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Abstract

In this paper, the author explains historical facts as well as legal and political concepts and terminology in defining "Bosnian nation" and "Bosnian state", with the aim of helping to find a solution for the establishment and normal functioning of the state of Bosnia as a UN member and subject of international law. Today's so-called Dayton Bosnia and Herzegovina is a product of the imposed will of major international powers and unprincipled "attitudes" of the international community, and as such it represents a "sui generis state", established in violation of democratic practices and applicable international norms. In the paper we apply a comparison between Freud's psychoanalytic observation of the development of the individual, on the one hand, and the socio-historical development of the collectivity - of the people / ethnos and nation, on the other. The paper cites the opinions of relevant authors, citing the case of the former Yugoslavia and USA, and points to certain dilemmas in the application of two possible principles in establishing modern states - national and civil. In applying either of these two principles, it is important to (re)define the Bosniak national name and eliminate the dilemma: „Bosniaks“ or „Bosnians“ to look at the two names in the context of the three existing Bosnian-Hercegovinian peoples – Bosniaks, Serbs, and Croats.
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1. Introduction

We have witnessed decades of debate about Bosnia as a state and its - the Bosnian nation. What is the Bosnian nation, what are its peoples - Bosniaks, Serbs and Croats? Are they each a separate nation for themselves or do all three of them form a single Bosnian nation. Whether the name of the state and the name of the nation should match? And, why - when it comes to the name of Bosniaks as a people, there is a certain dualism, or ambivalence - why the people and the state are not of the same name. In general, in order for a state to exist, it must be based on (its) nation. For, the nation is the basic substance, the foundation upon which every state rests. In order to better understand what a nation is, we will try to explain in the simplest methodology how it is created. Our aim is to find out - if there is a Bosnian nation, if there is one, then there is Bosnia as a state with its internal and international legal capacity and subjectivity. For the sake of ease of understanding the genesis of the emergence of a nation, for the purposes of this paper, we will make a comparison between the development of the human personality, ie. the human being as an individual, on the one hand, and the development or emergence of a nation as a collectivity, on the other. Sigmund Foyd (1856-1939) explained in his theory of psychoanalysis that a man's personality can be viewed through three developmental segments: Id - ("it"), Ego - ("I"), and Superego - ("over-me") . In this work „id“ means tribe, „ego“ means people, and „super ego“ means nation. Froyd says - “Id is the only component of personality that has been present since birth. This aspect of personality is devoid of all logic, completely unconscious and involves instinctive behavior ... Id is absolutely irrational and functions in accordance with the principles of pleasure and pain, demanding immediate, immediate gratification, whenever circumstances allow ... " . The ego represents the conscious part of the personality, the part of the psyche that is perceived as 'I' ... Unlike the ido, the ego is guided by the principle of reality ... The ego delays satisfaction, selects acceptable situations and adjusts instincts to the real environment ... it coexists with the id as the unconscious part of the psyche, and the superego, as the part that represents the conscience or internalization of social norms ... The ego mediates between the ide and the
superego by building different defense mechanisms ... It is composed of moral and norm principles, which are an important regulator of behavior. This last layer of personality is the product of living in a particular social environment. The main role of the superego is to retain and prevent the fulfillment of id demands that are not in accordance with social morals ... Between id, ego and superego there are hierarchically arranged relationships in which the superego has a major, guiding role - it controls the ego in the performance of its tasks in relation to id. The ego directs the activities of ida so that he must take into account the circumstances ... " (Compare: https://www.opsteobrazovanje.in.rs/zanimljivo/id-ego-i-superego/).

Therefore, in our imaginary comparison, in this paper, where we make a comparative observation of the development of the personality of the individual, on the one hand, and the development of the collectivity, on the other, "id" would mean tribe, "ego" - people, and "superego" - nation. We did not go to the lower forms of socio-historical development of collectivity - family and gender, because the two layers are not relevant for the treatment of this topic, since they do not possess the lowest form of state-forming consciousness. However, in order to better understand the "Bosnian" case, we briefly state the genesis of human community development, starting from "family" as the first step, then "gender" - as the second stage of the human community, which is composed of multiple families. Further, by multiplication, the gender is transformed into the third stage - the "tribe", which is made up of several genera, then the fourth step is the "people" (ethnos), made up of multiple tribes, and the fifth step - that people (may, but may not), grows into a "nation." (Compare: Ćerić, S. (1968), p. 11.) This way of nation-building is the "endogenous" way, or the way of moving within one ethnos - from the bottom up, (from botom to top) - from family, gender, tribe, ethnicity / people, to nation-state. Another way to create nations is when they come from top to botom they are formed under various external "exogenous" influences, such as the unification of biological and external variable labels, the imposition of ways of thinking and acting, the imposition of political projects, the use of force, the conquest of war, the disintegration of complex federal states, the dissolution of empires, decisions of the international community and the like, where the opposite is the way of movement - first creation of the state, and only then "creation" of the nation (regardless of the existence or non-existence of a homogeneous ethnos which would be a "national" substance for the formation of the nation-state), which is the case for the emergence of
a large number of states on the African and American continents, after the abolition of the colonial system, but also the case of the breakup of the Ottoman, Austro-Hungarian and Russian empires, etc. Most of these colonial states were created by applying the territorial principle, the "uti possidetis iuris" principle, which is why the "ethnic" and "state" borders do not coincide with them, because these political nation-states are created by "civic" and not on an "ethnic" basis.

