NATO

FINAL REPORT

on the research works for the study

NATO AND THE EU IN THE BALKANS - A COMPARISON
Case study: Romania as stability factor and security provider in South-Eastern Europe

Project conducted within the
NATO EURO-ATLANTIC PARTNERSHIP COUNCIL
INDIVIDUAL RESEARCH FELLOWSHIPS
2001-2003 PROGRAMME

By **Daniel CALIN**

(ROMANIA)

- Bucharest, June 2003 -

Motto of the Final Report:

Waiting for the Barbarians

What are we waiting for
Assembled in the forum?
The barbarians are to arrive today.

Why such inaction in the Senate?
Why do the Senators sit and pass no laws?
Because the barbarians are to arrive today.
What laws can Senators pass any more?
When the barbarians come they will make the laws.

Why did our emperor wake up so early,
and sits at the greatest gate of the city,
on the throne, solemn, wearing the crown?
Because the barbarians are to arrive today.
And the emperor waits to receive
their chief. Indeed he has prepared
to give him a scroll. Therein he inscribed
many titles and names of honor.

Why have our two consuls and the praetors come out
today in their red, embroidered togas;
why do they wear amethyst-studded bracelets,
and rings with brilliant, glittering emeralds;
why are they carrying costly canes today,
wonderfully carved with silver and gold?
Because the barbarians are to arrive today,
and such things dazzle the barbarians.

Why don't the worthy orators come as always
to make their speeches, to have their say?
Because the barbarians are to arrive today;
and they get bored with eloquence and orations.

Why all of a sudden this unrest
and confusion. (How solemn the faces have become).
Why are the streets and squares clearing quickle,
and all return to their homes, so deep in thought?
Because the night is here but the barbarians have not come.
And some people arrived from the borders,
and said there are no longer any barbarians.

And now what shall become of us without any barbarians?
These people were some kind of solution".

Constantin P. Cavafy (1904)
translated from the original Greek by Ray Dalven

CONTENTS OF THE FINAL REPORT

Executive summary

Introductory remarks – aim of the project; research works progress

Introduction
- Why to choose such a topic?
- The research methodology and the structure of the final report
- Considerations vis-à-vis the bibliographic resources
- Defining the Balkans and South-Eastern Europe. How to define a region
- Annex to Introduction – Description of the methodology-explanatory part

Chapter 1: Security issues - from theory to practice
- The new security paradigm in the post Cold War world
- Security risks in South-Eastern Europe
  - Political challenges
  - Defense-Military challenges
  - Economic challenges
  - Social and Democratic Development challenges
  - Environmental challenges and Civil Emergency
- The clash of civilizations in South-Eastern Europe- reality or utopia?
- Conclusion

Chapter 2: South-Eastern Europe - between (sub)regional cooperation and integration into the Euro-Atlantic bodies and organizations
- Overview
- The relevance/importance of certain initiatives [not only in the field of (sub)regional cooperation] launched and supported by NATO and the EU: North Atlantic Cooperation Council (NACC) and Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC), Pact on Stability in Europe (1993), Europe Agreements, Partnership for Peace (PfP), South-East Cooperative Initiative (SECI), The Royaumont Process, SEDM Process
- Stability Pact for South-Eastern Europe (1999), South-Eastern Europe Initiative, Stabilization and Association Agreements
- A partial conclusion–between (sub)regional cooperation and Euro-Atlantic integration

Chapter 3: NATO and the EU in the Balkans
- The Balkans or the "powder keg" of Europe – historical overview
- NATO and the EU – stances and actions vis-à-vis the former Yugoslavia
- Bosnia and Herzegovina – the way from war to peace
- Kosovo – an introduction
- The crisis in FYROM - towards a new Kosovo?
- The Balkans – partial conclusions; the way ahead

- Possible final conclusions
- Annex to Chapter 3 – The break up of Yugoslavia: a chronology of events (1918 - 2003)

Chapter 4: "*Hard security*" versus "*soft security*", "*hard power*" versus "*soft power*" in South-Eastern Europe - Kosovo, battle field and anteroom for the "*new world order*"? A Romanian perspective
- Origins of the conflicts in the province
- Kosovo – a roadmap
- The 'just wars" doctrine
- The EU, NATO and the international community's stance vis-à-vis Kosovo
- The impact of the democratic changes in the region: Croatia and [Union of] Serbia and Montenegro on the way to Euro-Atlantic integration?
- Romania between the Euro-Atlantic commitments and its historical neighboring ties
- Conclusion
- Annex to Chapter 4 – Kosovo: a chronology of events

Chapter 5: Case study - Romania presented through the bias of the "Analysis grid of the risks challenging security"
- Self-definition of the strategic situation
- Perceptions vis-à-vis specific political risks
- Perceptions vis-à-vis specific economic risks
- Perceptions vis-à-vis specific military risks
- Self-definition of the present security interests
- Place of Romania within the security interests of: the neighboring countries, the USA, NATO, the EU, the EU member states…

Chapter 6: The future of the region – few scenarios for South-Eastern Europe
- Achieving the ultimate goal of Euro-Atlantic and European integration
- Keeping the status quo
- Return to the spheres of influence
- Withdrawal of the West/international community – return to chaos?

Final conclusions

Selective bibliography

List of abbreviations

Annex - maps used

Analysis grid of the risks challenging security

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The **aim** of the project is to is to give the reader an overview on the actions undertaken and stances adopted by NATO and the EU towards the developments of the last decade in the Balkans region (the onus is on the post-Dayton developments).

After some **Introductory remarks** describing the main items to be touched upon within the project, the **Introduction** section gives some initial explanations regarding the rationale behind the decision to choose such a topic as well as on the research methodology and the various definitions and representations related to the Balkans and South-Eastern Europe (representing the AOI for this project).

