems that are used to assess leadership style (Hermann, 2003). These data can then help establish baselines for investigations of Tudjman's approach to leadership.

Attitudes Regarding International Conflict and Cooperation

During the first phase of the war (1991-1993), Tudjman pursued a twofold strategy. On one level, he emphasized negotiations as a peaceful way to solve the crisis. Rados (2005, p. 57) argues that "Tudjman did not foresee the possibility of war and did not, according to his opposition, believe in the possibility that JNA (Yugoslav National Army) would turn into a Serbian army." Whether or not his willingness to negotiate with Milosevic in 1991 is seen as a testament to broadly cooperative behavior or whether it was part of a specific foreign policy strategy stemming from a position of strategic weakness is something that is still disputed among Croatia's political circles. For example, the politician Drazen Budisa, argues that "Tudjman had neither strategy nor tactics and that the circumstances overwhelmed him" (Rados 2005, p. 57). It is entirely possible that such choices in that time period did not stem from a fundamental preference for cooperation. It is possible that such a stand was due to Croatia's lack of preparation to fight a war. It is this point that led to the other side of his strategy during the first period of the crisis. While willing to negotiate, he was simultaneously building a modern Croatian military (Rados 2005, pp. 57-59). And over time, as the military balance began to tip to Croatia's favor, Tudjman became less cooperative. And indeed in 1995, he gave the order to commence operation *Storm*.

Franjo Tudjman's ostensible tendency towards cooperative behavior is illustrated in Davorin Rudolf's (2002) book in which he chronicles his trips with Tudjman in United

States and Canada in October of 1990. According to Rudolf, it was during this trip that Tudjman first spoke of his “concept of a modern confederacy, or the union of independent states of former Yugoslav republics” (Rudolf 2002, p. 25). Nikica Baric, (2005, p. 52) echoes Rudolf’s interpretation and affirms that in HDZ’s (Croatian Democratic Union) first campaign platform, Tudjman advocated for the “affirmation of Croatia’s sovereignty, respectively, for the restructuring of Yugoslavia into a confederative union.”

It appeared that Franjo Tudjman wanted to avoid war, a possibility rarely discussed in the literature on him. As a witness to these efforts during his stint as Tudjman’s minister of foreign affairs in 1991, Davorin Rudolf (2002) sent Tudjman’s plan on the concept of the union of independent states of former Yugoslav republics to the leaders of all the Yugoslav republics who, with the exception of Serbia, accepted this proposal.

Franjo Tudjman’s complex behavior was evident throughout the period of 1991-1995. It comes to no surprise that he was portrayed differently from different sources. Though, Tudjman was more cooperative at the onset of the crisis in 1991, later on, his foreign policy behavior was also mired with behavioral tendencies usually associated with an un-cooperative and autocratic leader. For example, as international ties were proceeding apace, and Croats were defending Bosnia from Serbia, caring for Bosnian refugees, and helping and healing Bosnian soldiers during the conflict (Praljak 2002, pp. 172-173), there were of course policy areas in which Tudjman was not cooperative. Tudjman was very distrustful of the media (Kearns 1998; Rados 2005; Uzelak 1998). Kearns (1998) argues that Tudjman’s authoritative style of leadership extended to media

control. Sadkovich (1998, 2006, 2006) is especially critical of Yugoslav media's illustration of Franjo Tudjman and argues that Yugoslav media at the time was heavily influenced with Serb propaganda. At Tudjman's suggestion, the government passed a series of administrative regulations in an attempt to control the press (Kearns 1998). Praljak (2002) asserts that the media was especially critical of Tudjman's policies towards Bosnia and Herzegovina, and that this criticism, which Tudjman saw as unfair, led to his sanctions against the media. His clashes with the media also stemmed from party politics. The HDZ's re-introduction of the old Coat of Arms in their first electoral campaign in 1990, led to harsh criticism from some Croat journalists who started referring to Tudjman as Milosevic's twin (Baric 2005). Tudjman's HDZ experienced a fury of criticism from the Serbian political parties as well, partially due to its association with the NDH *Ustasha* government of WWII. Nevertheless, Tudjman's stance on Bosnia and Herzegovina was heavily criticized by the Croat media as well.

With regard to the question of the secret agreement for the division of Bosnia and Herzegovina between Slobodan Milosevic and Franjo Tudjman, Jovic (2002) insists that such a suggestion is a myth. Sadkovich (2006), too, rejects rumors that the war between Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina happened as a result of a secret agreement between Tudjman and Milosevic. To Jovic, Tudjman never considered starting a war in Bosnia. Instead, the war in Bosnia and Herzegovina was forced upon him by Serbia's and the international community's policies.

According to Sadkovich (2006) the circumstances on the ground, i.e., the Bosnian government's neglect of the Croat population in the region, coupled with a lack of a unified military structure among the Bosnian government's armed forces, and the

lack of Croats' political legitimacy in the Bosnian government, forced the Croat population to organize their own territorial forces. To Sadkovic, Tudjman sent Croatian troops to Bosnia to protect Croats from a mounting Muslim threat (Sadkovich 2006, 216-217).

On the other hand, Zdravko Tomac (2003) believes that Tudjman had long courted the idea that one could reason with Milosevic. He believed that with the partition of Bosnia and Herzegovina along ethnic lines a long lasting peace would be reached, one that would guarantee peaceful living for all three sides regardless of historical animosities (Tomac 2003, 219). According to Tomac, both Milosevic and Tudjman believed, incorrectly as it turned out that the Muslims in Bosnia were weak and that they had no option but to accept the solution of partitioning Bosnia along ethnic lines. This could be interpreted as the belief of a leader who opposed war, generally, but who was willing to accept conflict, and even benefit from it, depending on the conditions he faced. However, Tomac also believed Tudjman was a very optimistic individual. He had confidence in his policies, believed that fate had chosen him to form the Croatian state, and went so far as to consider Tudjman a visionary (Tomac, 2003) – though apparently one willing to bow to the necessities and opportunities of the time.

There is clearly disagreement among observers and scholars of Croatian politics about the nature and depth of Tudjman's orientation toward conflict and cooperation, and the extent to which it varied in the 1990s. Through a systematic analysis of Tudjman's beliefs about conflict and cooperation in the international political system we may provide some order and cohesion to this jumbled and sometimes vague literature.

Tudjman and Milosevic

Another, often controversial interpretation of Tudjman involves the assertion of a close association of Tudjman's personality characteristics with those of Slobodan Milosevic. Although, this study is not meant to be an elaborate comparison of these two leaders, I believe that some discussion of this issue is pertinent, especially since Tudjman has often been the focus of such comparisons from Western scholars (Holbrooke 1998; Ramet 2005; Silber and Little 1996; Zimmerman 1999). In Tomac's judgment (2003) there are significant differences between the two leaders. Tomac (2003) argues that Slobodan Milosevic waged a war of aggression without goals beyond conquering Croatian territory, whereas Tudjman's war was defensive and just. To Tomac (2003), Milosevic was a war criminal, whereas Tudjman was not. Although Tudjman waged a war with Bosnia and Herzegovina, he was also a peace broker in 1993, and early on advocated for a confederacy between the three ethnic sides, something Milosevic objected to (Tomac 2003, 484-485).

Of course, broadly speaking, Tudjman's nationalism is often a frequent focus of Western writings on Tudjman (Stokes 1982, Owen 1995, Silber and Little 1996, Uzelak 1998, Zimmerman 1999). Stokes considers him to be a nationalist and someone who actually considered nationalism to be a great "humanistic principle" (Stokes 1982, pp. 773-774). Gordana Uzelak (1998) defines him as an autocrat with a nationalist ideology. But sources seem at least a bit divided on whether nationalism was something that was truly at the center of his political being, or if instead it was something of a political convenience that he came to later in his life. It has been argued that if Tudjman had

become the commander of JNA's General Headquarters, he would have remained a great Titoist and a devoted Yugoslav (Hudelist 2004, pp. 234-235).

James J. Sadkovich (2006, p. 739), writes that Tadjman "...was a complex individual with a deceptively simple obsession, the creation of a Croatian state." He is credited with bringing about the destruction of the old Yugoslavia, though some maintain his goal was the destruction of communism in SFRJ, not necessarily the destruction of Yugoslavia (Hudelist, 2004). Tadjman believed that Croatia should be exclusively a Croatian state. He also believed that the question of Serbs in Croatia could be solved by a "compassionate transfer of populations" (humanin preseljenima) (Hudelist 2004, 682). But while he advocated policies that led to conflict with a number of groups, with regard to the war with Bosnia and Herzegovina, it is believed by some that he was pushed into that by the Herzegovina lobby and by Gojko Susak (who became the Minister of Defense during his first administration) (Hudelist 2004, 681-684).

In this chapter I do not directly compare the personality traits and cognitions of Tadjman and Milosevic but I do provide a basic operational code scores for Slobodan Milosevic. Instead, I argue that by producing systematic measurements of Tadjman's personality traits and foreign policy belief system, and considering his level of nationalism, his leadership style, and his fundamental tendency toward conflict versus cooperation, we should be able to determine if Tadjman was essentially another Milosevic, as he is sometimes portrayed in Western analyses. Put another way, this analyses, since they are of his own cognitions, may help us untangle if he was a true-believing nationalist, or more a leader who adopted a staunchly nationalist line out of political convenience.

Operational Code Analysis

In this chapter I am investigating the personal characteristics of the leader of Croatia that would potentially be tied to his country's foreign policy. Drawing on research associated with the political psychology and foreign policy decision making literatures I investigate Franjo Tudjman's four psychological characteristics that have been linked to variations in one's proclivity toward cooperation and conflict. Operational codes are individuals' fundamental belief sets about the international world and their place in it. Conceptual complexity reflects how individuals structure their cognitions. And distrust and in-group bias reflect the extent to which individuals harbor doubts about the intentions or legitimacy of other actors in the political universe. There is already a substantial literature linking variations in these characteristics to particular political behaviors (cooperative international behavior is associated with cooperative operational codes, higher levels of complexity, and lower levels of distrust, while international conflict is associated with the opposite).

Of course a notable complication in this literature is how one can systematically measure the psychological characteristics of political leaders. Given the limitations regarding access to public figures a solution to this problem has been refined over the last two decades. As it is not possible to run tests and experiments on the leaders themselves, it has become the norm to rely on so-called at-a-distance measures. That is, measures of the characteristics of decision makers that can be conducted from afar. As to these variables, over time measures have been developed that systematically capture these psychological characteristics, and variation in them over time, by examining variation in the language used by political leaders. Depending on word choice, modifiers, and how

leaders structure their communication, they are conveying how they see the world around them and their place in it. To the extent that such patterns hold up within and across large amounts of their comments over time, it becomes possible to chart variation and movement in their psychological characteristics that relate to tendencies toward conflict and cooperation. These measures have been further systematized in recent years with the development of automated coding systems. In this chapter I employ the *Profiler Plus* coding system to analyze public statements made by Franjo Tudjman and produce precise measures of his psychological characteristics. Using a computerized system has a number of benefits including 100% replicable results and the ability to process much larger amounts of data, which should strengthen our ability to be assured of the validity of the measurements. I will explain the individual coding systems further as I review each part of the analysis. While coding psychological characteristics from public comments has attracted criticism, it has become a norm in the discipline, and studies have found that public comments are not necessarily inferior to private comments or correspondence when it comes to reflecting interior dispositions (Renshon 2009).

To measure Franjo Tudjman's worldview, and later his conceptual complexity, distrust, and in-group bias, I applied at-a-distance content analysis to a selection of speeches he made in the 1990s. I used Tudjman's speeches to the Croatian parliament from 1990 to 1999, except for 1992 as I was not able to acquire that year's. The speeches were obtained from the Croatian parliament's Ministry for Information. It is important to note that Tudjman's speeches to the Croatian parliament are long and detailed. Gordana Uzelak (1998) who studied Franjo Tudjman's narrative in his speeches described them as very thorough and abundant with historical narratives. A speech could very well reach

far over 100 single-spaced pages. The lack of English translations of Tadjman's speeches initially limited our sample selection, so to ameliorate this problem the aforementioned speeches were sampled and translated from Croatian to English. The speeches were sampled by randomly selecting 1500-word sections of a speech from within the text until it totaled 10 percent of the whole (so for a 160 page speech, a total of 16 pages were coded, in sections randomly selected from the whole).

In terms of the assertion that speeches are usually tailored to specific audiences and therefore the scores in these measures reflect this bias, Hermann (1980, 1984) has noted that personality traits should not vary by material source and context. Dille (2000) has tested this assumption and found that very little variance (insignificant) by the document source type in his analysis of conceptual complexity between spontaneous and prepared remarks. Nevertheless, with respect to the operational code measures, Dille (2000) cautions that operational code measures may reflect the material source bias. With respect to Franjo Tadjman, this will not be a problem because the speeches come from the same material – his speeches to the parliament. Therefore we should not expect material source bias variation in Tadjman's measures.