2. Bosniak or Bosnian - unnecessary dualism or confusing ambivalence

Dualism as a term signifies a duality, something that is composed of two basic elements - quality and quantity, male and female in biology, spirit and body, something that is both idea and matter and necessity ... It is the teaching of the existence of two different, completely opposite to the state, principles and ways of thinking or worldview. (Compare: https://velikirecnik.com/2015/12/10/dualism/).

Ambivalence (in sociology) can be defined as conflicting or alternating attachment to first to one then to another norm or ethical value. This is when we have completely opposite views in relation to or towards a person, situation, subject, etc. In psychology, however, ambivalence also signifies emotional doubt, that is, the simultaneous existence of strong positive and negative feelings about the same object. (Compare: https://velikirecnik.com/2016/05/27/ambivalence/).

When discussing "Bosnian" and "Bosniac", first, it should be clarified with the (false) dilemma - whether Bosnia should be a state of all three of its peoples (and others), as a multiethnic, multicultural, civic state, or, alternatively, that Bosnia be a mono-ethnic (tri-ethnic) - nation-state of Bosniaks (Serbs and Croats). This dilemma fits in with the discussion of two prevailing principles in the formation of modern states - the ethnic-national, and the civic-territorial, principle.

Today, when the survival of Bosnia and Herzegovina, as a state, is the subject of much debate, then the question of choosing one of these two principles is not a matter of emotions, desires, religion, mythology, folklore, etc. but rather the question of applying an adequate political and legal methodology in defining the "Bosnian issue" in which these two possible solutions are imposed as the ultima ratio.

It is true that there is no Bosnia without Bosniaks, but it is also true that there is no Bosnia without either Serbs or Croats, because each of these
three peoples is an essential constituent and the pillar on which the state of Bosnia stands. It is the famous Bosnian, real, historical, legal, sociological, fateful "tripod" on which the state of Bosnia exists and functions. The essential assumption, even conditio sine qua non of such Bosnia, is that its tripod has an inevitable, unique, common platform - a clamp that holds these three pillars together. Otherwise, these pillars would be unusable, the tripod would not have the necessary synchronization and balance, and, according to the laws of physics, would collapse.

What, specifically, could this clamp-platform be at the top of the Bosnian tripod? It is something in common that results from the consensus of all these three pillars (peoples), something that is their common denominator, the smallest common constituent of the "Bosnian equation with three unknowns". It is the territory of Bosnia, it is the Bosnian name, the Bosnian identity, the Bosnian geographical designation - as an autochthonous space, a land of ancestors, as one of the elements of statehood (territory, population, sovereign power). Such a state of Bosnia must be the product of the concerted political will of its three common constituents, it must be the result of a "compromise". After all, any complex, multiethnic, multicultural, multi-confessional state can only survive as a compromise of its constituents. It is not influenced by the fact that these constituents, peoples, ethnicities and nations are "constructs", ie. that and how they came into being throughout history - under the influence of various ideologies, mythologies, religions, projects, violent homogenisations, indoctrination, etc., the fact that these ethnicities and nations now exist, and therefore must be taken into account, is already important consideration - their interests, the interests of them as subjects that influence the finding of such or that solutions in solving social and political problems and regulating adequate state structures.

3. The nation-state and "Bosniaks"

Bosnia (and Herzegovina) could be established as a multi-ethnic nation-state, and as such it would be a state belonging to its three legitimate ethnicities, which are its constituents - Bosniaks, Serbs and Croats. These constituents of the state of Bosnia, in that case, would have to have a fully-built national-state-consciousness, their well-defined-bounded, ethnic (indigenous) territory, and a clearly defined, "separate" power in those ethnic territories. In that case, Bosnia would inevitably be constituted as a
complex state composed of three of its member-federal units, each of which would be "states in embryo" (states in statu nascendi) with good prospects of, in the near or far perspective, dissolution and disintegration along established "federal" lines.