Chapter 1 deals mostly with "new security paradigm" and analyses the security risks and challenges in SEE. A short section of this chapter is dedicated to the issue of the "clash of civilizations in SEE". The main findings in this respect may be summarized under the following headings: first, the 9/11 tragic events did not change the very nature of security but influenced the prioritization of risks and challenges to security; second, the main causes of war have to sought elsewhere then in the clash of civilizations (namely in the sparks of "aggressive nationalism fanned into roaring flames by some of the political leaders of the dissolving Yugoslav federation").

After the description of the two main dimensions of sub-regional cooperation in SEE, with an emphasis on the SP, **chapter 2** draws a partial conclusion, namely that regional cooperation is an indispensable component and a precondition for Euro-Atlantic and European integration. For the first time in history, it seems that countries in SEE perceive such activities as a building block, not a stumbling block on their way to the West.

Chapter 3 analyses the various stances adopted and actions undertaken by the two organizations dealt with, i.e. NATO and the EU, in their attempt to stabilize SEE. The main conclusion would be that after more than a decade, there are mixed results both in terms of their involvement and concerning their achievements so far. Before talking about "regional and local ownership" it seems that the West should think first in terms of further exporting to its frontiers the most wanted commodity on the market, i.e. **development**. Moreover, the role played by the two organizations in defusing the conflict in Southern Serbia and preventing civil war in FYROM may be regarded as milestones in the evolution of the relations between an enlarged NATO and an EU encompassing almost whole Europe.

The issue of "legality" versus "legitimacy", especially in relation to the Kosovo crisis, represents one of the main issues of **chapter 4**. The possible scenarios on the future of the province complete the conclusion of the Independent Commission on Kosovo stating that NATO intervention in Kosovo was "illegal but legitimate". [The Union of] Serbia and Montenegro "issue" as well as the "standards before status" principle in relation to Kosovo were also approached.

As a "leading nation" in SEE, Romania is presented through the "Analysis grid of the risks challenging security". The conclusion of **chapter 5** is that, through its stances, actions and commitments in various fields of activity, Romania should be regarded as a stability factor and security provided in SEE.

In the end, within **chapter 6**, there are presented few possible scenarios for the evolution of SEE. The integration of the Balkans countries into NATO and the EU will probably take some time, but the pace of the process will largely depend on the individual progresses of these actors. As the EU officials put it bluntly: "there are rules and standards to be implemented and respected". NATO declared too that the Alliance would help building a "peaceful, stable and democratic SEE, where all countries assume ownership of the process of reform, and are integrated into the Euro-Atlantic structures".

The **Final conclusions** section tries to make few valuable suggestions and to draw some conclusions out of the substance of the project. Firstly, conflict prevention, crisis management and post-conflict management can be successful only if a holistic approach is chosen that addresses in parallel three sectors: the creation of a secure environment (with both NATO and the EU having an important role to play); the promotion of a sustainable democratic system (OSCE and the EU being mutually reinforcing in this area); and the promotion of economic and social well-being (the EU is best suited in this respect, of course with the help of the countries of concern). Secondly, these activities need to be embedded in a integrated regional approach and there is a need for further cooperation between NATO and the EU in order to help solving the complex system of equations in SEE. Last but not least important, a strong incentive for implementing the necessary and often-painful reforms as well as fostering regional cooperation needs to be offered. For the coming decade the West needs to continue exporting in SEE the stability, security and prosperity created within the European and Euro-Atlantic area. As for the "new neighborhood", as recently defined by the EU, it seems that the European and Euro-Atlantic perspective ought to be replaced by another credible offer for a better future.

Introductory remarks – aim of the project; research works progress

The **aim** of this project is to give the reader (be him/her an academic, student or just an individual interested in the research topic) an overview on the actions and stances adopted by NATO and the EU towards the 'recent'' developments in the Balkans. Although it does not intend to deal with the history of the region, in order to offer a clear picture, the historic background will be touched upon, either within the introductory part of different chapters or in the appendices presenting the chronology of events.

The **working hypothesis** of the project, i.e. *NATO and the EU become more and more mutually reinforcing in the field of crisis management (CM)*, seems to have been true, especially in the light of the latest evolutions (EU took over from UN/IPTF in Bosnia and Herzegovina, through EUPM and from NATO/Allied Harmony in FYROM, through the EU [first] military operation [ever] "CONCORDIA"; NATO summit in Prague with the decision to invite seven new countries to join the Alliance as well as the launching of PCC/NRF, may be regarded as a proof of the further commitment for the stability of the region; European Council in Copenhagen marking the decisive moment of inviting ten new states to become EU members, considering the military involvement of the Union in the Balkans and preparing the new approach of the Union towards the region – presented at the Thessaloniki summit; conclusion and implementation of the permanent and security agreements between NATO and the EU). However, the Iraqi crisis coasted shadows on the effectiveness and functionality of the Trans-Atlantic link and NATO–EU relations. At the same time, the mini-summit on the European defense, held in Brussels in the end of April 2003, showed the determination of some EU member states towards taking on more responsibilities in this area. Hopefully, this will not divert the attention of the international community and especially that of the EU member states, from the still unstable Balkans area.

The project focuses on the post-Dayton developments in the Balkans, with a special emphasis on Kosovo, FYROM and [Union of] Serbia and Montenegro. Through this project I did not try nor intend to find a panacea for the region's illness but to provide the reader with a list of possible solutions that might be taken into account by the decision-makers both in the region and those in the Western states in order to try solving the complex system of equations in the Balkans. This may be seen in connection to "the Balkan predicament"[1].

My intention is to enrich the "Final Report" through the "End Product" by adding at the end of each chapter a short "Further reading" section (which may offer the reader the opportunity to deepen his or her knowledge on the topic) and by developing all the subheadings (providing also the necessary updates).