In order to assess Tadjman's operational code, this chapter utilizes the automated content analysis system VICS (Schafer and Walker 2006), using *Profiler Plus* software. It measures a leader's philosophical and instrumental beliefs using verbs as a unit of analysis, specifically using the degree and intensity of verb utterances. A quantitative technique of content analysis, VICS was first employed by Walker, Schafer, and Young (1998) to overcome problems associated with qualitative content analysis. VICS focuses on the verbs uttered by political leaders, and presents a leader's operational code in terms

of numeric indices. *Profiler Plus* eliminates problems of inter-coder reliability that can occur with manual coding of texts. Therefore, an automated content analysis of Tudjman's texts should improve the accuracy of the coding, and limit validity concerns. The same selection of speeches and software program were used to measure Franjo Tudjman's conceptual complexity, level of distrust, and in-group bias later in this project.

I focus on five of the operational code indices; aspects of an individual's belief set that appear likely to shape one's choices in international relations. The first two, *Nature of the Political Universe* and *Realization of One's Political Aspirations*, are measured similarly. Both are measured according to how *others*, political actors with whom Tudjman does not share a relationship or affinity, act in the world. The former is scaled +1 to -1, and is the percent of negative actions attributed to others subtracted from the percent of positive actions attributed to others. The latter is also a +1 to -1 scale, but here actions are scored as not merely positive or negative, but to the degree of positivity or negativity. The third index I examine is the individual's perception of their *Control*. This is measured as the percent of self attributions divided by the total number of self and other attributions. The concept is that those who speak of themselves as being generally in control of their surroundings and the world are more likely to truly believe this than others. It varies between 1 and 0, with a higher number connoting a greater belief in one's ability to control events. The final two indices are *Approach to Goals* and *Pursuit of Goals*. These are measured in the same fashion as the first two indices, except that here the focus is on self attributions as opposed to other attributions. They tell us how Tudjman sees himself behaving in the political universe.

Hypotheses

On the basis of the biographical record and the events of 1991-1995 I hypothesize the following:

Nature of the Political Universe (P1)

Franjo Tudjman is more likely to have seen the political environment as cooperative during the first phase of the war (1991-1993) than later when the war intensified. I expect a further shift to occur in Franjo Tudjman over time, seeing the political universe as much more cooperative in the years after the war (1996-1999).

Realization of One's Political Aspirations (P2)

Similarly, Franjo Tudjman is likely to have been more optimistic in achieving his political aspirations during the beginning of the crisis in 1990 than in later periods of the war. Again, I expect him to be more optimistic about the world after the war is over, with probably his highest scores occurring from 1996-1999.

Control over Historical Development (P4)

I expect that as the war intensified, his vision of the political environment will become more negative. However, Croatia's position actually became stronger in the latter years of the war. Therefore, while he sees conflict around him, we expect that Franjo Tudjman is likely to have a greater sense of control over historical development during the latter stage of the war. I expect to see his lowest scores at the beginning of the 1990s.

Approach to Goals (II)

Tudjman is likely to have been more cooperative during the first phase of the war. Given that his attempts to achieve a cooperative settlement were not reciprocated, we would

expect that as the war continued this measure would decline, rebounding upward once more as negotiations ended the war and peace returned to the region.

Pursuit of Goals (I2)

I expect this measure to be similar to Approach to Goals. Tadjman may have had a stronger belief in cooperation in the first phase of the war. Changes in this index are expected by 1993, with a rise again by 1996, after the war ended.

Results of Operational Code Analysis

Table 1.5: Tadjman's Operational Code Over Time

Year	P1	P2	P4	I1	I2
1990	.41	.20	.24	.40	.15
1991	.38	.16	.33	.74	.28

1993	.19	.07	.26	.33	.19
1994	.61	.32	.35	.56	.41
1995	.26	.13	.37	.36	.27
1996	.60	.44	.31	.84	.57
1997	.43	.36	.27	.80	.57
1998	.55	.41	.30	.92	.51
1999	.68	.38	.28	.76	.43

Scale of P1, P2, I1 and I2: -1 to 1 (conflict to cooperation).

Scale of P4: 0 to 1 (no control to control).

For comparison other world leader's P1 and I1 scores include:

Table 2.5: Basic Operational Codes of Slodoban Milosevic and Others

	P1	I1
Milosevic Slobodan	0.219	0.414
Netanyahu Binyamin	0.239	0.356
Peres, Shimon	0.248	0.414
Rabin ,Yitzhak	0.229	0.356
Mubarak_Hosni	0.522	0.539
al-Qadhafi_Muammar	0.002	0.232

Source: Social Science Automation Inc.

The results of the operational code analysis are laid out below in Table 1. Three basic points leap out in these results. First, throughout this time period, even during the war, Tadjman maintained a basically cooperative view of the world. In line with the biographers who held he was surprisingly open to cooperation for someone so often seen as an ardent nationalist, and who pointed to his “wait and see” approach to many political issues, it appears that he maintained a view that cooperation was the norm in the world, even while at war. Secondly, and relatedly, his favored approach to political behavior remained the use of cooperative means. While P1, P2, I1 and I2 all vary over time, all of these indices are fundamentally cooperative throughout the time period under review, even though Tadjman and his country were involved in a major war at the time. Finally, his perception of his control over his environment varied little over time. To the extent it varied, it varied in ways that both fit with our hypothesis and do not. It was lowest in 1990, at the start of this study and the conflict, a finding that fits with the literature that highlights Tadjman’s focus on Croatia’s relatively weak position in the region. As I hypothesized his perception of his control rose later in the conflict, when Croatia was in a stronger position vis-à-vis its neighbors. Interestingly though, it declines following the war. The shift is marginal, and the score does not decline to where it was in the early

years of the war, but the measure shows that Tadjman was most sure of his control when he was administering a winning, warring state, not in the years of peace that followed.

As to variation in the other four indices, it occurs somewhat as I expected. From the early years of the war (1990-1991) to the later years of the war (1993-1995; excluding the 1992 data as discussed above) Tadjman came to see a less cooperative world, and he interacted with it in less cooperative ways. That 1993 stands out as a lower point in this data than 1995 also makes a certain sense as in 1995, Tadjman and Croatia were anticipating the end of the war and anticipating taking part in negotiations to end it. However, the 1994 data does not fit this expected pattern. But the shift between 1995 and the later years occurs as was predicted, with Tadjman seeing a more cooperative world, and acting in more cooperative ways, as the region shifted from war to peace.

On the whole we see a somewhat cooperative leader, but one whose pursuit of that orientation varied somewhat with the tides of war and peace in the region. Interestingly, the instrumental indices are generally higher than the corresponding philosophical indices, which may also point to his commitment to a generally cooperative line. And of course that was his position throughout the decade, even though throughout this entire era he saw a world in which he had limited control over events. This data therefore can be seen to answer certain questions about Tadjman's true foreign policy orientation about which the descriptive histories disagree.

Leadership Trait Analysis

Conceptual Complexity

Conceptual complexity is usually defined as one's ability to integrate multiple dimensions of information, an idea, or a situation simultaneously (Dille and Young 2000;

Hermann 2002). The literature on conceptual complexity contends that people with low levels of conceptual complexity generally tend to view the world in simpler terms. In contrast, people with high levels of conceptual complexity tend to view the world in a more complex and nuanced manner, have a higher level of tolerance for multiple sources of information, and are more susceptible to different ideas and situations.

Conceptual complexity has been found to have important effects in studies of foreign policy (Suedfeld and Tetlock 1977). Differences in leaders' conceptual complexity measure have been found to correlate with leaders' foreign policy actions (Dille and Young, 2000; Hermann 1980, 2002, 2003; Preston 2001; Thies 2004, 2009). In particular, it has been linked to decision makers' tendencies toward cooperation and conflict, with those higher in complexity more prone to cooperation. It has also been found that leaders who score high in conceptual complexity tend to exhibit a high need for affiliation, are trusting of others, and score low in nationalism (Hermann, 1980). All of these characteristics have also been associated with higher levels of cooperation. So whether through direct effects, or through being part of a larger set of associated psychological characteristics, complexity may play a role in influencing decision makers toward either more or less cooperative endeavor. As it is a basic personality trait it has often been found to be stable, though some leaders are prone to fluctuations in their conceptual complexity (Schafer 1997).

In Franjo Tudjman's case, high scores on the conceptual complexity measure may indicate that the impact of Tudjman's nationalism is not as deep as it is often portrayed (Owen 1995; Silber and Little 1996; Stokes 1982; Kearns 1998; Uzelak 1998; Treanor 1997; Zimmerman 1999) or at least that it may not have limited Tudjman's planning and

choices as is often conveyed. In addition, if he scores high on this measure it may provide more support for a general inclination toward cooperation seen in his operational code. This chapter utilizes content analysis to measure Franjo Tudjman's conceptual complexity. Once again I used the automated content analysis software *Profiler Plus* for coding purposes. The score is based on the relative use of words in two dictionaries, one associated with high complexity words (showing variation and shades of gray) and one associated with low complexity (featuring more absolute language). The results of this analysis are seen below in Table 3.

Results of Leadership Trait Analysis

Table 3.5: Tudjman's Personality Traits Over Time

Year	Complexity	Distrust	In-group Bias
1990	.60	.19	.23
1991	.65	.42	.25

1993	.64	.31	.19
1994	.71	.09	.29
1995	.65	.16	.35
1996	.69	.17	.28
1997	.67	.16	.24
1998	.68	.05	.34
1999	.68	.05	.36

Scale of all three measures: 0-1 (low to high).
 For comparison, the mean scores for 122 international political leaders (Hermann 2003) were .45 for Conceptual Complexity, .38 for Distrust of Others, and .43 for In-group Bias.

For most of this period we see considerable stability in Tudjman's complexity score. Perhaps surprising to those who focus on his nationalism, though perhaps not surprising to his supporters who saw him as a careful thinker, he was generally more complex than not. Compared to a sample of 122 international political leaders (Hermann, 2003), his scores are relatively high for every year in our sample. His lowest score was in the first year of the study. That relatively low (though still high, relative to other leaders) score may be tied to the fact that Croatia faced what many saw as a difficult and endangered position that year, which may have limited his perception of what moves were possible at that time. The possibility that relative variation in his complexity may have turned with the tides of war is buttressed by the fact that his complexity scores in peace time are slightly higher than his measurements during war time. But on the whole this characteristic was largely stable, and in-line with many of the biographies of him, Tudjman appears to have been a complex political leader.

Distrust

In Leadership Trait Analysis studies, distrust is usually defined as the leaders' "doubts, misgivings, or expectations of harm from groups not identified with" it (Winter et.al. 1991, p. 7). Distrust has been found to be correlated with leaders' foreign policy behavior (Herman 1980, 1987; Winter et al. 1991). Leaders who score high on distrust are linked to authoritarianism and hostility toward other nations (Winter et al. 1991). Having a precise measure of Franjo Tudjman's level of distrust can inform our understanding of his political motivations and his decision-making style, as leaders' who score high on distrust are especially sensitive to outside criticism and may be less oriented toward cooperative behavior with in-group members as well as out-group

members (Winter et al. 1991). However, we should recall that Tudjman scores relatively highly on conceptual complexity, and his high conceptual complexity score may mitigate the impact of a distrustful nature, should he be found to have one. As with the two previous analyses, I used *Profiler Plus* to code Tudjman's level of distrust toward others. The coding scheme involves how others, those with whom the leader does not identify, are described by the leader. The higher the frequency with which others are described in a distrustful way, the higher Tudjman's distrust score will be. The results of this analysis are seen above in Table 3.

The conceptual complexity measure did not fluctuate overwhelmingly in ways that appeared to mirror Croat foreign policy, apart from Tudjman's complexity appearing to be slightly higher after the war. While not shifting in as clear a way as his operational code did, Tudjman's level of distrust fluctuated more than his complexity did, and it fluctuated in ways that could be linked to Croatia's international situation. Tudjman was most distrustful in the early and middle periods of the war, especially after his attempts at conciliation had been rebuffed, and before Croatia's national security position had been relatively strengthened. It appears that in these periods of conflict, threat and strife, Tudjman was relatively more distrustful. However, as the war wound down, and after the region had stabilized, Tudjman was notably more trusting. It is worth noting though that compared to other international political leaders (Hermann 2003), Tudjman was relatively trusting. Apart from 1991 and 1993 when his scores are about average for a leader in Hermann's sample, Tudjman's distrust scores are notably lower than the norm. This contrasts with a number of the descriptive histories of the Croatian president, and

suggests that perhaps his nationalism was not deeply ingrained, or that it stemmed from matters distinct from distrust.

In-group Bias

Examining Franjo Tudjman's level of in-group bias can tell us about the leader's motivation towards the world, specifically his views of his country in relation to others. Margaret Hermann (2002) contends that leaders' who score low on in-group bias and low on distrust see the world in more nuanced terms. These leaders have a more complex view of the world and see conflict as context-specific and understand that the nature of the international system affects their foreign policy choices. These leaders are more cooperative in their foreign policy decisions. Conversely, leaders who score high on in-group bias (and high in distrust) tend to see a world filled with conflict and adversaries who are untrustworthy or beneath them in some way. Such leaders are more aggressive in their foreign policy decisions, and may turn toward different sets of prospective policies than less biased leaders.

Having a precise measure of Franjo Tudjman's in-group bias score can be particularly helpful. Nationalism is frequently mentioned as a key explanatory variable in Tudjman's personality that had a powerful effect on his policy choices. However, there is some disagreement on this point, and claims that Tudjman was an ardent nationalist, as opposed to an opportunistic one, feature especially prominently in studies of Tudjman written by scholars outside the region. Establishing a precise measurement of Tudjman's in-group bias will help us empirically evaluate those claims and the degree to which we should expect the president's personal nationalism to be the key factor behind his, and his country's, political behavior.