On the other hand, it is possible to organize a completely mono-ethnic state in the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina, in which the present "Bosniak people" would inevitably grow into a mono-ethnic "Bosniak nation", thus creating a "Bosniak state of Bosnia". Such a small state Bosnia could be organized, not on the whole, but only on one, much reduced part of the present territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina (the territory of the present Federation of B&H, but not in the territory of the Republic of Srpska), and it, in that situation, initially had to fight for international recognition and membership in the UN and other European and world organizations and forums, as a completely new state and a new subject of international law. Therefore, in the debate about "Bosniak" and "Bosnian", one does not want to deny "Bosniak", nor its identity, colturological, ethnological, customary, religious, historical merits and qualities, but tries to preserve a unified B&H through a certain, partial "abstraction", because to apply the civic principle, and to create not a "Bosniak" but a "Bosnian", non-ethnic, but political, nation, that would incorporate all three existing ethnicities-peoples, with all their virtues and disadvantages, without diminishing their the degree of universal (mono) national emancipation reached.

So, if we decide on "Bosniak" as a "state" nation of the state of Bosnia, and if we were to opt for an "ethno-national" method of dealing with be-ha problems, then we would have to "produce" Bosniakness into the nation and thus create that "Bosniak's", but territorially reduced, one-nation, state of Bosnia. Because, in that case, we would have to leave two parts of the teritori of Bosnia and Herzegovina to Serbs and Croats to create their own mono-ethnic states.

4. Civil state and "Bosnians"

If, however, all three peoples of B&H (and others) want to preserve the entire Bosnia and Herzegovina, within its present, historical, boundaries, then, at this level of Bosniak (both Serbian and Croatian), "national maturation", Bosniaks should "stop" and "prevent" "themselves (analogous to being done by both Serbs and Croats) and not to go into the phase of a
fully formed and "state-forming mono-ethnic nation", but to renounce all three peoples of their further, individual, ethnic-people-national "emancipation" and creation of their partial, narrow-ethnic small states, but to start by establishing a common, democratic, civil, legal, secular state of B&H. This would be a way to form a common non-ethnic nation from the three existing, fully formed and indisputable peoples (Bosniaks, Serbs and Croats) - a "Bosnian nation" whose state-forming substance is made up of residents, and citizens, members of these three (abstracted) ethnicity-nation, throughout the territory of present-day B&H - and these would be these "Bosnians", as holders of Bosnian, state, undivided sovereignty and subjectivity. That "B&H nation" would be a new quality, a higher form of political, civic, consciousness, a higher category than any single "constituent" B&H nation, but a quality that is inevitable in the process of creating a common, whole, independent, civic, a contemporary, internationally recognized state of Bosnia and Herzegovina. It is the raison d‘éther of preferring „Bosnian“ to „Bosniak“. It would be a way of creating a unique B&H nation and a unique, functional B&H state, established on its three pillars, on its tripod, through compromise and political agreement. Of course, it is not a disadvantage that this "Bosnian nation" would be one political entity, one "construct", but a construct that is indispensable for B&H's survival. And the American nation, e.g. is a political construct that "embedded" in itself English, German, Spanish, Italian and other ethnicities, but this construct was necessary for the creation, or preservation, of a unified, peaceful, stable, whole, sovereign, developed, civil, functional state of the USA (analogous to us in Bosnia), as a subject of international law and a factor in international relations. It is only in this sense that one should interpret the preference for "Bosnian" over "Bosniak", since it is the best, perhaps even the only, solution for the survival of the whole, civic, democratic state of Bosnia within its current borders, and the preservation of its membership in international organizations, institutions and bodies.