The **scope** of the analysis covers the following areas: conflict prevention, crisis management and post-conflict management. Of course, the three of them are inter-related and they should be dealt with accordingly. The most important is to be able to apply the appropriate tools in order to find a lasting solution. In this context, it is crucial to remember the following recommendations made by an expert in the crisis management area[2]: there is a need for early involvement of the international community should a crisis arise; there should be a leader assuming responsibility and coordinating the efforts in order to avoid their ineffective duplication; politics back up military, force backs up diplomacy; there is a need for sound agreements and credible capabilities in order to implement them; enforcing the decisions adopted require also to pay attention and solve the possible emerging contradictions between the following principles: territorial integrity, sovereignty, self-determination, human rights.

---

[1] The International Commision on the Balkans, *UNFINISHED PEACE. Report of the International Commission on the Balkans,* Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington, D.C., 1996.

[2] Ambassador Okun, H., *The EU and the crisis over Bosnia-Herzegovina in restrospect*, presentation and discussions at the DGAP Summer School on European Foreign and Security Policy, Berlin, July 2001.

According to some authors[3], after the Cold War, one may talk about the "**new security dilemma**" relying on the fact that states are challenged much less by states than by social forces that act following different rules and pursue multiple and competing objectives, utilizing a range of coercive means. This became even clearer with the emergence of terrorist threats. The fact is that the mode of coercion that becomes predominant is intra-state, low intensity conflict (in 2000, e.g., 90% of all wars were intrastate wars[4]). **Terrorism** fits into low intensity conflict picture. And there are lots of voices (and evidences) talking about the relationship between terrorism, organized crime, drug trafficking, i.e. the so-called soft security risks/challenges/threats, as well as their presence in the Balkans.

However, what seems to be new is the perception of the ongoing privatization of violence as a fundamental threat to international security and the strength of international reaction to terrorist acts.

Security is further more about keeping the functional status of an entity within certain accepted limits/parameters. At the same time, security may be seen as the result of the evolution/developments between two dimensions: objective, i.e. the de facto status and subjective, i.e. the perception of threats and risks. One may also add a third dimension, namely the cooperation relations. Did security change after 9/11? I believe that the nature of security did not really change; what has changed or become more visible is the range and hierarchy of risks and threats. This in turn has implications upon the nature security strategies and means requested/needed to deal with these new threats and risks. Nowadays, states no longer fear a massive attack characteristic for the Cold War era, but other challenges threaten their existence. For the Balkans the challenges are related especially to their weak economies, under developed administrative structures as well as to the soft security risks. That is why, before talking about "regional and local ownership" the West should think in terms of exporting to its frontier the most wanted commodity on the market, i.e. **development**. As one Romanian political analyst[5] rightly pointed out "the real democracy starts at a certain level of the GDP". Development enhances democracy. Prosperity and democracy creates stability and security. Which in turn attracts more investments and forges development. The stability and security virtuous spiral becomes reality.

The Kossovo crisis has triggered an unprecedented crisis of the international system. There were experts talking about the real end of the Cold War and the beginning of the "new world order". A world relying no longer on the rules of the international law, no longer complying with the decisions of the international organizations/bodies, a world of a superpower, the only remaining one. The plastic definition of the US deputy state secretary for defense, Mr. Wolfowitz, i.e. "mission determines the coalition", launched at the Berlin security conference in February 2002, became the mantra of the coalitions for the wars to be waged during the 21st century. Does it also mean that NATO became obsolete? Or does it equate that the EU should replace the "most successful alliance of the last 50 years"? Is it the big time for the regional/sub-regional security settlements?

In a world of globalization, with the information and communication technology getting rid of the "informational privilege" and shrinking every day the "global village", the syntagm "global security is indivisible from continental/regional/national security" becomes the norm. As a consequence, the whole world, in the various representations of the international community should further pay attention to the "hot spots" of the Earth. And the Balkans region is still in such a position.

---

[3] Rosenau , S.J, *Turbulence in World Politics. A Theory of Change and Continuity*, Harvester Aheatsheaf, New York, 1990.

[4] Let us take, for example, the case of Europe, where between 1964 and 2000, UN were involved in 10 missions. No less than 9 of them were launched after 1992, out of which 8 in the space of former-Yugoslavia.

[5] Secares, V., *The new world order and the Balkans war*, in Codita, C.(ed.), The Balkans – Coming Out of the Past, ISIS, Bucharest, 2000, pp. 130-145.

Of course, the picture would have not been complete without saying a few worlds about the role to be played, by Romania as a stability factor in a troubled area. The country is analyzed through the grid of the risks challenging security provided by professor Foucher[6].

In the end, I also tried to offer a perspective on the future possible developments of the region.

But, as the recent examples in our history shown, the social and political issues are almost bizarre through their unpredictability. Let us then listen to the Saint Exupery: "As for the future, your task is not to predict it but to make it happen".

After these introductory remarks related to the contents of the project, it is also worth mentioning the most important aspects related to the way I conducted the research, the achievements and the stumbling blocks on the way to the Final Report, as well as to express my gratitude to those who supported me during the two years elapsed since the moment I was awarded the NATO Individual Research Fellowship.

In my case, I had the chance to mix the research work for the project with the day-to-day work as an expert in regional cooperation and European integration at the Ministry of National Defense for Romania as well as with my inclination towards sharing my knowledge or/and concerns with the public at large through various articles I wrote on topics related to Balkans, South-Eastern Europe, regional cooperation, involvement of international organizations in the management of regional crisis in the Balkans etc.

The research works rely mostly on books, articles, reports and Internet sources. I also had the chance to talk to people directly involved either in the management of the crisis in the Balkans or just interested in the developments in the area. As far as the End Product is concerned, I would also try to circulate it before submission to NATO, in order to receive as many inputs as possible and to improve its contents.

Although it was not a request stemming from the obligations of the fellowship, I took the decision to also design and implement a website dedicated to the involvement of both NATO and the EU in the Balkans (the link to the website is http://users.pcnet.ro/natoeuinbalkans; it is due to be fully operational by September 2003). Given the importance of the topic as well as my personal interest, I intend to keep it alive as a follow-up to the project.