Once again, the results of my analysis do not match the political portrait that is often painted of Tadjman, especially in histories written in the United States. Again using Hermann's sample of 122 international leaders as the basis for our comparison, Tadjman's scores over nine years never place him among the set of leaders who would be considered likely to be highly nationalistic based on in-group bias. In fact only in 1995, in the final year of the war, and in 1998 and 1999 are his nationalism scores even in the "average" range. In the other six years Tadjman exhibits a relatively low level of nationalism. This stands in stark contrast to the understanding of Tadjman that portrays him as an inflexible leader, ardent nationalist, and as one who suppressed dissent.

Generally, there is stability across the three trait variables that suggests these characteristics are indeed lasting individual-level attributes. If that is the case, one might expect alterations in these attributes would be limited, but that the core nature of the characteristics would be exhibited in the decision maker's political behavior. In this case one would expect Tadjman, if he was setting policy according to his core traits to be a complex leader, and one who was not especially distrustful or biased against other political actors. Those characteristics are often associated with a preference for cooperation and an aversion to war-making. This of course is not exactly the political path generally associated with Tadjman. However, it is likely worth remembering that in the early period of the war Tadjman was pressing for cooperative measures, and as complexity is associated with learning, it is not surprising he moved to another path as his efforts were rebuffed. Relatively cooperative leaders can still find themselves immersed in war, and complex ones may work to find ways to benefit from such situations, even if initiating such fights were not in their original plans.

Summary of Chapter

In this chapter I noted that there is paucity of systematic research on President Tudjman, especially in the English language, which is a notable hole in our ability to understand Croatia's first president and the important role he played in European politics. The biographical record was incomplete or potentially biased. By carrying out a systematic investigation of his foreign policy world view and foundational personality traits have helped to fill these holes in the literature.

Fitting with the generally outsized role he is seen as having played in Croatia's foreign policy we see a fit, to a certain degree, between the shifts in Croatia's foreign policy in the early 1990s and changes in Tudjman's own operational code. Fitting with changes in Croatian behavior between the earlier and later stages of the war, Tudjman was less cooperative in the later stage of the war. But also fitting with a change in the balance of power, Tudjman saw himself as having a relatively higher level of control as the war went on.

My analysis also reaffirms multiple sides of the literature on Tudjman, sides which sometimes seem to be in conflict in the literature. However, it appears Tudjman may have simply been a complicated individual. He appears to have had a preference for cooperative policy means, but was willing to change those as events and his perceptions of other political actors changed. He appears to have been conceptually complex; a personal characteristic that often reinforces an orientation toward cooperation. But exhibiting a certain level of distrust once the war was underway, and often failing to see himself in control of his environment, his general tendency toward cooperation could sometimes be lessened when he was challenged. Often seeking cooperation and seeing

shades of gray in his surrounding, but doubting his power to affect events, and doubting the intentions of others when enmeshed in deep conflict, it is not surprising that he was often slow to commit to a decision. Extending inferences from these patterns we might expect him to engage in deals and alliances regardless of nationalistic lines, as he did on occasion, to strike back against repeatedly-conflictual political actors he believed he could exert power over (like the media), but to generally be a dealmaker when interacting with other political actors, trying to deftly achieve gains in his and his country's complicated position.

With regard to the literature on Franjo Tudjman's nationalism, my analysis suggests it was more complex than the portrait painted by Western observers (Sibel and Little 1996, Holbrooke 1998, Zimmerman 1999). While there is abundant evidence in the literature for the position that he was a nationalist, fitting that stance with his cognitive complexity and low levels of distrust and in-group bias reminds us that nationalism is not necessarily simplistic, and does not necessarily prevent subtlety and complexity. It can be fitted to detailed strategies, tactics, and even pragmatism. And the analysts who suggest that Tudjman's nationalism may have been a convenient affectation as well as a deeply held belief may be onto something.

My results support Sadkovich's assessment (2005, 2006) that Tudjman was a complicated leader; whose personality and political psychology may have affected the way crisis unfolded in Yugoslavia, and may have also influenced the outcome of the peace accords. I believe that the findings show Tudjman merits further study. Examining how his unusual combination of characteristics affected his behavior may help us understand how he worked within the milieu of Croatian politics, and made specific

choices regarding international alliances. But for now, this work has provided systematic evidence illuminating core beliefs, traits, and motivations that drove the behavior of an enigmatic but influential player on the world stage.

CHAPTER SIX

An in Depth Analysis of Slobodan Milosevic's Operational Code and Leadership

Traits

This chapter argues that insight into Slobodan Milosevic's belief system and personality traits is crucial in understanding how this leader's view of the world and his place in it may have affected his approach to politics. The literature on Slobodan Milosevic is vast and much of it comes from in depth qualitative sources and much of that literature remains to be systematically tested. The views presented in the literature on the Serbian leader leave us with an incomplete understanding of Slobodan Milosevic, a man who played a key role in the former Yugoslavia's violent break-up and Serbia's politics throughout much of the 1990s. In this chapter I study Slobodan Milosevic's psychological characteristics relevant to his decision-making behavior through at-a-distance analysis of his public statements. Specifically, I measure Slobodan Milosevic's operational code and four leadership traits: belief in the ability to control events, distrust, need for power, and conceptual complexity. Through this systematic analysis I try to get a more precise understanding of Slobodan Milosevic's world view, leadership style and his approach to politics. In so doing I hope to get a better understanding of the role of Milosevic's psychological characteristics in his foreign policy behavior.

Much of the literature on Slobodan Milosevic is concerned with his role in the wars of the former Yugoslavia (see Glenny 1992; Owen 1995; Silber and Little 1996; Holbrooke, 1998; Ramet 2005; Judah 2009), and while there is a broad agreement that Slobodan Milosevic played a key role in those wars, our understanding of him and the

role he played in international politics is still limited. There is a notable divide whether his internal characteristics such as his need for power and nationalism affected his political behavior, and whether or not he was attentive to others around him. This chapter argues that by assessing his world view and personality traits in a systematic manner, we will have more-informed answers to these questions. Having a more precise understanding of who he was can give us a better understanding of his foreign policy behavior and of Yugoslavia in the tumultuous 1990s.

To measure Slobodan Milosevic's foreign policy belief system, this chapter utilizes operational code analysis (Walker, Schafer and Young 1998, 1999, 2003). In addition to studying Milosevic's foreign policy beliefs, this chapter utilizes Leadership Trait Analysis to study the effects of Milosevic's personality in his foreign policy behavior. In this chapter I measure five aspects of Milosevic's personality using coding schemes associated with Leadership Trait Analysis (LTA) -- belief in one's ability to control events, conceptual complexity, distrust, need for power, and in-Group bias (Hermann 2003). As I will recount throughout this chapter, the literature on the Serbian leader suggests that he was very active in the day to day activities of his government. Margaret Hermann (2002) contends that a leader with a high score on the belief to control events is generally more active in the process of foreign policy decision-making. These types of leaders are less likely to delegate authority to others and are more likely to initiate policy on their own (Herman 2003). Slobodan Milosevic's score on this characteristic could help us understand how strongly we should expect the Serbian leader to be involved in Serbia's and Yugoslavia's foreign policy decision-making process during the years under this study.

Thus, by developing a reliable measure on this characteristic, we will be able to test some of these assumptions. Additionally, consider the effects of conceptual complexity in foreign policy behavior. Research on Leadership Trait Analysis (LTA) has shown that leaders' who score high on this measure are more likely to shift their behavior as new information is made available (Hermann 2002, 2003). By measuring Slobodan Milosevic's conceptual complexity in relation to his ability to control events should give more insight into Milosevic's tendency for political compromise. Research has shown that leaders who score high on conceptual complexity are more susceptible for compromise. Additionally, by measuring Slobodan Milosevic's distrust characteristic in relation with his in-group bias score may give us some more insight into one of the hottest debates over the Serbian leader -- just how nationalistic was he (Glenny 1992; Holbrooke 1998; Judah 1997, 2009; Siber and Little 1996; Zimmerman 1999)?

Information about the degree to which political leaders believe they can control events and their need for power and influence should tell us how likely leaders are to challenge the constraints of the environment in which they belong to (Hermann 2002). So, political leaders who score high on the need for power trait and high on the belief that they can control events have been found to be more likely to challenge the constraints of their environment and push for better decision-making (Herman 2002; Kowert and Hermann 1997; McClelland 1974; Walker 1983; Winter and Stewart 1977). Consequently, leaders who score high on the ability to control events but low on the need for power suggest that these leaders push the envelope in the decision-making situations but are not as effective in manipulating others in realizing the desired outcome (Hermann 2002). Milosevic is often portrayed as a shrew political manipulator, or as Pappas

(2005) and Djilas (1993) argue, as someone who used nationalism in his bid for political power. For example, according to Pappas (2005), Milosevic was a political entrepreneur who understood the power of cultural symbols in mobilizing political support in his bid to political power. By measuring his belief in the ability to control events and his need for power, we will gain new insights into this assertion, and we will do it in a systematic way, through the development of replicable measures.

As the literature on Milosevic varies, this chapter will provide replicable data that may improve our understanding of Slobodan Milosevic's rule and the extent to which Serbia's foreign policy behavior reflected its leader's policy preferences. Therefore, this chapter will review different interpretations of Milosevic's leadership style, his world view toward international conflict and cooperation, his nationalism, and finally his similarity or dissimilarity with Franjo Tudjman of Croatia. This chapter will review the four psychological characteristics it uses as systematic measures, and examine how his psychological profile, as measured through these at-a-distance techniques, fits with the existing literature on the Serbian leader.

This chapter argues that finding the answer to these questions is of great value in the understanding of Slobodan Milosevic and his approach to political goals. A quantitative study of Slobodan Milosevic's world view, along with his personality traits that are believed to correlate with his foreign policy behavior -- distrust, in-group bias, conceptual complexity, need for power, and belief in one's ability to control events -may add key information to understanding Slobodan Milosevic's political choices.

Who was Slobodan Milosevic?

Foreign observers had speculated for years whether or not Yugoslavia would survive after the death of its charismatic leader, Josip Broz Tito (Ridgeway and Udovicki 1995). This was all but confirmed when in December of 1990; the Central Intelligence Agency predicted in its report the former Yugoslavia's potential bloody collapse. Nevertheless, those inside Yugoslavia maintained hope that once a multi-cultural haven of South-Eastern Europe, Yugoslavia, would manage to survive the wave of changes that was sweeping Eastern Europe at the time – collapse of Soviet Union and the wave of democratization. But the international community did not understand how these changes were going to affect the former Yugoslavia as well as Franjo Tudjman and Slobodan Milosevic did. Both leaders understood that the appeal for self-determination would entail territorial expansion for both of their respective states (Ridgeway and Udovicki 1995, 1-15). The ever-increasing wave of nationalism that was sweeping the former Yugoslavia was engineered carefully to serve this purpose for territorial expansion by both of these two leaders. Both of them used fear and nationalism as a vehicle to stay in power (Ridgeway and Udovicki 1995).

A lot has been written about the role of Slobodan Milosevic in the breakup of the former Yugoslavia (see Becker 2005; Cohen 2001; Judah 2009; Lebor 2004; Post 2004; Sell 2002). Some studies on Yugoslavia, and particularly those written by western scholars, have conjectured about the link between Milosevic's internal characteristics and his foreign policy behavior during the Yugoslav wars of 1991-1995 (Glenny 1992, 1996; Holbrooke 1998; Judah 2009; Owen 1995; Silber and Little 1996; Zimmermann 1995). So, the literature on the Serbian leader is vast. Adam Lebor (2004, 13-73) described him

a “loner,” a “student political activist,” a communist apparatchik, a heavy drinker, and an “authoritarian” leader. Louis Sell (2002, 175-176) depicts him a “callous user of people” and “a master of betrayal.” Doder and Branson (1999, 239) describe the Serbian leader as a “master of tactical surprises” but who seemed “paralyzed when it came to the [issue] of Kosovo.” To Eric D. Gordy (1999, 26, 192-193) Milosevic was a “poor strategist” who showed a lack of vision especially as it pertained to the growing “economic problems” in Yugoslavia. Furthermore, they all agree that Milosevic played a significant role in the re-emergence of nationalism in Serbia and throughout the region (Glenny 1996; Gordy 1999; Holbrooke 1998; Judah 2009; Sibel and Little 1996).

Slobodan Milosevic’s rhetoric on Yugoslavia’s disintegration is documented extensively. In 1990, the Serbian leader vowed to unite all Serbians in one state. In 1991, he used force against his own people (Silber and Little 1996). Year 1991 was a decisive year for Slobodan Milosevic. It was during this period that the Serbian leader set the entire Yugoslav federation on the course to war. But, as noted earlier in this dissertation and as Silber and Little (1996) aptly point out, the stage for the former Yugoslavia’s collapse had been set four years before in 1987. The origins of the former Yugoslavia’s bloody collapse can be traced with the rise of Serbian nationalism among the Serb intellectuals, and the subsequent manipulation of this wave of nationalism by ‘opportunistic’ leaders such as Slobodan Milosevic (Silber and Little 1996).