5. Bosnia as Yugoslavia

If we were to accept the option of "Bosniak", starting from the present achieved level of development of "ethnicity-peoples", to grow into an independent, mono-ethnic, "Bosniak nation", then we would have to accept the growth of both Serbian and Croat people into their independent
"nations", and all this in the territory of present-day B&H. It is normal, for these three newly-emerged nations, as fully rounded sovereign entities, to at one point question the purpose and interest of the continued existence of such BiH as a common, whole and united state, since in that case the state would impede the freedom of action of these three mutually independent nations. If, then, we had these three newly formed nations - then more, even if we wanted, we would not be able to prevent the breakup of B&H along such established national seams. For, in Article 1 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966), it is stated that “All nations have the right to self-determination. By virtue of this right, they freely determine their political position, and freely attain their economic, social and cultural development” (Resolution 2200 (XXI), 16 December 1966, effective March 23, 1976), so, the three B&H nation-nation in that case conducted the prescribed procedure for secession and completion of the process of creating these independent small states. We have a typical example here - what happens when the "ethnic-people" comes to the degree and the ability to grow into a "nation", and that is the example of the SFR of Yugoslavia. Namely, when the 1974 Constitution gave broad powers, almost complete independence, to the republics and federal units of the SFRY, then the pandora's box was opened, i.e. the unstoppable process of rounding up - independence, the dissociation of all these republic peoples - nations began, and finally, the dissolution of the common state of Yugoslavia "along the republic, federal (ethnic) borders" occurred. (Small metaphor - if a beekeeper allows a new queen bee and a new swarm to form in one hive, that hive, or that old swarm, will inevitably split into two new swarms). In such a SFRY, "Yugoslavism" was to serve as a construct, as a "political" nation in an attempt to save its survival, however "mature" republican ethno-nations (new swarms) inevitably went to create their own republic-national states. By the way - if we ignore the hidden, big-Serbian intentions - to make "Greater Serbia" from the SFRY, then the "Yugoslav nation" was a good idea in trying to preserve the survival of that common state. Similarly, it was not necessary for this "Yugoslav nation" to deny the cultural, legal and ethnic level of the "republican ethnicities", but merely to create the necessary nation-building nation, political "national" substance, as a necessary platform and base for the survival of Yugoslavia, that is, to create a "state nation" for the state of Yugoslavia (no state without a nation), without endangering any of the republican ethnicities / peoples, but unfortunately or fortunately, this idea, that attempt to save the SFR
Yugoslavia, failed. Bosnia and Herzegovina can also happen if it gives up "Bosnians" as a "Bosnian nation" and citizens, and then goes to strengthen and create its three local ethnic "nations" - Bosniaks, Serbs and Croats.

It is quite logical, with this state of affairs (if the three Bosnian peoples grew into three independent Bosnian nations), to ask one legal political question - why should a already-matured nation renounce its possible nation-state at its fingertips, thereby invalidating its sovereign right to govern itself and be the only one "decision maker" about your destiny? Why, then, would such a nation unnecessarily share its sovereignty with any other nation? Doctrine and practice have demonstrated and proved that the essence, purpose and purpose of the formation of each nation - the creation of its nation-state, membership in the UN, and the conquest-of reaching its full international legal capacity and subjectivity. In international law and international relations, states (both mono-ethnic and multiethnic-civil) are sovereign entities and they wish to be the sole holders of rights and obligations when it comes to their subjectivity. Also, according to international law - no nation or state has, or can have, power over another nation or state - this is a well-known principle: par in parem non habet imperium (equal over equal cannot rule). On the contrary, we would have dependent, or, vassal states and a sizeren-vassal relationship. In our example, the peoples of Bosnia and Herzegovina cannot have power or authority over each other. That is why multiethnic, complex, states, states with a heterogeneous national composition, such as B&H, must reach their intracountry compromise on their definition, constitution and survival. In that case, they must form, not three mono-ethnic ones, but one common, political, nation, civic type, which will be the basis for the creation, survival and functioning of their common civic state. This is done through appropriate constitutional solutions, through some interstate agreement, declaration, or with the assistance of the international community, etc. Such a common, united, civic "nation-state" is an inevitable state-forming substance and the sole carrier of that state's unique and indivisible sovereignty. Such is the case of the B&H states. The sui generis case. That is why in B&H most of the effort, political and scientific engagement, sacrifice and renunciation must be submitted by Bosniaks, as the most important of the three pillars holding Bosnia, and the most interested nation for the preservation and survival of Bosnia, because they do not have any of their other, reserve states. That is why they must first "renounce" their ethnicity - the "Bosniaks", and accept "the Bosnians" as the
safest formula for the salvation and survival of Bosnia. It is quite to be expected that Serbs and Croats will not voluntarily accept the option of "Bosnian nation" and Bosnia as "civilian state". But they do not have another and more democratic, peaceful, cost-effective and civilized solution, unless the Bosniaks, through the use of their bosniakism, helped the Serbs and Croats to break up Bosnia and all together grow Bosnia in three mono-ethnic states. Countries such as Bosnia must necessarily be civic-type and should not, at the "state level", on a platform that integrates the three pillars of the Bosnian tripod, allow for the imposition of their own ethnicities, but must "abstract" them to the extent that these ethnicities they would no longer interfere with the normal functioning of this common, civic, state, through compromise and agreement. These are some of the reasons why the survival of civilian Bosnia requires the strengthening of central, common, "ethnically impersonal", "secular", institutions, institutions that are "Bosnian" rather than tribal Bosniak, Serb, and Croat. We repeat again - let there be Bosniacs, Serbs and Croats, wherever they do not "interfere" with the functioning of the common state institutions of the State of Bosnia. It is absurd to claim that "Bosnia" is a product and project of the SANU, on the contrary, the proponents of Greater Serbian ideas and projects are more suited to emphasizing the "Bosniak", and analogously to other narrow-ethnic entities in B&H - Serbian and Croatian. Therefore, "Bosniakism" (both Serbianism and Croatism), with all its features, is a priority and necessary - until it becomes a hindrance to the survival of the entire, democratic, civic, secular state of B&H. If we were to make a ranking list, the "Bosniak" priority scale would be in third place: 1. Bosnia, 2. Bosnian nation, 3. Bosniaks (both Serbs and Croats). Each of the three ethno-political categories listed has its indisputable and irreplaceable values, its role, its quality and its constitutive share in the historical development, emergence and survival of the state of Bosnia, but, of course, the highest priority of Bosniaks and all others who want Bosnia is Bosnian state. Therefore, it is not exaggerated, but it is quite normal to say that in this situation, for the survival of Bosnia and the Bosniaks themselves, "Bosnia and Bosnianism" is far more important and priority than "Bosniak and Bosniakism".
6. Historical (un)substantiation of the Bosnianism/Bosniakism syntagm