In relation to the project I conducted several research works. In a chronological order, they would be as follows:

- 22 July – 4 August 2001: *Summer School on European Foreign and Security Policy*, German Council on Foreign Relation (DGAP), Berlin/Germany.
- 4 March – 26 April 2002: *Visiting Research Fellow*, The EU Institute for Security Studies (EU-ISS), Paris/France.
- December 2002 – March 2003: *Research works at the National Library of Romania*, Bucharest/Romania.
- 24 March – 4 April 2003: *Research works within NATO Studies Center*, Bucharest/Romania.
- 2002 – up to present: *Research works and various articles published in "Balcanii" Magazine*, Bucharest/Romania.

Of course, although I elaborated progressively, partially at least, most of the chapters, the bulk of the work for the Final Report was done in May and June 2003. This coincided with a very busy period both at the office (why all the important official events are concentrated in the transitory months from spring to summer?) and at home (with my wife learning for the summer exams and my daughter eager to take all the early sun of this year in the week ends).

But life is always so complicated and we have to live up to its requirements. Especially when we committed ourselves.

---

[6] Foucher, M., *Les defis de securite en Europe mediane, Fondation pour les Etudes de Defense*, Collection Perspectives Strategiques, 1996, p. 12.

Introduction

- **Why to choose such a topic?**

During the East-West confrontation the primary concern of the Western democracies was to keep the bi-polar confrontation stable with the least risk and at the lowest possible cost. Accordingly, stability was defined mainly in military and strategic terms and the means for achieving this goal security policy along with arms and disarmament policies. Nowadays stability should be understood as a kind of process, i.e. a social and political evolution with contradictory elements, both cooperative and confrontational, open-ended as to its results and with the goal of strengthening and making more durable the cooperative elements. Stability can only be achieved as the result of the mutual relationship between the creation of internal structures and internal developments[7], the latter being of decisive importance.

The West tried to develop various instruments for strengthening its relations to the political East as it was, and for stabilizing that region. Four kinds can be distinguished:

✓ *First*, the cooperation between individual Western and Eastern countries as it found expression in hundreds of treaties and in the fundamental reorientation of the CEECs international economic relations. As for the Balkans region, we shall see later on that the international community did not pay too much attention, at least in early (and decisive) stages of the conflicts.

✓ *Second*, cooperation between the West as a whole and individual countries in the East. This took the form of member ship in the Council of Europe and in the OECD, Europe Agreements with EC/EU, and NATO's PfP program. Again, the Balkans were left apart,

---

[7] Cf. Nerlich, U., Posibilities and Problems of a Constellation Analysis as the Basis of Future Security Planning, in: Heydrich, W., Krause, J., Nerlich, U., Notzold, J., Rummel, R. (eds.), Germany's Security Policy: New Constellations, risks, Instruments, Baden-Baden 1992, pp.23-75.

countries in the region getting at best the status of associated partner to the EU (by concluding the Stabilization and Association Agreements) or being in the position to become members of PfP.

✓ *Third*, cooperation between the West and East, each acting as a group. The clearest example is the EAPC/NACC. Unfortunately, the comments made above in relation to the Balkans are still valid in this area too.

✓ *Fourth*, the encouragement of sub-regional cooperation between CEECs, ranging from support for the Visegrad group to the Stability Pact for South-Eastern Europe (SP). The importance of the latter type of initiative lies in the fact that the countries of Middle Europe, in their westward march, tended to neglect their immediate neighbors and especially their former alliance partners. Thus regional cooperation initiatives, touched upon within this project, filled an important gap in European cooperation.

Unfortunately, at the dawn of the new post-Cold War era, the Western democracies proved not to be ready to cope with the challenges of the new security environment. And the immediate consequence of this unpreparedness of the West was the emergence of sub-regional conflicts, especially in the geographical space of the Socialist Federative Republic of Yugoslavia (by that time).

The stances adopted by the West as whole were quite ambiguous ones and they were almost useless (at least in the outset of the crisis) due to the lack of coordination (and sometimes a sort strange competition) between various international organizations and bodies, e.g. UN, NATO and the EU[8].

In this context, the aim of this paper is to analyze and explain the reasons behind the involvement of both NATO and the EU in the settlement of the conflictual situations in South-Eastern Europe (SEE herein after). After such an analysis one will try to demonstrate that there still is enough room for the involvement of the international organizations interested in stabilizing the region and willing to transform in an area of prosperity. And such an involvement should be materialized in a concrete and comprehensive strategy towards the region. Probably, another important impact of this approach is the need for a single leading organization (body, agency), able to deal with the complex system of equations in the region. Should it be NATO, the EU or the UN? One ought to try finding out some possible answers in this respect, including the reasons behind.

- **The research methodology and the structure of the final report**

The research within this study will consist of several phases and will be based on what one calls "**content and comparative analysis**"[i].

The project aims at addressing the three basic types of questions for any research, as follows:

- *Descriptive* – designated primarily to describe what is going on or what exists. This approach will be used for chapter 1, 2 and 5 (partly).
- *Relational* – designed to look at the relationship between two or more variables. This is the case for chapter 3 – studying the relationship between the nature of the two organizations involved, i.e. NATO and the EU, and their actions in the field.