According to Silber and Little (1996, 26) Milosevic’s dream was to “step into the shoes of Josip Broz Tito as the leader of whole Yugoslavia.” This dream would later change and it included only the Serbs. Yugoslavia under the leadership of Slobodan Milosevic’s was engulfed in three civil wars. The civil wars provided for the devolution

of political power from the former communist leadership of the KPJ (Communist Party of Yugoslavia) to him and his network of collaborators. It is no wonder why most scholars agree that Milosevic played a direct role in the alteration of Yugoslavia's federal structure and its constitution in the 1980s and 1990s (see Cohen 2001; Hall 1999; Ramet 2002; Sell 2001).

Slobodan Milosevic was a polarizing personality. To most of foreign diplomats, he was an intriguing and a puzzling individual. Milosevic was a mystery to the media, his people, and even his closest friends. By some analysts, he is described as a very capable politician (Glenny 1992; Vujacic 1995; Hall 1999). To others he was a masterful manipulator (e.g Post 2004), who used the power of the media to amass popular support (Snyder and Ballantine 1996). His decade long rule in Serbia is portrayed in both negative and positive light. For example, from 1991-1993, he was referred to as the butcher of Balkans; while from 1995-1996, he was portrayed as a pragmatist willing to support the Dayton peace accord of 1995 (Becker 2005). Some argue that his personality was a mix with elements of charisma and stubbornness and that to the majority of Serbs he was a confusing personality (Arsenijevic 2009).

Some analysts suggest that Milosevic's rise to power is largely believed to have been an accident. They attribute one event in his political development as a critical moment in his rise to power. On April 24 1987, Slobodan Milosevic, upon Stambolic's request (Ivan Stambolic was then the president of Serbia), went to Kosovo Polje to address the Serb population's growing concern about Albanian nationalism in Kosovo. What transpired during that visit would forever alter his view of the world around him. A crowd of approximately 15,000 people demanded that Slobodan Milosevic answer their

growing grievances against the Kosovo Albanians. It is believed that it was in Kosovo that he uttered his, now, mythologized remarks: “No one will be allowed to beat you! No one will be allowed to beat you” (Cohen 2001, 63). Cohen (2001, 64) suggest that this meeting “was his epiphanal moment.” Slobodan Milosevic was transformed. He was transformed from a cautious Titoist, to a post-Titoist politician, who, in 1989 on the 600th anniversary of the Battle of Kosovo, would unleash Serb nationalism that would only two years later bring Yugoslavia to its bloody collapse (Cohen 2001).

To Djilas, Milosevic was a simple leader with a simple rhetoric. This was evident in the book he published in 1989. The book, *Godina Raspleta*, was a collection of his speeches. According to Djilas, Milosevic’s writing was dull but his book became uncharacteristically popular with the masses. His book, too, became an instant success, despite the fact that it was poorly written. Djilas (1993) argues that Milosevic became popular not as a result of orchestrated events, but largely as a result of a spontaneous cult that started gathering around him (Djilas 1993, 82-83). Milosevic did not use nationalism for political reasons only; he embraced it. The roots of Slobodan Milosevic’s success can be traced to early 1970s. The elimination of the liberal reformers from the party lines in the early 1970s by Tito paved the way for the emergence of new leaders in the political scene, and this includes Milosevic. His speeches made him popular because he exploited the Kosovo problem to the Serbs and as Djilas (1993, 86) writes, “Milosevic reinvigorated the party by forcing it to embrace nationalism.”

Pappas (2005) looks at the factors that led to Milosevic’s rise as a charismatic leader of Serbia. The author concludes that Milosevic rose to power because of the endemic economic problems in the federation and because of the lack of strong

democratic institutions in the former Yugoslavia. According to Pappas (2005), Milosevic exploited the nationalist feelings of Serbs in Serbia and Kosovo and used this as a political ploy to catapult himself to power. According to Pappas (2005), Milosevic should be considered as a politician who understood the importance of cultural symbols and nationalism in his bid for power. This is what made him attractive to the masses.

Psychologist, Jerrold M. Post (2002) argues that Milosevic was an autocrat who showed a chilling indifference to the sufferings of his people. On the other hand, Vujacic (1995) argues that the Serbian leader possessed a unique quality that made him highly attractive to the political masses in Serbia and beyond. But, Doden and Branson (1999) contend that no one would have heard of Slobodan Milosevic had he not been sent to Kosovo in April of 1987. To get to the heart of these conflicting interpretations, I examine his worldview and his attitudes towards conflict and cooperation, nationalism and leadership style in greater detail

World View

This discordance of views on Milosevic's world view has affected the way we understand this leader -- his leadership style and the way he conducted politics remains a puzzle. As Ramet (2002, 357) notes, he is portrayed as a "dictator," "corrupt," "nationalist," and as someone who experienced a "sexual thrill"⁴ from murder. Some psychoanalytical studies have tried to find some sort of correlation between his childhood experiences and his view of the world. Slavoljub Djukic (1994 *Izmedju Slave I Anateme*) has speculated that Milosevic's experiences as a child: his parents' suicides, in particular, may have influenced his distorted world view later in life. David Owen (1995) whose

⁴ A direct quote (see Sabrina P. Ramet, *The Balkan Babel*, page 357) from the German psychiatrist, Dr. Dennis Friedman, who speculated on Milosevic psychology.

encounters with Milosevic are well documented portrays the Serbian leader as paranoid. According to Owen (1995) Milosevic was very distrusting, especially about the intentions of the international community toward Serbia. Ramet (2002) suggests that Milosevic's occasional bouts with depression and paranoia may be a result of his parents' lack of affection toward him (Ramet 2002). When one reads his biography, one gets the impression that Milosevic was an introvert, pedantic, respectful, and studious (Ramet 2002).

Slobodan Milosevic published a book titled *Godine Raspleta* (The Years of Solution) in 1989. In it he notes that the motive for writing the book was the solution of the Yugoslav crisis. According to Milosevic, the Yugoslav crisis consisted of three inherent problems: the inequality of Serbs within the Yugoslav federation; the problem with Kosovo; and the problem with the wave of democratic transition in the territory of Eastern Europe, which according to Slobodan Milosevic undermined the newly elected leadership in Yugoslavia (Milosavljevic 2000).⁵

Godine Raspleta (1989) was a compilation of Slobodan Milosevic's speeches during the 1980s. According to Milosavljevic (2000) Slobodan Milosevic's speeches in *Godine Raspleta* were full of explicit messages to his diverse constituency. On their face, the speeches advocated for unity, justice, reforms, equality, brotherhood, but underneath these messages were threats directed to other ethnic groups in the Yugoslav federation. In those speeches, Slobodan Milosevic argued that the rallies of 1987-1989 across Yugoslavia were a social revolt, and not orchestrated by him and his political machine.

⁵ With regard to the inequality of Serbs in the Yugoslav federation, Dimitrijevic (2000 *The 1974 Constitution as a Factor*) writes that a "closer scrutiny of the legal terms of the 1974 constitution reveals, that, *per se*,the [constitution] was not necessarily disadvantageous to the Serbs under all circumstances."

But, as Miloseavljevic (2000, 71) aptly points out in her writing that “there was only one type of slogan absent from those [social] gatherings -- those with social content.” In *Godine Raspleta*, Slobodan Milosevic called the year 1989, the year of the solution [of Yugoslav crisis], but the years 1990-1992 became a continuation of the pledge made in 1989 and the solution was not found. As Milosavljevic (2000, 71) writes: “the frequent debates on whether Slobodan Milosevic was a nationalist or a Communist who was playing the nationalist card...” became meaningless by 1992.

A number of authors (e.g Vujacic 2004) have argued that Slobodan Milosevic was effective at rallying the support of people beyond the nationalist-socialist base. Tim Judah (2009), who has written extensively on Yugoslavia, praises Slobodan Milosevic’s exceptional political skills. According to Judah (2009), Slobodan Milosevic’s political skills were crucial to his survival in office, and that in fact Milosevic’s rhetoric was at least in part motivated by his desire for political power (Judah 2009). Gregory O. Hall (1999) posits that Milosevic’s rise to power was made possible by a broad base of support--the intelligentsia, the media, the Orthodox Church and the political masses. To the masses, Milosevic presented himself as the defender of their rights, especially of the rights of the Serb minorities in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Kosovo. Toward this end, he is described as a cunning opportunist (e.g Glenny 2001; Hall 1999; Judah 2009)⁶, who used populist politics in his drive to attain power in the region. The prevailing opinion among political observers in Serbia was that Milosevic was not a nationalist, nor an ideologue, as is commonly presumed, but a political opportunist, whose main drive was his consolidation of political and economic power (see Obrad Kesic 1993). Some argue

⁶ Glenny (1996) notes, Milosevic consolidated his political power under the pretense of anti-bureaucratic revolution.

(See Vujacic 2004) that Milosevic was a populist leader who possessed the uncanny ability to reconcile the seemingly different preferences of different constituencies in Serbia. Vujacic (2004) believes that Milosevic's charisma was integral to his rise to power.

One notable characteristic of Milosevic was his demand for loyalty, a loyalty which did not necessarily run in both directions. His former ally, Nebojsa Covic, remembers Slobodan Milosevic's willingness to help people in their political careers, and then discard them once they had ceased to provide any kind of political incentive (Cohen 2001). His closest coworker, Zvonimir Trajkovic, his former adviser, characterized him as a "very imposing man, excellent with details...and excellent individualist, but a catastrophically bad organizer."⁷ To Gregory Hall (1999, 238) Slobodan Milosevic was a "political chameleon" who had a clear strategy in mind when it came to issues of political governance -- a single party rule -- but with respect to economic policy, he lacked a coherent program. Slobodan Milosevic opposed economic freedom and advocated for a state controlled economy. Hall (1999, 239) notes that "before the collapse of...Yugoslavia...he was the loudest voices for a recentralization of the economic power....especially in foreign economic relations." This is especially interesting given Milosevic's own assertions that he was an economic liberal (Ramet 2002). Richard Holbrooke (1998) portrays him as intellectually agile prone to switching arguments in order to keep others around him guessing. Ivo Banac (2009) posits that Milosevic's prevailing anti-Western rhetoric in the early 1990s were important elements of his rule. Warren Zimmerman praises his political skills and suggests that had Milosevic been born in a democratic system, he would have been a good politician (Cohen 2001, 106-107).

⁷ This is a direct quote of Zvonimir Trajkovic (see Sabrina P. Ramet, *The Balkan Babel*, page 357).

In terms of his public demeanor and his political rhetoric, Milosevic spoke in clear and short messages, but was very ambiguous about his own political preferences (e.g., Cohen 2001; Glenny 2001). He was appealing to the masses.

Attitudes Regarding International Conflict and Cooperation

In his study of Milosevic's phone intercepts from May 1991 to May 1992, Glaurdic (2009) confirms widely held beliefs on Slobodan Milosevic's strategy in relation to Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina. The strategy was subject to changes in the external environment but Slobodan Milosevic had an overall vision he planned to stick to (Glaurdic 2009). The intercepts suggest about Milosevic's miscalculations on the Bosnia's Muslim's resolve to stand up to his military might. According to Glaurdic (2009), Milosevic was more willing to commit to war in the early years of the war when the balance of power was in Serbia's side. The phone intercepts between Milosevic and his closest associates suggest that Slobodan Milosevic had no intention of ever honoring his agreements with Franjo Tudjman of Croatia and Alija Izetbegovic of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Glaurdic (2009, 89) notes that "Serbia's boss was truly and personally committed to the goal of creating an enlarged Serbian state." The phone intercepts indicate that Milosevic relied on key advisers⁸.

Ivo Banac (2009) argues about Milosevic's aspirations to expand Serbia's territory into Bosnia and Herzegovina and parts of Croatia, as part of his elaborate plan at homogenizing the Serb territories within the newly created borders. This idea of homogenization, according to Banac (2009) came not from past historical grievances as it

⁸ His personal adviser, at least initially, was Dobrica Cosic. Dobrica Cosic "...proofread Milosevic's speeches, personally phoned Milosevic to praise his public appearances and interviews, and...advised both [Slobodan] Milosevic and the leader of Bosnian Serbs, Radovan Karadzic, on foreign policy matters" (Glaurdic 2009, 90).

is widely assumed, but from the political class inside Serbia proper. In the first, post-WWII years, the Yugoslav communist leadership under Tito's tutelage successfully confronted ethnic nationalism. Later on as Tito's influence began to decline, the Yugoslav movement within the Communist party became highly nationalized (Banac 2009). With the death of Tito in 1980, the Serb communist leadership began to attack Tito's and KPJ's (Communist Party of Yugoslavia) structural reforms. The 1974 constitution, which decentralized the federal system and gave equal representation to Serbia's two provinces of Kosovo and Vojvodina equal representation in the federation, became the focal point of attack. Therefore, Banac (2009) associates the destruction of Yugoslavia to the policies of the Serbian political elite who worked hard at restoring Serbia's power within the SFRJ. The principal figure in this revolution was Slobodan Milosevic (Banac, 2009, 464-468). According to Banac, Slobodan Milosevic "put the party-state of Serbia in the services of Serbian national homogenization" (Banac 2009, 464). Milosevic's seemingly stubborn conduct at institutionalizing his power was met with very little opposition from within SFRJ and from other republics in the SFRJ. His arrogant behavior became apparent throughout the first years of the war, but was later subdued as the Croatian and Bosnia and Herzegovina's military started gaining more ground which changed the strategic climate in the region mostly to Milosevic's disadvantage (Banac 2009, 468-469).