In historiography as well as in political, legal, sociological, ethnological, theoretical debates, it is almost indisputable that the terms "Bosniak" and "Bosnian" are synonymous. It is only true that, in certain historical periods or socio-political conditions and situations, used to be one and sometimes another nomination of the Bosnian people, which in later generations caused some confusion, even confusion, unnecessary controversy, heated discussions. In this section we point to several quotations from several relevant sources, which we wish to support the given thesis, that is, to contribute to the solution of the existing artificial - false dilemmas - Bosniak or Bosnian, and in this regard, we provide some pro-Bosniak / probosnian arguments, from which the readers themselves will be able to derive a conclusion for or against "Bosniak" and "Bosnian".

The famous Bosniak, Hussein Husaga Ćišić, in his book entitled Bosnian Muslims and Bosnian Autonomy, (1991), Preporod, Sarajevo, states: "All Belgrade governments in the former Yugoslavia were, by their ideological content, Serbian. Bosnian individuality was a thorn in the eye, and the word Bosnian and Bosnianism were almost as sacrilegious as possible "(p. 57). "For not only did the Austrian army suffer a series of terrible defeats in Bosnia of that year, but they were suffocated by the Bosnian Pasha, mentioned by Hećimović, who, as a native son, put himself at the forefront of the Bosnians ..." (p. 9). "... the need to separate Bosnia from other Serbo-Croats, especially Serbs before his (Kulin ban, m.p.) era, was not felt among Bosnians" (p. 13). "The Bosnians, that is, the Bosnian heretics, were originally directed to reciprocity in the struggle for existence with the Ottomans ..." (p. 24). "In the Austrian era, in Bosnia, as everyone knows, in our own style we could spread Serbian nationalism with our (Muslim) assistance; the movements of the Bosnians for their national commitment were given a collective national character only when these movements and we (Muslims) are godfathers "(p. 47). "But what is of particular interest to us Bosnians ..." (p. 62).