---

[8] For a detailed analysis in this respect it is worth reading the conclusions of the multi-year project "UN, NATO and Other regional Actors in the 21st Century: Partners in Peace?", project that involved the International Peace Academy, the EU-ISS and the Delegation for Strategic Affairs of the French Ministry of Defense. According to the documents released to the public, since 1991, the UN's operational role in Europe has evolved through four periods: 1991-1994, when the UN played a central role in the maintenance of peace on the European continent (under UNPROFOR, although with limited results I would add remembering the Srebrenita massacre); 1994-1998, when UN was largely discredited and gradually marginalized (as was evident in the creation of the Contact Group and the Dayton agreement); October 1998-June 1999, when the UN's role was contested both by the OSCE-led KVM and NATO's Operation "Allied Force"; June 1999-present, which corresponds to the establishment and functioning of UNMIK and, consequently, a leading legal and political role for the UN (but limited to some regions of the world?!). The final conclusion of this report was the following: "The most important role for the UN is in authorizing military force employed by regional actors in Peace Support Operations (PSO). Nevertheless, it is worth noting that such prior authorization from the UN Security Council is not always regarded as indispensable, particularly if there exists sufficient consensus that such prior authorization may, in fact, serve the <<common good>>". Probably, the most suitable regional actors are at the moment NATO and the EU, while the cases of Kosovo and Iraqi crisis may be regarded as precedents for bypassing the authority of the UN (although post-intervention legitimization may be sought).

- *Causal* – designed to determine whether one or more variables causes or affects one or more outcome variables. This could be the case for chapter 4 – how the failure of the preventive actions led to the outbreak of the crisis in the region; chapter 5 – how the outbreak of the crisis in the Balkans and Romania's quest for Euro-Atlantic and European integration led to the involvement of the country in the process of stabilizing the region.

As far as chapter 6 is concerned, this is going to also involve a mixed approach:

- *Descriptive*;
- *Relational* – relationship between the domestic situation and the actions/stances of different countries on the regional stage;
- *Causal* – how the involvement of different actors in the regional cooperation process could affect their future actions and evolution.

The research methodology may be described as follows:

- First phase – *defining the theoretical horizon of the research*: identification of the pursued features (**analysis units[ii]; basic concepts[iii]; working hypothesis[iv]**; etc.); explanation concerning the degree of correlation[v] between the different studied aspects.
- Second phase – *operationalising the concepts previously defined*/elaboration of the instruments and rules governing the analytical work:
  - Prescriptions concerning the classification[vi] of the data/information used, the working hypothesis[vii] and the principles governing the research planning and review process[viii];
  - Prescriptions on the analysis units (temporal and spatial definition of the research[ix] - identification of the geographical space and the studied span period, scope of the analysis[x], e.g.);
  - Prescriptions on the contextual aspects (should it or should not it take into consideration the context where one find different information?[xi]).
- Third phase - *codification of the data /research phase*.
- Fourth phase – *analysis and elaboration of different chapters/analysis and elaboration phase* (including the review process).
- Fifth phase – *envisaging scenarios on possible future evolutions of the studied phenomenum /prospective analysis phase of the project.*

The first two phases, with a theoretical content, were accomplished during the first working month of this project, while the third and the fourth ones were carried out along the whole research, analysis, elaboration and review processes for different chapters. The fifth phase has consisted of a prospective analysis exercise, an attempt of envisaging several scenarios on the [future] evolution of the analyzed phenomenon within this study.

Relative to the economy of the "Final Report", it should be mentioned that one tried to draw a parallel between its structure and the methodology presented above. Because this structure was already described in the Executive summary section, it does not make sense to repeat it here. Details concerning the research methodology are presented in **Annex to Introduction**.

- **Considerations vis-à-vis the bibliographic resources**

I presented above the Romanian and foreign institutions where the research works were conducted. Besides, an important factor and a resource impossible to be neglected nowadays was represented by the Internet. This is the meaning of providing a list of the most important web sites one should take into consideration and rely on along any research. The Selective bibliography section of the report encompasses the most important books, articles, reports and reviews consulted during the research works as well as a list of the electronic resources I considered absolutely necessary to be used when undertaken such an action.

In order to contribute to the fair presentation of SEE and its real situation and to make more transparent the comparison between NATO and the EU's involvement in stabilizing this area, I decided to design a website dedicated to the above-mentioned issues. The website is structured in several modules, the most important being: definitions, NATO, the EU, history of the region, maps,

and bibliography on SEE, as well as useful links. Taken into account the high conflict potential of the area and the new developments in this respect, the website is intended to be an interactive one, being open to suggestions from the part of the readers/surfers. The location of the website is http://users.pcnet.ro/natoeuinbalkans (e-mail: natoeuinbalkans@pcnet.ro or dancalin@pcnet.ro).

- **Defining the Balkans and South-Eastern Europe. How to define a region?**

The former Eastern Europe became again, within present representations, *"Central and Eastern Europe"* or, for some authors and politicians, *"East Central Europe"*[9]. The term *"Middle Europe"* could describe in an exhaustive way the area one will focus on within this paper. After 1968 the term of *"Central Europe"* was used as a dissident concept in relation to the orders issued from Kremlin.

Fernard Braudel, a reader and analyst of the Hungarian historian Janos Szucs's papers, talked about a *"Median Europe"* vis-à-vis a East Central Europe, i.e., Poland, Hungary and Bohemia, one of the *"Trois Europes",* that he opposed to the Western and Eastern Europe: "(…) *The Median Europe has never had the chance to grow in space, to blow up beyond itself. Its neighbours have always shackled it"*[10].

Before 1919, the term *"Mitteleuropa"*, resumed between 1933 and 1945 in an expansionist way, meant for German authors the spaces of German colonization and influence eastward and South-Eastward from Germany.

Oscar Halecki understood *"East Central Europe"* strengthening from Finland to Greece, the broadest approach concerning this area. He seemed to believe that a division of Europe into four parts (Western, West Central, East Central and Eastern Europe) has some advantages over its division into two parts (Eastern and Western)[11].

According to professor Michel FOUCHER, *"The twofold concept of **Middle Europe** seems to be the most valid one can use in order to define the former Eastern Europe as follows: an intermediate geopolitical space between the West and Russia; a space of historical transition between these two organisational poles; political and territorial heirs imposed from the East, i.e. Kremlin; nowadays streamlining process imposed by the West. This **middle ensembl**e coincides in its northern part with the Central Europe **stricto sensu**, i.e. Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic and Slovakia, and no doubts hereafter Slovenia and Croatia. It consists in its Southern part of the European East, i.e. Romania, Bulgaria, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYROM) and Albania, and overflows towards Ukraine and Belarus. Greece is not a part of this ensemble but, given its special position as a member of both NATO and EU, it is playing an important role in the region"*[12].