Nationalism

While prominent in the literature, some observers do not support the "nationalist" thesis in its entire form. To some scholars, Slobodan Milosevic was a more complex leader. For example, Warren Zimmermann (1995) argues that Milosevic was an

ambitious and ruthless politician who bullied his way to the top of Serbian politics through intimidation. Zimmerman (1995, 2-5) describes the Serbian leader as susceptible to the opinions, feelings, and attitudes of others, and that he did not respond well to personal criticism. To Zimmermann (1995) Milosevic was a politician at least as much as he was an ideologue or a nationalist as he is often portrayed in the West. Zimmerman (1995, 11) argues that Milosevic had three important character traits “his cynicism about Yugoslavia’s unity...his natural mendacity, and the pains he always took to avoid direct responsibility for aggressive actions.” To Zimmerman (1995) Milosevic’s strategy toward Bosnia and Herzegovina, at least initially, was calculated.

According to Nebojsa Popov (2000) the decline of the central authority in the late 1980s in the former Yugoslavia created a sense of insecurity in the Serb population. The late 1980s saw the emergence of opportunistic leaders who used nationalism in all parts of Yugoslavia. In Serbia, Slobodan Milosevic became glorified as a new leader. Similarly, in her discussion of the former Yugoslavia’s eventual disintegration, Olga Zirojevic (2000, 208) notes that in 1989 “a new mythical hero emerged who ...came to announce the beginning of a new time of freedom...” to the Serb population. The new political program in Serbia in the late 1980s was personified by Slobodan Milosevic (Milosavljevic 2000). Even a large number of Serbian academics joined Milosevic’s political party. In the process of mobilizing public opinion, Milosevic wisely used the peoples’ fears of the future in Yugoslavia’s transitional period. This process was most evident from 1988 to 1991, but it continued throughout most of the 1990s (Obradovic 2000). This wide-scale mobilization movement managed to create an environment in which the political opposition became difficult to organize (Obradovic 2000). Secondly,

Milosevic's policies included the instigation of conflict in Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina under the pretense of democracy -- to "hinder internal social differentiation, democratization, and modernization" (Obradovic 2000, 427). But, as Obradovic (2000, 437) notes eventually "the institutions lost their function as catalyst and instruments for resolving social conflicts, and this role was taken by SPS and its leader Slobodan Milosevic." Slobodan Milosevic's political program operated within the communist-nationalist continuum (Obradovic 2000).

According to Jack Snyder and Karen Ballentine (1996) Milosevic managed to create an effective monopoly of the media which help foster his image to the Serbian people. Interestingly enough, Snyder and Ballentine (1996, 16) argue that autocratic leaders in democratizing systems are forced to compete for public opinion support precisely as a result of the democratizing process; they argue " ...as the political system opens up, old elites and rising counter- elites must compete for the support of new entrants into the marketplace through popular appeals, including appeals to the purported common interests of elites and mass groups in pursuing nationalistic aims against out-groups." The authors' argue that Slobodan Milosevic showed little affinity for nationalism until he was forced by the increasing pressure from mass participation (Synder and Ballentine 1996). The marketplace was ripe for nationalist ideas Serbia: Tito's constitutional reforms from 1974-1980 the ensuing war with Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina, helped facilitate Slobodan Milosevic destructive policies.

Leadership Style

As his nationalist political campaign began to unfold by April of 1987, Milosevic transformed from an affable and sometimes charming individual, to an intense and

arrogant politician. His tendency to shun the international community's requests to stop the war, his increasingly nationalist policies, and his savvy manipulation of the public opinion, eventually led him to three brutal wars in Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Kosovo. During these conflicts, he showed a chilling indifference towards the suffering of his own people (see Post 2004 and Sell 2002). Slobodan Milosevic never visited his troops in the battlefield, and he would rarely address his own people during the crisis. His disappearance from public life gave him an impression of a mysterious leader, a quality often associated with a hero in the Serbian culture (Cohen 2001). Some scholars maintain that his disappearance from the public eye may have been due to the fact that wars in Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina were unpopular wars. Others maintain that the rigors of the office, coupled with the stress of handling international community's pressure to end the violence, made him depressed (see Cohen 2001).

Although he is generally portrayed as the 'butcher of Yugoslavia,' many of his closest observers describe him as clever and capable. Milosevic possessed one unique trait. One of his associates observed how Milosevic "decides first what is expedient for him to believe, and then he believes it" (Cohen 2001, 106). He is usually described as a good tactician but lacking a long term strategy. According to the Bosnian Serb leader, Biljana Plavsic, Milosevic was a very capable person, charming but often times lacking a long term commitment to his policies (Cohen 2001, 106). He was a hard man to understand. While moving up the political ladder, especially during the time when he was just a communist apparatchik, he is described as pleasant.

In his discussion of his conversations with Slobodan Milosevic, Hrvoje Sarinic (1999) believes that Milosevic's main political objective was the accomplishment of

Greater Serbia. This aim became apparent to Mr. Sarinic during the meeting at the conference on Yugoslavia in The Hague in 1991, when Milosevic rejected the Carrington plan (Sarinic 1999). The Lord Carrington Plan tried to stop the wars in the former Yugoslavia in early 1991. The plan argued that the territory of the former Yugoslavia be divided into six sovereign republics. The plan never materialized because it did not have the support of one important republic – Slovenia. Franjo Tudjman later objected that too much was given to Serbia and Slobodan Milosevic.

Hrvoje Sarinic believes that Milosevic was a deliberate politician who served his own interests in an analytical manner. According to Sarinic, JNA's brief war with Slovenia in June of 1991 was a calculated decision in order to rid JNA of Slovenian and Croatian soldiers with the intent to wage an outright war against Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina. To Sarinic, Slobodan Milosevic was an acute observer and keen in accepting the facts of life and in favoring practicality. Slobodan Milosevic was a "political realist" who was guided by practical facts and who changed his preferences according to the situation on the ground (Sarinic 1999, 28). Such was the case when Milosevic would later settle for a "smaller Serbia," with a territory that would include half of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

With regard to the plan on the division of Bosnia and Herzegovina with Franjo Tudjman, it is believed that Milosevic distrusted the Muslims in Bosnia and Herzegovina and was perfectly content in making them a part of Croatia (Sarinic 1999). Today, scholars consider the division of Bosnia and Herzegovina hypothesis to be unlikely. According to Sarinic, Milosevic exhibited a pragmatic approach to the Yugoslav crisis in the 1990s. Sarinic's accounts of his conversations with Slobodan Milosevic intimate a

leader who, at times, was open to discuss every issue honestly, with one striking characteristic -- his tendency to change his goals as the political situation changed. According to Sarinic (1999, 45), when Milosevic understood that he could not create his idea of a 'Greater Serbia,' he took the role of the peacemaker (*mirotvorca*). Hrvoje Sarinic argues that Milosevic's biggest grievance during the wars in the former Yugoslavia was the EU embargo. Often times, he would demand the elimination of this embargo as a precondition to talks.

Slobodan Milosevic's cunning predisposition to manipulative politics would baffle foreign diplomats. Richard Holbrooke, who spent considerable time dealing with Milosevic, described him as crafty. He was prone to mood swings. His personality could range from charm to abrasiveness in a matter of minutes. Cohen (2001, 108) believes that Milosevic's leadership style was distinct in two ways: Milosevic's desire for privacy, and his modesty. Milosevic almost never appeared in public; he liked his privacy. This is quite intriguing considering his appetite for political power. His idea of entertainment revolved around his closest friends. In addition, he is said to have lived a modest life. He did not have an appetite for ostentatious things that are often associated with autocratic leaders.

Misha Glenny (1992) writes that Milosevic's initial rise to power is linked together with the plight of Kosovo Serbs. The Serbian leader would later widened the nationalist debate by including the Serb masses outside Kosovo and Serbia. According to Glenny (1992) Milosevic was very cautious not to bear responsibility for any policy (Glenny 1992, 35-36). Contrary to Franjo Tudjman, Glenny argues that Milosevic did not have a network of advisors; he formulated all of his policies himself, but when

confronted by western observers, he would contend that he had very little executive powers.

Operational Code Analysis

This chapter investigates whether or not personal characteristics of Slobodan Milosevic were reflected in his foreign policy behavior. Drawing on research associated with the political psychology and foreign policy decision making literatures this chapter investigates whether variation in Milosevic's belief set and personality traits fits with shifts that occur in Serbia's international behavior. Toward this end, this chapter focuses on several psychological characteristics that have been linked to variations in the proclivity toward cooperation and conflict. This chapter measures Milosevic's operational codes. Operational codes are individuals' fundamental belief sets about the international world and their place in it. Additionally, this chapter measures Slobodan Milosevic's five leadership traits—conceptual complexity, distrust, in-group Bias, need for power, and the belief in one's ability to control events.

In order to assess Slobodan Milosevic's operational code, this chapter utilizes the automated content analysis system VICS (Schafer and Walker 2006), using *Profiler Plus* computer software. VICS measures a leader's philosophical and instrumental beliefs using verbs as a unit of analysis, specifically using the degree and intensity of verb utterances. A quantitative technique of content analysis, VICS was first employed by Walker, Schafer, and Young (1998) to overcome problems associated with qualitative content analysis. VICS focuses on the verbs uttered by political leaders, and presents a leader's operational code in terms of numeric indices. *Profiler Plus* eliminates problems of inter-coder reliability that can occur with manual coding of texts. Therefore, an

automated content analysis of Slobodan Milosevic's texts should improve the accuracy of the coding, and limit validity concerns. The same selection of texts and software program were used to measure Slobodan Milosevic's conceptual complexity, level of distrust, in-group bias, and belief in one's ability to control events later in this chapter.

In this chapter, I focus on five of the operational code indices; aspects of an individual's belief set that appear likely to shape one's choices in international relations, especially on issues of international conflict or cooperation and on issues of motivation, if a leader is directing policy, at least in part, according to his or her personal understanding of the international environment. The first two, *Nature of the Political Universe* and *Realization of One's Political Aspirations*, are measured similarly. Both are measured according to how *others*, political actors with whom Slobodan Milosevic does not share a relationship or affinity, act in the world. The former is scaled +1 to -1, and is the percent of negative actions attributed to others subtracted from the percent of positive actions attributed to others. The latter is also a +1 to -1 scale, but here actions are scored as not merely positive or negative, but to the degree of positivity or negativity. The third index I examine is the individual's perception of their *Control*. This is measured as the percent of self attributions divided by the total number of self and other attributions. The concept is that those who speak of themselves as being generally in control of their surroundings and the world are more likely to truly believe this than others. It varies between 1 and 0, with a higher number connoting a greater belief in one's ability to control events. Our final two indices are *Approach to Goals* and *Pursuit of Goals*. These are measured in the same fashion as the first two indices, except that here the focus is on self attributions as

opposed to other attributions. They tell us how Milosevic sees himself behaving in the political universe.

Hypotheses

On the basis of the biographical record and the events of 1991-1995, I hypothesize the following:

Nature of the Political Universe (P1)

Slobodan Milosevic is more likely to have seen the political environment as less cooperative during the first phase of the war (1991-1993) than later when the war intensified. I expect a further shift to occur in Slobodan Milosevic over time, seeing the political universe as much more cooperative in the years after 1993.

Realization of One's Political Aspirations (P2)

Slobodan Milosevic is likely to have been more optimistic in achieving his political aspirations during the beginning of the crisis in 1990 than in later periods of the war. I expect him to be less optimistic about the world after 1993, with probably his lowest scores occurring from 1993-1995 and from 1998-1999.

Control over Historical Development (P4)

I expect that as the war intensified, his vision of the political environment will become more negative. I expect that Slobodan Milosevic is likely to have a less sense of control over historical development during the latter stage of the war. I expect to see his lowest scores at the beginning of 1995.

Approach to Goals (I1)

I hypothesize that Slobodan Milosevic is likely to have been less cooperative during the first phase of the war from 1991-1993. I expect that as the war continued this measure would increase.

Pursuit of Goals (I2)

I expect that Slobodan Milosevic to have had a stronger belief in noncooperation in the first phase of the war from 1991-1993. Changes in this index are expected after 1993, with a rise again by 1995.

Results of Operational Code Analysis

Table 1.6: Milosevic's Operational Code Over Time

Year	P1	P2	P4	I1	I2
1989	.06	-.08	.20	.30	.21
1990	.73	.51	.21	.50	.00
1991	.14	.03	.23	.15	-.01
1992	-.07	-.15	.24	.78	.41
1993	.38	.14	.33	.75	.21
1994	.28	.21	.56	.86	.50

1998	.35	.18	.31	.29	.12
1999	.17	.06	.31	.55	.33

The interpretation of Milosevic's VICS indices can reveal important information on Milosevic's foreign policy behavior, especially his view of the nature of the political universe and his perception on the most effective strategies for realizing his political goals. With respect to Slobodan Milosevic's view of the nature of the political universe --

the index P1 in the Operational Code Analysis -- shows a leader whose view changed significantly with the situation on the ground. The index for the nature of the political universe (P1) varies between -1.0 (Extremely Hostile) to 1.0 (Extremely Friendly). With this information in mind, we can say the following about Slobodan Milosevic: In the year 1989, the score of .06 on the scale P1 indicates that Slobodan Milosevic had a mixed view -- hostile and friendly -- of the political universe. The score of .06 is anchored to the descriptor of “mixed” (0.0) political universe on the nature of the political universe scale for P1. The June 28, 1989 speech is the speech he delivered at the 600 anniversary of the battle of Kosovo which occurred in June of 1389. This speech is often cited as an example of Milosevic’s fervent nationalism. Interestingly enough, the score on the P1 index strongly suggest an indecisive politician as it pertains to his view of the political universe.