Muhsin Rizvić, another great Bosniak and Bosnian intellectual, in a brochure entitled BOSNIA AND BOSNIAKS - LANGUAGE AND LETTER, (1999), Preporod, Sarajevo, states, among other things: "Safvet-beg Bašagić is with the emphasis of patriotism and romantic fervor of Bosnian patriotism, which, in his understanding, has an almost divine significance..."
and deserves respect immediately after religion, or, equally with it, mentioned the Bosnian language and the Bosnian people.” "And as a spiritual content of the vernacular, Bosnian language ... (magazine) 'Bosniak' cited Hörmann's Folk Songs of the Mohammedans in Bosnia and Herzegovina, while narrowing the national-political platform of Bosnia and taking them, given their specific national content and belonging, as evidence of the traditional-literary identification of Muslims with the Bosnian "(p. 56). Rizvić further states: "Traveling through Bosnia in the seventeenth century, Evlija Čelebija calls it 'the language of the Bosniak and Croat people' and says: 'People, in folk speech, are called Bosniaks in these parts of the country. But they prefer it when someone calls them Bosnian / "Bosnians". And, in fact, these are just two different names for the same term: Arabic - Bosnian, and Turkish - Bosniak." (Čelebi, Evlija: 1979/121). Rizvić further states: "Thus, in March 1832, Gradaščević wrote to the Austrian Emperor Francis ... that the Sultan needed to appoint them as a vizir (governor) of Bosnia one of their ranks, who is Bosnian, that they would continue to be the Sultan's subjects and receive his commands."(p. 26). On p. 34, Rizvić, explaining that throughout history in Bosnia, Catholics and Orthodox used to speak "Bosniak" and sometimes "Bosnian", and further writes: "Alone Jukić (Ivan Frano Jukic, Catholic, Ilir - Bosniak from Bosnia, who signed himself with a pseudonym 'Slavoljub Bosniak') is explicit in determining national identity when, in the 1848 invitation to 'Kolo Bosansko' (The Bosnian wheel), he exclaims, replacing only the former Illyrian name with Slavic: 'We Bosniaks, once a glorious people, are now hardly alive, only as a branch of the tree of Slaves, the friends of science are watching - and they are pitying us!' "While on p. 37, Rizvić, further, quotes Jukić, stating: “I. F. Jukić in his book: A land-survey of the Turkish Empire in Europe. - Bosnian Friend, sv. 3, Zagreb, 1861. Sabr. dj. 2, 410, says: "The people of Bosnia are one, Slavic dialects of the Illyrian dialect. /.../ Turkish are spoken by Ottoman officials and Bosniaks by the Turks who taught him in the Medrezah. Other Bosnian Turks speak both in the villages and in the towns in the Illyrian language, which they refer to as "Bosniak" and Christians as "Bosnian".

Salim Ćerić, in THE MUSLIMS OF SERBIAN-CROATIAN LANGUAGE (1968), "Svjetlost", Sarajevo, p. 131-132, quotes Matija Mažuranić, who wrote in his travelogue "A View of Bosnia 1839-1840". (Zagreb, 1842) says: "In Bosnia, Illyrian is mixed with the Turkish word, that is 'Bosniak' is spoken there... They immediately say: 'Still, you don't know Bosniaks
language yet, it's not Ottoman, but Bosniaks language"... And in Sarajevo there are a lot of aghas (aga i begova) who do not know than Bosniak language... If anyone in Turkish says what he says, and he always answers on Bosniak language, and says 'that our famous Bosniak language is the most beautiful in the world'.

A well-known Bosnian intellectual, one of the most prominent fighters for recognition of the Muslim nation in Tito's Yugoslavia, named "Muslims" with a large "M", Atif Purivatra, in his work *NATIONAL AND POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT OF MUSLIMS*, (1970), Svjetlost, Sarajevo, p. 13. states that Josip Broz-Tito at the Second Plenum of the CK SKJ, in November 1959, concerning the national name of Muslims, said the following: "I mentioned this incidentally to show that those things concerning the nationality of Muslims should be gradually liquidated. People should be let go if they want to be nationally undetermined citizens of Yugoslavia. Make that man Bosnian, Herzegovinian. Outside, they don't call you differently than the name Bosnian, whether it be Muslim, Serb or Croat."

Also, Purivatra on p. 73, of the same book, cites Proceedings of the NOR, Volume II, Vol. 2, p. 229-230. and states: "The proclamation of the Supreme Headquarters of the NOP and DV Yugoslavia (January 1942) to the peoples of Bosnia and Herzegovina contains the subtitle: "Bosnians! Serbs, Muslims and Croats"

The text cites efforts by occupiers and domestic servants "to deceive the Bosnian peoples of Serbs, Muslims and Croats."

Muhammad Abdagić, a revolutionary, Tito's partisan, writer, the Sandžak man, a dissident, in a letter written in 1970, at a time when uncommitted Muslims were fighting for the national name "Muslim" with the big "M", sent from Belgrade an ANUBIH (Academy of Sciences and Arts of Bosnia and Hercegovina), letter stating, among other things, "I insist that the proper name is Bosnian, not Muslim, when it comes to Bosnian Muslims... No one from Bosnia can be forbidden from feeling Bosnian, and therefore who can be called whatever it feels like... it's just that they do not recognize us from the East or from the West, but we ourselves do not recognize our nationality in large numbers..."

(See more at: www.muhamedabdagic.com).