Within this paper, the term *"Middle Europe"* is defined as follows: the region stretching from the Baltic to the Black Sea, divided in to three sub-regions, i.e. Northern Middle Europe (Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, i.e. the Baltic States), Central Europe *'stricto sensu'* (Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and Slovakia) and South-Eastern Europe (Albania, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, FYROM, Romania, Slovenia, plus the continental parts of Greece and Turkey). According to this exhaustive definition both Greece and Turkey will be dealt with as important actors in SEE. It is also important to explain the present meaning of *'the Balkans'* term, i.e. the region consisting of most of the countries in the former Socialist Federative Republic of Yugoslavia – Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, FYROM, plus Albania and Bulgaria. Due to their proximity, very often, Romania as well as Greece are incorrectly regarded and dealt with as Balkan countries. An important aspect to be mentioned is related to the concept of "Western Balkans" promoted by the EU, i.e. Albania, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, FRY, FYROM. As one could easily see, the EU's approach towards the Balkans is a limited one,

---

[9] Kloczowski, J., *East Central Europe in the historiography of the countries of the region*, Institute of East Central Europe, Lublin, 1995, p. 5.

[10] Braudel, F, preface to Szucs, J., *Les trois Europes*, Paris, 1990.

[11] Cf. Halecki, O., *The limits and divisions of European history*, Sheed&Ward, New York, 1950, p. 120.

[12] Foucher, M. (dir.), *Fragments d'Europe – Atlas de l'Europe mediane et orientale*, Fayard, Paris, 1993, p. 60.

due to the fact that other countries in this sub-region have already established special relations with the Union (Association Agreements), while the remaining ones have just started at best the negotiating process in order to conclude Stabilization and Association Agreements.

Of course, the region of concern for this paper (Area of Interest - AOI) is SEE, as defined above, but it is difficult to understand such a complex area without placing and analyzing it in a broader context. That is why, within the paper, one shall try to interact with other processes in Middle Europe as a whole (via regional cooperation initiatives,e.g.).

The geographical proximity of several important actors, such as Germany, Austria and Italy, is another important factor one should take into consideration in an attempt to solve the extremely complicated system of equations in this area. One should talk about a system because, in order to provide security[13] and stability of the region, it should be solved the military-political equation with economic and societal unknowns, the societal equation with, at least, the same conditionalities, the economic equation… What one means here by security and stability can be referred to as *securing the normal and necessary conditions for the existence of a unit of the international system and its further development*. These two concepts are to be developed in the first chapter.

Is the sub-regional co-operation a solution for the system or it is simply a palliative? Were NATO and the EU involvement/actions decisive factors for the stabilization of the region? One will try to find out possible answers to these questions within the paper.

What are the dimensions of a region generally speaking? One could summarize them under the following headings: **a definable geographical/ecological area; shared historical experiences; interacting social, political, economic, cultural systems; developed links in any of the above mentioned fields; institutional framework/organizations to regulate collective affairs; common perceptions on external states and/or organizations**. In spite of the weak sub-regional co-operation among states in SEE after the fall of the communist regimes, one should admit, relying on the elements above-mentioned, that this is a particular region in Europe.

Defining the terms of Middle Europe/SEE does not mean that the task is accomplished. One should now concentrate on the proper definition of the concepts and reality referred to as *security* and *stability* in the sub-regional co-operation environment.

- **Annex to Introduction - Description of the methodology -**explanatory part

Defining the theoretical horizon of the research:

[i] **Content analysis** – the research works relied on different "open sources" of information (press releases, books, research studies, NATO and EU official documents etc.)

Comparative analysis – the research aimed at doing a comparison between the two organizations, based on the following items: their approaches/strategies (if any?!) and stances adopted (at the beginning, during and in the aftermath of the crisis), possible competitive actions and relevance of these organizations for the region (perception of the population, perspectives for future cooperation).

[ii] **Analisys units**: NATO, the EU and Romania

[iii] **Basic concepts**: security, stability, risks, regional cooperation and integration, prosperity

[iv] **Working hypothesis:** NATO and the EU are organizations different in nature but they become more and more mutually reinforcing in the field of crisis management

[v] One must pay attention to the degree of correlation between different information sources

Operationalising the concepts:

[vi] Collected data were classified either by topic (conflict in Slovenia, Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo, FYROM) or using the chronological criterion.

---

[13] According to Buzan, B., Waever, O. and De Wilde, J., *SECURITY. A new framework for analysis*, Lynne Rienner Publishers, London, 1997, p. 23, '*any public issue can be located on the spectrum ranging from **nonpoliticized** (meaning the state does not deal with it and it is not in any way made an issue of public debate and decision) through **politicized** (meaning the issue is part of public policy, requiring government decision and resource allocations, or more rarely, some other form of communal governance) to **securitized** (meaning the issue is presented as an existential threat, requiring emergency measures and justifying actions outside the normal bounds of political procedure)*".

vii Formulating the working hypothesis one bared in mind NATO's adaptation to the new security environment (end of the Cold War, demise of the soviet empire, ESDI, enlargement process) and EU's quest for a role on the international stage (CFSP, Petersberg tasks, ESDP, widening versus deepening process).

viii The Research Planning and Review Process (RPARP) was based on multiple feed backs. It has been carried out before and after each report (preliminary, final etc.), as well as after the elaboration of each particular chapter/section. It was also improved after discussions with different analysts, decision-makers etc.

ix **Temporal definition of the research**: 1990 - 2003, with focus on the post-Dayton evolutions

Spatial definition of the research: the space of the former Socialist Federative Republic of Yugoslavia; nowadays Romania.

x The **scope of the analysis** covered mainly three areas/arenas:

- conflict prevention - the sequence for action in this area is to be based on the following items: diplomacy (first resort) - economy (economic/development aid and cooperation) - military (just as deterrent) - interests (of the countries able and willing to be involved in the prevention activities). As Machiavelli said long time ago: "it's easier to prevent than to cure...". In this area I believe that here is room for various organizations such as **UN, OSCE, EU**. The relatively recent events in FYROM and Southern Serbia proved that NATO also has conflict prevention potential.
- crisis management/response [operations] - the sequence for action may be: military - diplomacy - economy - public opinion support (abroad). All major international organizations (**NATO, UN, OSCE, EU**) have a role to play here. The cooperation among these important actors should be the norm rather that the exception.
- post conflict management/developments – the sequence for action ought to be: economy (reconstruction programs) - military (enforcement of the military and political agreements; reasons to justify the need for NATO!!!) - diplomacy - public opinion support (who do we help first/more? why?) - interests (difficult to assess; difficult to convince people home on the real need to send troops on the ground). I consider that also all major international organizations have a role to play. Because the stabilization of a region means also stability for the system as a whole.

xi Every time information is used it is necessary/compulsory to verify the reliability of the source and to give all the details about the way the information was collected.

_____

Issues taken into account during the analysis and elaboration process:

- US were reluctant to intervene at the outbreak of the crisis in the Balkans (this attitude has to be seen also in the complex international situation at that moment: demise of the Soviet Empire, Gulf War)
- Russia was unable to intervene in early '90s, but caught up especially after Kosovo (we do not have to neglect the Contact Group – created in '94, which involved also Russia)
- OSCE was and still is lacking means and capabilities to manage a crisis situation. Better fitted for conflict prevention (probably!)
- EU has been a "civil power" in a quest to become "global power" (see the emergence and implementation of CFSP/ESDP)
- NATO - an Alliance adapting to the new security environment.
- The Balkans - a small region characterized by a huge diversity, in terms of culture, religion, historical heritages etc.
- Heritages of the communist era (artificial republics and people - FYROM, Constitution of '74, special status of Yugoslavia during the Cold War)

Chapter 1: Security issues - from theory to practice

- **The new security paradigm in the post Cold War world**

  <u>What is security?</u>

  *"The answer to what makes something an international security issue can be found in the traditional military-political understanding of security. In this context, **security is about survival**. It is when an issue is presented as **posing an essential threat** to a designated referent object (traditionally, but not necessarily, the state, incorporating government, territory, and society)* [14].

---

14 Ibid., p. 21.

The end of the Cold War period and the emergence of new risks and threats challenging security led to the widening of the concept. Consequently, one could talk about a *multidimensional security concept* covering various sectors: military security, political security, economic security, societal security, and environmental security.

In the academic sphere there is a continuous debate about the *new security agenda*, among three main schools of thought: the traditionalists, the wideners and the Critical Security Studies (CSS). The traditionalists' concept of security gravitates around national security and has as object of security the state[15]. The wideners extend the security agenda to incorporate new dimensions, as mentioned above. **This approach is used within this paper.** CSS challenge both the traditionalists and the wideners. They think that the concept of threat is constructed and want to examine how and where threats arise[16].

A definition of security, sector-by-sector, could be as follows: *"The **military security** concerns the two-level interplay of the armed offensive and defensive capabilities of states, and states' perceptions of each other's intentions. **Political security** concerns the organizational stability of states, systems of government and the ideologies that give them legitimacy. **Economic security** concerns access to the resources, finance and markets necessary to sustain acceptable levels of welfare and state power. **Societal security** concerns the sustainability, within acceptable conditions for evolution, of traditional patterns of language, culture and religious and national identity and custom. **Environmental security** concerns the maintenance of the local and the planetary biosphere as the essential support system on which all other human enterprises depend'*.

What one is obliged to mention is that if a multisectoral approach to security was to be fully meaningful, referent objects other than the state would have to be allowed into the picture.

According to Barry Buzan *"in the post-Cold War world international relations (IR) will take on a more regionalized character"*[17]. The reason behind this assumption is that the collapse of bipolarity has removed the principal organizational force at the global level and there is no supranational body able to deal with all global issues. In this context the sub-regional initiatives should find and play a role within the Euro-Atlantic security and stability process. This does not mean that security could be regionalized; it only means that the Euro-Atlantic security is indivisible but the countries in different regions should take on more responsibilities in this respect.

In any analysis on the realm of IR involves, besides the different sectors, one should take into consideration, a definition of the levels of analysis. The five most important ones are[18]:

- *International systems* – meaning the largest conglomerates of interacting or interdependent units that have no system level above them.
- *International subsystems* – meaning groups of units within the international system that can be distinguished from the entire system by the particular nature or intensity of their interactions with or interdependence on each other. *Subsystems may be territorially coherent, in which case they are regional*, or not, in which case they are not regions but simply subsystems.
- *Units* – meaning actors composed of various subgroups, organizations, communities, and many individuals sufficiently cohesive.
- *Subunits* – meaning organized groups of individuals within units that are able (or try) to affect the behavior of the unit.
- *Individuals*.

In terms of levels of analysis, the region is a special type of subsystem. Why does this type of territorial subsystem come into being and sustain itself as a feature of the wider international system? A possible explanation was offered by Hans Mouritzen[19] which argued that if units (states)

---

[15] Cf. Krause, K, *Critical theory and security studies: the Research Programme of <<Critical Security Studies>>*, in: Cooperation and Conflict, Vol. 33, No. 3, 1998, pp. 309.

[16] Cf. ibid., p. 309.

[17] Buzan, Waever and De Wilde, op.cit., p. 9.

[18] Cf. ibid., p. 5.