Nevertheless, in 1990 we see a spike in the scale P1 from .06 in 1989 to .73 in 1990. The score of .73 is anchored to the descriptor of “very friendly” political universe on the nature of the political universe scale for P1. The year 1990 was the year of the first multi-party elections in the territory of Yugoslavia, with nationalist leaders in each of the three republics – Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Serbia – winning the elections. 1990 was also the year of reforms in Yugoslavia with Ante Markovic’s failed attempts at economic reforms (Meier 1999). Over all, the scale P1 suggests that Milosevic had a “somewhat” friendly view of the political universe in 1990, 1993, and 1998. The score on the scale I1 (Direction of Strategy) in the year 1990, 1993, 1994 and 1998 also suggest a leader who believed that a “somewhat cooperative” direction is the best strategy for realizing political goals. Nevertheless, the I2 score (Intensity of Tactics)

in the year 1990 is 0.0 which indicates a leader with a mixed, cooperative and conflictual approach to political strategy. Generally, the years 1989- 1990 point to a leader who despite having a cooperative and friendly view of the political universe, still believed that the best way at achieving his political goal was through a mixed strategy of cooperation and conflict. This certainly is true given the literature on Slobodan Milosevic.

As noted earlier in this dissertation, the literature on the role of audience effect and material source bias with regard to the validity of these at-a-distance measurements is inconclusive. Dille (2000) has found that leadership traits, such as conceptual complexity, are relatively stable across different material sources, but he cautions us for the operational code measures. In their analysis of operational code indices between spontaneous remarks and prepared speeches, Schafer and Crichlow (2000) argue that spontaneous remarks may be more preferable. In the case of Milosevic, the sample of speeches was constrained by the availability of the number of speeches over 1500 words. As a result, the speeches that were selected using this criterion were very few. The speeches are a mix of prepared and spontaneous remarks. Unfortunately, there is no other way to ameliorate this problem; therefore, we should expect more variation in these indices in Milosevic.

So, how do we interpret this data? For example, in the years 1991-1993, Slobodan Milosevic believed in a somewhat friendly political universe (we see a slight change in the year 1992 with a score of -.07 in the P1 scale), believed in his ability to realize his political goals, and believed that a mixed strategy of cooperation and conflict is the best way to approaching his foreign policy goals. These scores generally fit with the hypotheses, again with a slight pessimistic view in the year 1992. But if we refer to

the score in the scale I2 (.41), we note that Slobodan Milosevic maintained a moderate belief in cooperation. The score on the scale I2 could be mitigated by the negative score in the P1 and P2 scale, which indicates that Milosevic may indeed have believed that the best strategy is a strategy of cooperative and conflictual behavior. This goes hand in hand with the qualitative literature on the Serbian leader. Foreign diplomats (e.g. Holbrooke 1998 and Zimmermann 1995) often times would note about Slobodan Milosevic's indecisiveness.

The year 1992 fits with the general literature on Slobodan Milosevic, as one would expect for Milosevic to have a somewhat hostile view on the nature of the political universe considering the fact that the year 1992 was the year Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina declared their independence from Yugoslavia. The year 1992 saw the war escalate between the three warring side and the imposition of United Nation's embargo on Serbia. There is one notable exception, and that's year 1982, in which year, Milosevic believed in a somewhat conflictual view of the world. In the years 1994 and 1999, Milosevic had a somewhat friendly view on the nature of the political universe, whereas in 1992, Milosevic had a somewhat hostile view of the nature of the political universe. With regard to his score on the scale for P2 (Realization of Political Values), we see a leader with a somewhat pessimistic view of the world for the years 1989 and 1992, but a more optimistic leader in 1990, 1994, and 1999. Year 1994 saw an increase in intensity in peace negotiations and year 1999 saw the conclusion of the war with Kosovo Liberation Army and NATO.

With respect to the year 1998 – this was the year of the conflict between the Kosovo Liberation Army and the Yugoslav forces – we notice a slight drop in the I1 and

I2 scale from the previous year in the analysis, the year 1994. Nevertheless, as we interpret all five indices, we see a leader who maintained that a somewhat friendly political universe view, and who continued to believe in his ability to realize his political goals, and maintained that a mixed strategy of cooperation and conflict is the best way to approaching his foreign policy goals.

Leadership Trait Analysis

As noted earlier in this chapter, this dissertation measures Milosevic's leadership traits; specifically, it measures Milosevic's conceptual complexity, distrust, need for power, in- group bias, and the belief in the ability to control events. Conceptual complexity reflects how individuals structure their cognitions. And distrust and in-group bias reflect the extent to which individuals harbor doubts about the intentions or legitimacy of other actors in the political universe (Herman 2002). There is already a substantial literature linking variations in these characteristics to particular political behaviors (cooperative international behavior is associated with cooperative operational codes, higher levels of complexity, and lower levels of distrust, while international conflict is associated with the opposite). The next trait, the belief in one's ability to control events is a "view of the world in which leaders perceive some degree of control over the situations" they find themselves in (Hermann 2002, 14). In coding for this trait, the focus is on action words or verbs. A score on this trait is determined by calculating the percentage of times the verbs in a public statement indicate that a leader or a group with whom a leader identifies has taken responsibility for planning or initiating an action (Hermann 1980, 2002). The last trait, the need for power, indicates a "desire to control, influence, or have an impact on others or groups" (Hermann 2002, 16). Leaders' who

score high on the measure work to manipulate the environment. These leaders' are good at understanding situations and identifying which strategy, and/or tactics to use to achieve maximum control. As Hermann (2002, 17) notes, "leaders high in power are generally daring and charming – the dashing hero." Milosevic has often times been praised for exuding charm (see Holbrooke 1998 and Zimmermann 1999). A precise measure on this characteristic should give more insight about this assertion.

Additionally, leaders who score high on the need for power and high on one's ability to control events are skillful in both "direct and indirect influence; know what they want and take charge to see it happens" (Hermann 2002, 14). Additionally, the score on in-Group bias will help us understand if Slobodan Milosevic's nationalism played a key role in his decision-making process, as it is widely assumed in the literature (Glenny 1996; Holbrooke 1998; Judah 2009; Owen 1995; Silber and Little 1996; Zimmerman 1995).

To measure Slobodan Milosevic's worldview, and later his conceptual complexity, distrust, in-group bias, need for power and belief in one's ability to control events, this chapter uses at-a-distance content analysis to a selection of public statements he made from 1990-1995. The sample of public statements is generated randomly from a pool of over 50 public statements Milosevic made from 1990- 1999. As a result, the statements are public speeches and personal interviews.

Results of Leadership Trait Analysis

Table 2.6: Milosevic's Personality Traits Over Time

Year	Complexity	Distrust	In-group Bias	BACE	NeedforPower
1989	.68	.30	.21	.44	.22
1990	.61	.07	.26	.35	.32
1991	.67	.13	.23	.24	.30
1992	.71	.13	.16	.35	.38
1993	.63	.27	.11	.29	.33
1994	.55	.10	.25	.44	.36

1998	.70	.10	.18	.37	.23
1999	.60	.16	.19	.23	.42

Conceptual Complexity

Political leaders differ on their degree of openness towards alternative sources of information. Leaders who score high on conceptual complexity tend to be more open to contextual information. They also tend to be considered to be more open to other leaders. Leaders who score high on this measure tend to be more flexible to the surrounding environment and are less likely to be driven by their ideologies. They tend to view the world in more nuanced manner and are willing to entertain the idea of alternative sources of information. According to Hermann (2002, 23) “conceptual complexity is the degree of differentiation which an individual shows in describing or discussing other people, places, policies, ideas, or things.” Research has shown that a leader with a high degree of conceptual complexity considers multiple sources of information before making a foreign policy decision. In coding for conceptual complexity the focus is on words that denote

leader's high level of differentiation as opposed to the words that denote that a leader's sees the environment around him as generally simplistic. As with the operational code analysis, the statistical software *Profiler Plus* was used for coding purposes.

In the case of Slobodan Milosevic (see Table 5) we see a leader with a relatively high score in the conceptual complexity measure for every year under study. In Social Science Automation's study of 58 leaders, the mean score in this trait for the 58 leaders was .64 (Social Science Automation Inc. 2007). This indicates that Milosevic was attuned to contextual information and understood that gathering more information may help him make better decisions. This is contrary to what one would expect about the Serbian leader. He is usually portrayed as stubborn and inflexible and less attuned to contextual information. Interestingly enough, a high score in conceptual complexity suggests that Slobodan Milosevic should have appeared as open and pragmatic to others around him, notably to those involved in negotiations with him. But, the research on this matter is mixed. Some writers suggest that Slobodan Milosevic was stubborn and sensitive to personal criticism (see Holbrooke 1998 and Zimmermann 1995), and others (see Sarinic 1998) suggest an open and knowledgeable leader.

Distrust and in-group Bias

The information about Slobodan Milosevic's distrust and in-Group bias score will give us an idea of whether or not the Serbian leader was driven by threats or problems or by the opportunity for cooperation (Hermann 2002). Research has shown that a leader's way of approaching the world can affect their country's foreign policy behavior, especially with regard to how likely they are to engage in cooperative behavior or in

military action (Driver, 1977; Hagan, 1994, 1995; Hermann and Kegley, 1995; Kelman, 1983; Levine and Campbell, 1972; Snyder, 1991; Vasquez, 1993).

In coding for distrust the focus is on nouns referring to persons other than the leader. “Distrust of others involves a general feeling of doubt, uneasiness, misgiving, and wariness about others--an inclination to suspect the motives and actions of others” (Hermann 2002, 31). If any of these conditions are present the noun is coded as distrust. Margaret Hermann (2002, 30) defines in-group bias as “a view of the world in which one’s own group (social, political, ethnic, etc) holds center stage.” In coding for in-Group bias the focus is on modifiers that suggest some form of affinity to the leader’s own group. *Profiler Plus* was used to code for these two traits.

Leaders who score high on distrust tend to view others with suspicion, especially those who they are in conflict with. Political leaders with a high score in in-Group bias tend to see the world in terms of “us” and “them.” The leader strongly identifies with the group so if anything happens to the group it happens to the leader. These leaders rationalize about the weaknesses of their group by over-emphasizing their strength.

We see that Slobodan Milosevic scores high on distrust, especially in the years 1989 and 1993 (we would expect his distrust to mitigate his high conceptual complexity score during those years – a leader less willing to consider contextual information before making a decision). Similarly, the other years under the analysis, point to a relatively distrustful leader. According to Social Science Automation (2007) analysis of the conceptual complexity score of 58 leaders, the mean on this score for the 58 leaders is .01. Slobodan Milosevic scores higher on this measure in every year under the analysis. In terms of his in-Group Bias score, we notice a relatively low score in this measure (see

table above). The analysis of these two traits (high distrust and low in-Group bias) suggests that Slobodan Milosevic believed that preparation is the best foreign policy strategy, especially as it pertains to containing the adversary's actions in the international arena. The low in-Group bias score suggests that nationalism is not as deeply associated with his foreign policy behavior as it is generally believed.

Belief in One's Ability to Control Events and Need for Power

Leaders, who score high on this measure, as well as on the need for power measure, are known to be game changers: they challenge the constraints in the environments and push the limits on what's possible (Hermann, 1980, 2002; Walker, 1983; Hermann and Preston, 1994; Kaarbo and Hermann, 1998; Kowert and Hermann, 1997; McClelland, 1975; Winter and Stewart, 1977). Leaders who score high in the belief in one's ability to control events tend to view themselves in control of the situation. These leaders are skillful in getting what needs to be done and in making others do what he/she wants them to do. In this trait Slobodan Milosevic scores vary from year to year. His lowest score is recorded in 1989 and 1998, which fits with the literature on the leader. Year 1989 was the year of political uncertainty in the entire territory of then Yugoslavia and the year 1998 was the year of the conflict with Kosovo. Generally speaking, Slobodan Milosevic score in the characteristics suggests that his view of his ability to control events was relatively high, with the exception of the two aforementioned years. As we recall the literature on Slobodan Milosevic, he is often portrayed as a cunning politician, a grand manipulator, and a callous user of people (see Post 2004). Milosevic was often good at using others as a means to an end. A score in this measure should provide us with a precise measure on this assertion.

According to Hermann (2002, 16) “need for power indicates a concern for establishing, maintaining, or restoring one’s power or, in other words, the desire to control, influence, or have an impact on other persons or groups.” Leader with high need for power tend to be more active decision-makers. They are directly involved in the decision-making and tend to manipulate their environment in order to become winners. Several scholars have noted Milosevic’s desire for power (see Pappas 2005). Slobodan Milosevic score relatively high on this measure, notably in the years 1990-1994, and 1999. What this means is that Slobodan Milosevic was a leader who was in charge and believed that the best course of action is the one advocated by him, especially in the years 1990-1994, and 1999.