Also, in the Serbian national program of Ilija Garasanin, from 1844, the same name –Bosniaks, was used for all three today's B&H-peoples of Serbs, Croats and Bosniaks. The chapter entitled *On the Policy of Serbia in the Consideration of Bosnia, Herzegovina, Montenegro and Northern Albania*, points 4 and 6 states, inter alia: "4. ... in addition, a brief and general national..."
history of Bosnia could be printed as a third degree, in which the glory and names of some of the Mohammedan faith of the Bosniaks who had been converted should not be left out. "6. For the more Eastern Bosniaks, greater influence will not be a difficult task for Serbia. More precaution and caution against this requires that Catholic Bosniaks be won. At the forefront of these are the Franciscan Friars."

In his address to viewers of FACE TV, from the hospital bed, from the Sarajevo Clinical Center, Alija Izetbegović said in an interview with the TV host: "I would have a lot of messages, I do not know what I would choose on this occasion ... yes ... namely, I think the important thing is for Bosnia to survive, and how they will survive - should remain Serbs - Serbs, Croats - Croats, Bosniaks - Bosniaks, but to be Bosnians as well, in my opinion is an important thing for the survival of Bosnia ...". (See: https://www.faace.ba/vijesti/bih/senad-hadzifejzovic-alija-i-ja/1168 in the attached video after 5 minutes and 20 seconds).

7. Possible Models for the Survival of BiH and a sufficient reason for transforming "Bosniak" into "Bosnian"

If the "Bosniak language" could change its name to "Bosnian", why couldn't the "Bosniaks" of all three faiths, by territorial and civic principle, be "renamed" as "Bosnians" as residents of Bosnia? Here, we have an equally logical argument as in the Bosniak / Bosnian language. These are completely normal and coherent facts - that both: language and nation, are bind to the country, to the territory of their state - Bosnia. Thus, all the inhabitants of Bosnia would be a Bosnian nation. So the name of nation and state would be the same. Why would we insist on unnecessary dualism and confusing ambivalence - a Bosniak whose language is Bosnian? Country-state Bosnia and its people Bosniak? Throughout B&H history we know, and what we have pointed out in this paper, that apart from Muslim-Bosniaks, e.g. in the 19th century both Orthodox and Catholics identified as Bosniaks. Today, after all the events, the turbulence, the impact, the projects, there are three nations in BiH with three different names.

From the above, six possible theoretical and practical models of the B&H enigma solution can be rounded up:

First, for all three B&H peoples - both Bosniaks and Serbs and Croats - to be "Bosniaks", thus regaining their historic national name and thus creating
a unique "Bosniak Nation" and a united state, Bosniak Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Secondly, for all three B&H nations – Bosniaks, Serbs and Croats - to be "Bosnians" and thus form a common, "Bosnian nation" so named, not by ethnic name, but by the name of the territory they inhabit, so that thus, Bosniaks and Serbs and Croats became Bosnians, thus creating a unified B&H civic state.

Third, for the three B&H peoples of Bosniaks, Serbs and Croats to create each their own separate ethnic entity - as a federal unit based on the ethnic-national principle, and then for those three federal units to create their common, complex, federal state – B&H, like the former Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

Fourth, to maintain the present solution of the so-called Dayton BiH, made up of two entities and three peoples, which is, as it is - dysfunctional, unnatural, unstable, impossible, with good prospects for further self-destruction and dissolution.

Fifth, for three Bosniak, Serb and Croat peoples to form their own ethnic, separate independent states, and then by signing a Confederate agreement, create a Confederation of B&H, consisting of three fully independent and sovereign states and three nations formed by the mono-ethnic principle, and,

Sixth, that Greater Serbian and Croat nationalist projects are respected, so that parts of B&H that are inhabited by Serbs and Croats (peacefully or be armed maeans) are annexed to Greater Serbia, or Greater Croatia, and that Bosniaks base their own enclave on their few enclaves that inhabit it "the Bosniak" state "Bosnia", which would be cut off from the world, without exit to the sea, without exit to the Sava river, to the Drina river, cut off by Sandžak, without the possibility of joining Euro-Atlantic integrations, without the possibility of economic development, in the environment of its proven the enemy ...

Based on the argumentation made in this paper, it can be concluded that the most logical, the most normal, the most democratic, the most modern, the most cost-effective, the best solution would be the second solution mentioned above, which would guarantee the survival of B&H, its democratic progress, economic, social and cultural development, Euro-Atlantic integration and safeguarding the interests of all its citizens, and all of its constituents. This would therefore be the logic of preferring and insisting on "Bosnian" instead of "Bosniak".
8. The “Bosniak” and “Bosnian” syntagm are synonymous

That the names Bosniak and Bosnian are identical, ie. synonyms, one can draw a conclusion from the entire text above. Of course, in this paper, as we have pointed out, because of “changed circumstances” we prefer Bosnian. We only mention here that, in the Serbian dictionary of Vuk Stefanović Karadžić ... the following explanations of the name Bosniak are given: "Bòšnjàk, Bošnjàka, m. Der Bosnier, Bosnus homo. Cf. /Bošnjanin/, Bosanac (Bosnian), Bosanlija." (Vuk Stef. Karadžić: Serbian Dictionary. Fourth State Edition. Belgrade, 1935. p. 39, cited by - Rizvić, Ibidem, p. 16.)