Summary of Chapter

This chapter shows that the research on Slobodan Milosevic, especially in the English language, has advanced contradictory statements on Serbia’s president and the important role he played in European politics. By carrying out a systematic investigation of his foreign policy world view and foundational personality traits I have helped to fill these holes in the literature.

Fitting with the generally outsized role he is seen as having played in Serbia’s foreign policy we see a fit, to a certain degree, between the shifts in Serbia’s foreign policy in the early 1990s and changes in his own operational code. Fitting with changes in Serbia’s behavior between the earlier and later stages of the war, Milosevic’s own operational code was more cooperative in the later stage of the war. But also fitting with a change in the balance of power, Milosevic saw himself as having a relatively medium level of control as the war went on.

My analyses also reaffirm multiple sides of the literature on Milosevic, sides which sometimes seem to be in conflict in the literature. Milosevic may have simply been a complicated individual. He appears to have had a preference for a mixed strategy of cooperative and aggressive policy means, but was willing to change those as events and his perceptions of other political actors changed. This analysis confirms the literature on the Serbian leader that he was difficult to predict (Holbrooke 1998). He appears to have been conceptually complex; a personal characteristic that often reinforces an orientation toward cooperation. But exhibiting a certain level of distrust once the war was underway, and often failing to see himself in control of his environment, his general tendency toward cooperation could sometimes be lessened when he was challenged. Often seeking cooperation and seeing shades of gray in his surrounding, but doubting his power to affect events, and doubting the intentions of others when enmeshed in deep conflict, it is not surprising that he was often slow to commit to a decision. Extending inferences from these patterns we might expect him to engage in deals and alliances regardless of nationalistic lines, as he did on occasion, to strike back against conflict-oriented political actors he believed he could exert power over, but to generally be a dealmaker when interacting with other political actors, trying to deftly achieve gains in his and his country's complicated position.

With regard to the literature on Slobodan Milosevic's nationalism, my analysis suggests it was more complex than the portrait painted by Western observers (Holbrooke 1998, Zimmerman 1999). While there is abundant evidence in the literature for the position that he was a nationalist, fitting that stance with his cognitive complexity and low levels of distrust and in-group bias reminds us that nationalism is not necessarily

simplistic, and does not necessarily prevent subtlety and complexity. It can be fitted to detailed strategies, tactics, and even pragmatism.

CHAPTER SEVEN

General Conclusions

This dissertation began with the premise of systematically and quantitatively measuring the psychological characteristics of Franjo Tudjman and Slobodan Milosevic. Specifically, this dissertation measured Tudjman's and Milosevic's worldview through operational code analysis, a tool used to measure a leader's cognitions. In addition, this dissertation measured Tudjman's and Milosevic's personality traits relating to leadership style through the content analysis technique of Leadership Trait Analysis as developed by Margaret G. Hermann. This dissertation measured Tudjman's conceptual complexity, distrust, and in-Group bias. With regard to Milosevic, this dissertation also measured Milosevic's need for power and the belief in the ability to control events, in addition to distrust, conceptual complexity, and in-Group bias, given these traits' connection to behaviors and perspectives often associate with the Serbian leader.

By developing replicable measures of these two leaders' psychological characteristics as displayed in their political statements, this dissertation has shed new light on the two leaders. By describing their fundamental foreign policy predispositions in a more precise manner, and by producing a more concise interpretation of their leadership traits through the systematic study of their individual traits, this dissertation has, for the first time, provided rigorous data in support for (or in opposition to) some of assertions put forth by other scholars. Although it did not directly test whether specific foreign policy choices of these two leaders stemmed from their psychological characteristics, this dissertation did generate important information on the role of cognition and personality traits in Tudjman's and Milosevic's approach to politics –

matters affecting world view and leadership style. This dissertation settled some of the questions regarding Tudjman's and Milosevic's nationalism. As far as both leaders' are concerned, this dissertation shows that while nationalism played a role in their political behavior, it may have been more something used conveniently for political purposes than a personal crusade based on deeply ingrained beliefs that were at the center of these leaders' goals and thought processes.

In terms of their leadership traits, both leaders seem to score high on three traits: distrust, conceptual complexity, and in-group bias. Both leaders seem to score relatively high on conceptual complexity. The high score on conceptual complexity would mitigate the feelings of distrust which help explain the both leaders' proclivity to pragmatism. Slobodan Milosevic scores average in the need for power trait. This also helps confirm several characterizations about him – he was just a competitive politician trying to stay in power. Nevertheless, it seems that his conceptual complexity score may have also mitigated the need for power. His need for power increases in the later years (see 1992, 1994, 1999) as his is more threatened by the situation on the ground. 1992 is the year the country was engulfed in full fledged war and the year in which Bosnia and Herzegovina and Croatia declared independence. Year 1994 is the year the situation on the ground turns in favor of Croatia, and 1999 is the year he is bombed by NATO.

In terms of their operational codes, especially their basic approach to political goals, we see that both leaders' preferred strategy was a mix of both conflictual and cooperative mean. We also note that both leaders' were much attuned to the situation on the ground and somewhat pragmatic, as their operational code indices appear to have varied as a result of the changes in the environment. Both leaders score relatively high in

conceptual complexity, which also could contribute to their sensitivity to the situation around them. Given these findings, it comes as no surprise why both leaders' are portrayed as very complex and hard to predict, as much of the literature on the both leaders suggests. Works that suggest their foreign policy orientations were set in stone and firmly ideological, stemming from deeply internalized personal characteristics, appear farther from the mark. Given their pragmatism and perhaps surprising flexibility, the next step in this research might be comparative studies of how they dealt with specific, discrete cases of decisions.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allcock, J. B. 2000. *Explaining Yugoslavia*. Columbia University Press, New York.
- Banac, I. 1993. 'Croatianism' *The New Republic*, 25 October, pp. 20-22
- Baric, N. 2005. *Srpska Pobuna u Hrvatskoj, 1991-1995*, Golden Marketing-Tehnicka Knjiga, Zagreb.
- Basta, K. 2010. Non-Ethnic Origins of Ethnofederal Institutions: The Case of Yugoslavia, *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, 16, No. 92, 92-110.
- Bekavac, I. 2002. *Dr. Franjo Tudman, Vizije i Postignuca: Rasprave za Okruglim Stolom uz Drugu Obijetnicu Smrti Prvoga Hrvatskog Predsjednika*, UHIP, Zagreb.
- Butkovic, D. and Grakalic, D. 1991. *Priloze za Politicku Biografiju Dr. Franjo Tudjmana Predsjednika Republike Hrvatske*, Sredista Knjiga 2, Zagreb.
- Carter, A. 1982. *Democratic Reform in Yugoslavia: The Changing Role of the Party*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- Cockburn, A. 1995. 'Beat the Devil: Hating Serbs is Fun' *The Nation*, 16 October, pp. 411-412.
- Cohen, L. J. 1997. Prelates and Politicians in Bosnia: The Role of Religion in Nationalist Mobilisation. *Nationalities Papers* 25, pp. 481-499.
- Crichlow, S. 1998. Idealism or Pragmatism? An Operational Code Analysis of Yitzhak Rabin and Shimon Peres. *Political Psychology* 19, 683-706.
- Crichlow, S. 2002. The Effect of Members' Personality Traits on Congressional Trade Voting. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 46, 693-711.
- Crichlow, S. 2006. The Eyes of Kesteven: How the Worldviews of Margaret Thatcher and Her Cabinet Influenced British Foreign Policy. In Mark Schafer and Stephen G. Walker

- (eds.) *Beliefs and Leadership in World Politics: Methods and Applications of Operational Code Analysis*, New York: Palgrave MacMillan, pp.77-99.
- Cviic, Ch. 1995. Review Article: Perceptions of Former Yugoslavia: an Interpretive Reflection. *International Affairs*, 71, No.4, 819-826.
- Dille, B. 2000. The Prepared and Spontaneous Remarks of President Reagan and Bush: A Validity Comparison for At-a-Distance Measurements. *Political Psychology* 21, No.3, 573-585.
- Dille, B. and Young M. D. 2000. The Conceptual Complexity of Presidents Carter and Clinton: An Automated Content Analysis of Temporal Stability and Source Bias. *Political Psychology* 21, No. 3, 587-596.
- Djilas, A. 1993. A Profile of Slobodan Milosevic. *Foreign Affairs*, 73, No.2, 81- 96.
- Eskeridge-Kosmach.,2009. Yugoslavia and U.S Foreign Policy in the 1960s-1970s of the 20th Century. *Journal of Slavic and Military Studies*, 22, 383-418.
- Djokic, D.,2003. (Dis)integrating Yugoslavia: King Alexander and Interwar Yugoslavism in Djokic, D., (eds). *Yugoslavism: Histories of a Failed Idea: 1918-1992*. The University of Wisconsin Press, 136-156.
- Dragovic-Soso, J., 2004. Rethinking Yugoslavia: Serbian Intellectuals and the National Question' in Historical Perspective. *Contemporary European History*, 13, 170-184.
- Feng, H. 2005. The Operational Code of Mao Zedung: Defensive or Offensive Realist? *Security Studies*, 14, No. 4, 637-662.
- Flere, S. 2003. Blind Alleys in Ethnic Essentialist Explanations of the Downfall of the Former Yugoslavia. *Critical Sociology*, 29, No.2, 237-256.

- Gagnon, V.P. Jr., 2004. *The Myth of Ethnic War: Serbia and Croatia in 1990s*. Cornell University Press, Ithaca, N.Y.
- Gagnon, V.P. Jr., 2010. Yugoslavia in 1989 and After. *Nationalities Papers*. No.38, Vo. 1, 23-39.
- George, A. 1969. The "Operational Code": A Neglected Approach to the Study of Political Leaders and Decision-Making. *International Studies Quarterly* 13, 190-222.
- George, A. 1979. The Causal Nexus Between Beliefs and Behavior. In L. Falkowski (eds.) *Psychological Models in International Politics*. Westview Press. Boulder, CO, 95-124.
- Glenny, M. 1996. *The Fall of Yugoslavia: The Third Balkan War*. Penguin Books. London.
- Hermann, M.G. 1980. Explaining Foreign Policy Behavior Using the Personal Characteristics of Leaders. *International Studies Quarterly* 24, 7-46.
- Hagan, J. D. 1994. Domestic Political Systems and War Proneness. *Mershon International Studies Review* 38, 183-207.
- Hagan, J.D. 1995. Domestic Political Explanations in the Analysis of Foreign Policy. In Laura Neack, Jeanne A.K. Hey, and Patrick J. Haney (eds.) *Foreign Policy Analysis*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Hermann, M G., and Kegley CH.W. 1989. Rethinking Democracy and International Peace: Perspectives from Political Psychology. *International Studies Quarterly* 39, 511-533.
- Hermann, M. G. 2002. Assessing Leadership Style: Trait Analysis. *Social Science Automation Inc*.

- Hermann, M.G. 2003. Assessing Leadership Style: Trait Analysis. In Jerrold M. Post (eds) . *The Psychological Assessment of Political Leaders: With Profiles of Saddam Hussein and Bill Clinton*. The University of Michigan Press, 178-212.
- Falkowski, L.S. 1978. *Presidents, Secretaries of State, and Crisis in U.S Foreign Relations: A Model and Predictive Analysis*. Westview. Boulder, CO.
- Hebrang, A. 2002 in Ivan Bekavac (eds) *Dr. Franjo Tudman, Vizije i Postignuca: Rasprave za Okruglim Stolom uz Drugu Obijetnicu Smrti Prvoga Hrvatskog Predsjednika*. UHIP, Zagreb.
- Holbrooke, R. 1998. *To End a War*. Random House, New York.
- Holsti, O. 1977. The 'Operational Code' as an Approach to the Analysis of Belief Systems. The Final Report to the National Science Foundation. Grant SOC 75-16368. Duke University.
- Hudelist, D. 2004. *Tudman: Biografija*. Profil International, Zagreb, Croatia.
- Johnson, L. 1977. Operational Codes and the Prediction of Leadership Behavior: Senator Frank Church at Midcareer. In Margaret Hermann (eds). *A Psychological Examination of Political Leaders*. New York: Free Press.
- Ivankovic. 2002. in Ivan Bekavac (eds) *Dr. Franjo Tudman, Vizije i Postignuca: Rasprave za Okruglim Stolom uz Drugu Obijetnicu Smrti Prvoga Hrvatskog Predsjednika*. UHIP, Zagreb.
- Jovic, D. 2004. Official Memories in Post-Authoritarianism: an Analytical Framework. *Journal of Southern Europe and the Balkans*, 6, No. 2, 97-108.

Jovic, D. 2002. in Ivan Bekavac (eds) *Dr. Franjo Tudman, Vizije i Postignuca: Rasprave za Okruglim Stolom uz Drugu Obijetnicu Smrti Prvoga Hrvatskog Predsjednika*. UHIP, Zagreb.

Jovic, D. 2009. *Yugoslavia: a State That Withered Away*. Purdue University press, West Lafayette, Indiana.

Jovic, D., 2003. Yugoslavism and Yugoslav Communism: From Tito to Kardelj in *Djokic, D.,(eds), Yugoslavism: Histories of a Failed Idea: 1918-1992*. The University of Wisconsin Press, 157-181.

Judah, T. 2009. *The Serbs: History, Myth, and the Destruction of Yugoslavia*. Yale University Press, Hartford, Connecticut.

Kaplan, R. D. 1994. *Balkan Ghosts*. St. Martin's Press, New York.

Kaplan, R. D. 1991. Croatianism. *The New Republic* pp. 16-18.

Kearns, I. 1998. Croatian Politics: Authoritarianism or Democracy? *Contemporary Politics* 4, 247-268.

Kelman, H. C.1983. Conversations with Arafat: A Social-Psychological Assessment of the Prospect for Israeli-Palestinian Peace. *American Psychologist* 38, 203-216.

Lampe, J. R., 1996. *Yugoslavia as History: There was a Country*. Cambridge University Press.

Leites, N.1951. *The Operational Code of the Politburo*. McGraw-Hill, New York, NY

Leites, N. 1953. *A Study of Bolshevism*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Madzar, Lj. 2000. Who Exploited Whom? In Nebojsa P., (eds.) *The Road to War in Serbia*. Central University Press, 161-188.

- Malici, A. and Malici, J. 2005. The Operational Codes of Fidel Castro and Kim Il Sung: The Last Cold Warriors? *Political Psychology* 26, 387-412.
- Mansfield, E., D., and Snyder, J., 1995. Democratization and War. *Foreign Affairs*, 56, No. 2, 79-97.
- Mansfield, E., D., and Snyder, J., 2002. Democratic Transitions, Institutional Strength, and War. *International Organization*, 56, No.2, 297-337.
- Mansfield, E., D., and Snyder, J. 2002. Incomplete Democratization and the Outbreak of Military Disputes. *International Studies Quarterly*, 46, No. 4, 529-549.
- Mearshehier, J. J. 2001. *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. W. W Norton and Company Inc., New York.
- McLellan, D.S.1971.The Operational Code Approach to the Study of Political Leaders: Dean Acheson's Philosophical and Instrumental Beliefs. *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 4, 52-75.
- Milosavljevic, O., 2000. In Nebojsa P., (eds.). *Yugoslavia as a Mistake*. Central European Press, 50-80.
- Morganthau, H. J. 1948. *Politics Among Nations*. Mcgraw and Hill.
- Owen, D. 1995. *Balkan Odyssey*. Harcourt Brace and Company Orlando, Florida.
- Pappas, T.S., 2005. Shared Culture, Individual Strategy and Collective Action: Explaining Slobodan Milosevic's Rise to Power, *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies*, 5, No.2, 191-211.
- Plestina, D. 1992. *Regional Development in Communist Yugoslavia: Success, Failure, and Consequences*. Westview Press, Boulder.

- Popovic, N. 1968. *Yugoslavia: The New Class in Crisis*. Syracuse University Press, New York.
- Posen, B. R., 1993. The Security Dilemma and Ethnic Conflict. *Survival*, 35, No. 1, 27-47.
- Post, J. M. 2004. *Leaders and Their Followers in a Dangerous World*. Cornell University Press, Ithaca, NY.
- Praljak, S. 2002. in Ivan Bekavac (eds) *Dr. Franjo Tudman, Vizije i Postignuca: Rasprave za Okruglim Stolom uz Drugu Obijetnicu Smrti Prvoga Hrvatskog Predsjednika*. UHIP, Zagreb.
- Preston, Th. 2001. *The President and his Inner Circle*. Columbia Press, NY.
- Rados, I. 2005. *Tudman Izbliza*. Profil International, Zagreb, Croatia.
- Ramet, S. P. 2005. *Thinking About Yugoslavia: Scholarly Debates About the Yugoslav Breakup and the Wars in Bosnia and Kosovo*. Cambridge University, Press.
- Ramet, S. P., 2002. *Balkan Babel: The Disintegration of Yugoslavia from the Death of Tito to Slobodan Milosevic*. Westview Press.
- Ramet, S. P. 2002. Views From Inside: Memoirs Concerning Yugoslav Break up and War. *Slavic Review: Interdisciplinary Quarterly of Russian, Eurasian, and East European Studies*, 61, No. 2, 558-580.
- Ramet, P. 1984. Political Struggle and Institutional Reorganization in Yugoslavia. *Political Science Quarterly*, 99, No.2, 289-302.
- Renshon, J. 2009. When Public Statements Reveal Private Beliefs: Assessing Operational Codes at a Distance. *Political Psychology* 30, 649-661.

- Robison, S. 2006. George W. Bush and the Vulcans: Leader-Advisor Relations and America's Response to the 9/11 Attacks. In Mark Schafer and Stephen G. Walker (eds.) *Beliefs and Leadership in World Politics: Methods and Applications of Operational Code Analysis*. Palgrave MacMillan, New York, 101-124.
- Rudolf, D. 1999. *Rat Koji Nismo Htjeli*. Nakladni Zavod, Globus.
- Rudolf, D. 2002. in Ivan Bekavac (eds) *Dr. Franjo Tudman, Vizije i Postignuca: Rasprave za Okruglim Stolom uz Drugu Obijetnicu Smrti Prvoga Hrvatskog Predsjednika*. UHIP, Zagreb.
- Rosenberger, Ch. 1993.. The Next Balkan War. *National Review*, pp. 22-26.
- Sadkovich ,J. J. 1998. *The U.S. Media and Yugoslavia, 1991-1995*. Praeger Publishers, Westport, CT.
- Sadkovich , J.J. 2006. Franjo Tudjman and the Muslim-Croat War of 1993. *Review of Croatian History* 2, 207-245.
- Sadkovich ,J.J. 2006. Who was Franjo Tudjman? *East European Politics and Societies* 20, 729-739.
- Schafer, M.1997. Cooperation in an Objective Conflict of Interest? Testing Two Psychological Approaches. *Journal of Politics* 59, 729-750.
- Schafer, M. and Scott, C. 2000. Bill Clinton's Operational Code: Assessing Source Material Bias. *Political Psychology* 21, No.3, 559-571.
- Schafer,,M. and Walker, S. G. (eds.) 2006. *Beliefs and Leadership in World Politics: Methods and Applications of Operational Code Analysis*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

- Schafer, M., Robinson, S., and Aldrich, B. 2006. Operational Codes and the 1916 Easter Rising in Ireland: A Test of the Frustration-Aggression Hypothesis. *Foreign Policy Analysis* 2, 63-82.
- Schafer, M. and Walker, S. G. 2006. Democratic Leaders and the Democratic Peace: The Operational Codes of Tony Blair and Bill Clinton. *International Studies Quarterly* 50, 561-583.
- Sekulic, D., Massey, G., and Hodson, R., 1994. Who Were Yugoslavs? Failed Sources of a Common Identity in Yugoslavia. *American Sociological Review*, 59, No.1, 83-97.
- Silber, L. and Little, A. 1996. *Yugoslavia: Death of a Nation*. Penguin Books, London.
- Snyder, J. 1991. *Myths of Empire: Domestic Politics and International Ambition*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Stevenson, M. 2006. Economic Liberalism and the Operational Code Beliefs of U.S. Presidents: The Initiation of NAFTA Disputes, 1989-2002. In Mark Schafer and Stephen G. , Eds. *Beliefs and Leadership in World Politics: Methods and Applications of Operational Code*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Walker (eds.) *Beliefs and Leadership in World Politics: Methods and Applications of Operational Code Analysis*. Palgrave MacMillan, New York, 201-217.
- Stokes, G. 1982. Reviewed Work(s): *Nationalism in Contemporary Europe* by Franjo Tudjman. *The American Historical Review* 87, 773-774.
- Suedfeld, P. and Tetlock, P.E. 1977. Integrative Complexity of Communications in International Crises. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 21, 169-184.

- Thies, C. 2004. Individuals, Institutions, and Inflation: Conceptual Complexity, Central Bank Independence, and the Asian Financial Crisis. *International Studies Quarterly* 48, 579-602.
- Thies, C. 2009. The Conceptual Complexity of Central Bankers and the Asian Financial Crisis. *Political Psychology* 30, 445-464.
- Treanor, P. 1997. Tower of Tadjman. *Language and Communication* 17, 67-69.
- Tomac, Z. 2003. *Prijepori o Nacionalnom: U Znaku Mosta*. . Birotisak Roso. Zagreb
- Tudjman, M. 2002. in Ivan Bekavac (eds) *Dr. Franjo Tudman, Vizije i Postignuca: Rasprave za Okruglim Stolom uz Drugu Obijetnicu Smrti Prvoga Hrvatskog Predsjednika*. UHIP, Zagreb.
- Uzelak, G. 1998. Franjo Tudjman's Nationalist Ideology. *East European Quarterly* 31, 449-472.
- Vujacic, V. 1996. Historical Legacies, Nationalist Mobilization, and Political Outcomes in Russia and Serbia: a Weberian View. *Theory and Society*, 25, No.6, 763-801.
- Vujacic, V. 2004. Perceptions of the State in Russia and Serbia: the Role of Ideas in the Soviet and Yugoslav Collapse. *Post Soviet Affairs*, 20, No.2, 164-194.
- Vujacic, V. 2006. Slobodan Milosevic: a Charismatic Leader or Plebiscitarian Demagogue? In Tismaneanu, V., and Howard, M. M., eds. *World Order After Leninism*. University of Washington Press.
- Vladisavljevic, N. 1994. Power and the Rise of Milosevic. *Nationalities Papers* 32, No.1, 182-204.
- Wallace, M. D. and Suedfeld, P. 1988. Leadership Performance in Crisis: The Longevity-Complexity Link. *International Studies Quarterly* 32, 439-451.

- Walker, S. G. 1990. The Evolution of Operational Code Analysis. *Political Psychology* 11, 403-418.
- Walker, S. G. and Schafer, M. 2000. The Political Universe of Lyndon B. Johnson and His Advisors: Diagnostic and Strategic Propensities in Their Operational Codes. *Political Psychology* 21, 529-543.
- Walker, S. G., Schafer, M. and Young, M.D. 1998. Systematic Procedures for Operational Code Analysis: Measuring and Modeling Jimmy Carter's Operational Code. *International Studies Quarterly* 42, 175-190.
- Walker, S.G, Schafer, M. and Young, M. D. 1999. Presidential Operational Codes and Foreign Policy Conflicts in the Post-Cold War World. *The Journal of Conflict Resolution* 43, 610-625.
- Walker, S. G, Schafer, M. and Young, M.D. 2003. Profiling the Operational Codes of Political Leaders, In Jerrold M. Post (eds) *The Psychological Assessment of Political Leaders: With Profiles of Saddam Hussein and Bill Clinton*. The University of Michigan Press, 215-245.
- Waltz, K. N. 1979. *Theory of International Politics*. McGraw and Hill.
- Winter, D.G., Hermann, M.G, Weintraub, W. and Walker, S.G. 1991. The Personalities of Bush and Gorbachev Measured at a Distance: Procedures, Portraits, and Policy. *Political Psychology* 12, 215-245.
- Wintrobe, R. 1999. Slobodan Milosevic and the Fire of Nationalism. *Economic Resource Center*, University of Western Ontario.
- Woodward, S. L., 1989. Review: Reforming a Socialist State: Ideology and Public Finance in Yugoslavia. *World Politics*, 45, No.2, 267-305.

Woodward, S.L., 1995. *Balkan Tragedy: Chaos and Dissolution After the Cold War*.
Brookings Institution Press.

Young, M.D, and Schafer, M. 1998. Is There Method in Our Madness? Ways of
Assessing Cognition in International Relations. *Mershon International Studies Review*
42, 63-96.

Zimmerman, W. 1999. *Origins of a Catastrophe: Yugoslavia and Its Destroyers—
America's Last Ambassador Tells What Happened and Why*. Three Rivers Press.

APPENDIX

SYSTEMATIC PROCEDURES FOR OPERATIONAL CODE ANALYSIS⁹

P-1. NATURE OF POLITICAL UNIVERSE: Index: % Positive Other Attributions minus % Negative Other Attributions.

P-2. REALIZATION OF POLITICAL VALUES: Index: Mean Intensity of Other Conflict/Cooperation Transitive Verb Attributions for Scale with values of -3 = Punish, -2 = Threatens, -1 = Oppose/ Resists, 0 = Neutral, +1 = Appeal/Support, +2 = Promise, +3 = Reward.

P-4. CONTROL OVER HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT: Index: Self Attributions divided by [Self Attributions plus Other Attributions].

I-1. STRATEGY: Index: % of Positive Self Attributions minus % Negative Self Attributions.

I-2. TACTICS: Index: Mean Intensity of Self Conflict/Cooperation Attributions for Scale with Values of -3 = Punish, -2 = Threaten, -1 = Oppose/Resist, 0 = Neutral, +1 = Appeal/Support, +2 = Promise, +3 = Reward.

To demonstrate the VICS coding procedure consider the following sentence, in which the speaker would be Franjo Tudjman: Serbian military forces have invaded Bosnia and Herzegovina. The subject is “Serbian military forces,” which would be coded as “other” as Tudjman does not associate himself with that subject. The verb is “have invaded.” This is a transitive verb, and one connoting a physical action, not a word or desire. Its directionality is negative and intensity high. Therefore, this verb would be coded as “punish.” All verb phrases are coded in this fashion, and then patterns between self/other attributions that are punish, reward, appeal, etc. are investigated.

⁹ Taken from Walker, Schafer and Young (1998).