9. Instead of a conclusion

Historical conditions, external influences, Ottoman state policy, the conquering ideologies of the neighbors, insufficient knowledge and distinction of the term "people" and "nation" led to different commitments, commitments and understandings of the Bosnian, historical, three-confessional people regarding their constitution as complete, state-forming, be-ha nation. Atif Purivatra on p. 28 quotes Joc Marjanović from his book "Odjek", Sarajevo, vol. XXI, iss. 4, Feb. 15, 1968, who, then, regarding only one of the be-ha nations, as yet not sufficiently nationally built-Muslim, said: "There was a debt to one theory and prejudice ... about how Muslims would to emancipate in the national sense, either as Serbs or as Croats.First it was considered that Muslims are a religious-feudal group, then that they are an ethnic (tribal, MP) group, and more recently that they are a people ... My thesis or my understanding is that Muslims are us in BiH in the process of constituting and constituting not, as some now point out, as ethnic or national individuality, but national individuality. " It is noticeable that Marjanovic and Purivatra here want to point to the formation of a "national" consciousness of Bosniaks (then Muslims), which was necessary for the then BiH as a federal unit of the SFRY (six republics and five peoples) to get its "national" background and equalize with other members.
of the Federation (six republics, six nations, six flames in state coat of arms). In doing so, Bosniaks (Muslims) gradually received recognition that they were tied to their territory, that they emerged as a distinct, indigenous and state-forming nation. That is why Husaga Ćišić, in the book cited above, particularly emphasizes: “Because every national thought assumes its own national territory. Its a living space, on which as such it has to develop and improve. If he already has the area, he does not lose it under any circumstances, and if he does not have it, it is unconditionally appropriated ... because there can be no compromise. It is the law of the nation.” (102-3).

And, Salim Ćerić, who we have also cited earlier in this paper, regarding the acceptance of any changes in society, including the change of national name, as well as the difficulty in accepting new ones in general ideologies and abstractions of the ancients, especially in Bosnian Muslim society, as well as attempts to understand certain stubborn attitudes when it comes to commitment (rather than religious, national naming of B&H-Muslims), from the 1960s and 1970s (analog - today: Bosniaks-Bosnians), in his book Muslims of Serbo-Croatian language, on pages 15, 16 and 18, among other things, states: "Ideology is realized when the number and quality of the forces that represent it grow to such an extent that they can impose it on society as a whole. Ideologies build their views on a general fund of human knowledge. But since knowledge is never finite, ideologies are not eternal. They are, in fact, always made up of facts and hypotheses ... When knowledge overcomes the essential elements of an ideology, the beginning of its end begins. A new ideology is born that paves the way for practical application ... Every ideology is a hope for people seeking a way out of difficulties ... But every new ideology has emerged from life ... It collides with the order defending governing ideas with the forces they represent new ideas ... The ideologies of the original communities are primitive spiritual constructions, with few exact elements, imaginatively limited to reflecting a small number for the life of the most significant phenomena ... feudal forms of production, which began to develop in the areas conquered by the Slavs, influenced to quickly replace the traditional system of ancestral communities with a feudal system. The following is the development of a series of states and states ... The group names of the inhabitants of that time were formed by the name of the genera and tribes or by the earlier name of the territory (eg Bosnians in the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina) that they inhabited ... Names Serb, Croat, Bosnian, Dubrovnik, Dukljanin, Macedonian, Slovenian, Montenegrin, etc. they
It is important to note here that the unique national consciousness of its peoples-citizens is not yet sufficiently developed in Bosnia, that is, Bosnia as a single state space does not yet have its own Bosnian nation, nor its civic, political, intellectual elite, which should promoting, advocating and defending the whole, civil state of Bosnia in the fields, but already on the scene are national, ethno-confessional elites, who put their religion, their culture, their mythology, their tribalism in the forefront, and which hinder the development of Bosnia's open society and Bosnia as a normal, contemporary, European, civil state. It is the duty of progressive forces in B&H not to give up but to support such advanced processes.
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