[19] Cf. Mouritzen, H., quoted in Buzan, Waever and de Wilde, op.cit., p. 9-10.

of the international system are mobile, each unit's average environment will, after a reasonable time, constitute the system as such rather than any particular segment of that system. By contrast, if the units are non-mobile (the most common situation nowadays), each unit will face a relatively stable regional environment consisting of the major units in its geographical proximity; each system will be characterized by a specific *location* in the system's structure. Identifying the mechanism that forms regions underpins the argument for paying attention to the regionalizing aspect of the subsystem in the analysis of international security.

"Classical security complex theory" (CSCT) posits the existence of regional sub-systems as objects of security analysis and offers an analytical framework for dealing with those systems. The normal pattern of security interdependence in a geographically diverse, anarchic international system is one of regionally based clusters, which were labeled *"security complexes"*[20]. A *security complex* is defined as *"a set of states whose major security perceptions and concerns are so inter-linked that their national security problems cannot reasonably be analyzed or resolved apart from one another"*[21]. One should be aware that a security complex could be seen, theoretically speaking, both as a positive and as a negative achievement at the (sub) regional level.

Regional integration could eliminate a security complex with which it is coextensive by transforming it from anarchic sub-system of states to a single, larger actor within the system.

In the above-mentioned concept of multidimensional security the analysis has to be opened to a wider range of sectors. There are two possible ways of opening security complex theory to sectors other than the military-political and to actors other than states[22]:

- *Homogeneous complexes* – this approach retains the *classical* assumption that security complexes are concentrated within specific sectors and are therefore composed of specific forms of interaction among similar types of units.
- *Heterogeneous complexes* – this approach abandons the assumption that security complexes are locked into specific sectors. It assumes that the regional logic can integrate different types of actors interacting across two or more sectors.

The approach used within this paper is the second one. It is based on the involvement of different international organizations (especially NATO and the EU) as well as various sub-regional organizations set up in **Middle Europe/SEE** after 1989, in order to help filling the political vacuum and restart economic co-operation with an aim at stabilizing and securitizing this area. Consequently, the focus will not be simply on the military-political sector but also on the economic, societal and environmental ones.

Given the *"new definition of security"*[23] which focuses increasingly on *"achieving a balance of prosperity, democracy at national level, political equality of ethnic minorities and preventive diplomacy"* [24], less importance is attached in relative terms, to nuclear deterrence. Consequently, the balance of influence between the transatlantic partners has become more evenly distributed. But a question arises: what are the consequences of such a situation for the emerging democracies in Middle Europe/SEE and for their incipient form of co-operation? One will try to figure out an answer within the last section of this paper.

One should also pay attention to the possible changes in what traditionalists called *high politics* (i.e. issues affecting the sovereignty or the vital interests of the state such as **monetary policy, external relations, defence,** etc.) versus *low politics* (i.e. **economic policy, cultural policy,** etc.). Nowadays, one can witness the emergence of new unimaginable processes concerning the transfer of sovereignty to supranational bodies (the most obvious examples are the creation of the European Monetary Union (EMU) and the last developments within the EU towards the creation of a European Rapid Reaction Force (RRF) able to take part in the so-called *"Petersberg tasks"*[25]).

---

[20] Buzan., Waever and De Wilde, op.cit., p. 12.

[21] Ibid., p. 12.

[22] Cf. ibid., p. 16.

[23] Francke, K., *Rebalancing transatlantic relations*, in: NATO Review, Vol. 45, No. 5, September-October 1997.

[24] Ibid.

[25] For further and detailed information see Art. 17 Treaty of Amsterdam (ToA).

Consequently, it is more and more difficult to draw a clear dividing line between these two types of above-mentioned politics. Consequently one must admit that these processes, if they are successful and strengthen by other conditions facilitating the intergovernmental co-operation and integration, could lead to a redefinition within the hierarchy of policies.

Nowadays, according to some authors[26], the notion of **security**, which could be partly understood as the observance of the *status quo ante*, was substituted by that of **stability**, i.e. *"seeking for lasting regional equilibrium"* [27]. On the other hand, a new dilemma arises on the international *arena*: where and what is the limit between domestic politics and international politics? And how to exit from this dilemma: giving up a part of your sovereignty for a better economic and social situation or to maintain the *status quo*? NATO and the EU involvement in the area of interest, as well as the establishment of sub-regional co-operation initiatives aim both at providing security and stability of the area and at strengthening it at the European level. A question arises: how successfully has this approach been so far?

As already mentioned in the Introductory remarks section, after the end of the Cold War (and especially with the emergence of terrorism at a global scale), one may talk about the "**new security dilemma**" relying on the fact that states are today challenged much less by states than by social forces that act following different rules and pursue multiple and competing objectives, utilizing a range of coercive means. The fact is that the mode of coercion that becomes predominant is intra-state, low intensity conflict (in 2000, e.g., 90% of all wars were intrastate wars). **Terrorism** fits into low intensity conflict picture. And there are lots of voices (and evidences) talking about the relationship between terrorism, organized crime, drug trafficking, i.e. the so-called soft security risks/challenges/threats, as well as their presence in the Balkans. The security risks in SEE, as described within the next section, clearly demonstrate that there is plenty of room for further actions in order to fully stabilize the region.

However, what seems to be new is the perception of the ongoing privatization of violence as a fundamental threat to international security and the strength of international reaction to terrorist acts. The way the international community has reacted as a consequence of the 9/11 terrorist attacks was a vivid proof that this new threat has to be dealt with in a proper manner. The world became aware that security was indivisible and that ignoring aggression might mean inviting aggression. The impact of 9/11 has been directly felt by SEE as a region. First, because it is still an area with a very high potential for conflict. Second, because terrorists have been active within its borders. Third, because a shift in political attention away from here might have unpredictable consequences at a time when unfinished business still requires the involvement of the international community. And fourth, because further disintegration in this region could have a disruptive effect on the necessary coordination efforts of the anti-terrorist campaign. That it why, the decision and stances adopted by the Europeans and the US to stick to their commitments in the Balkans were well received in the region.

In the face of the threat of "hyper-terrorism"[28], the notion of homeland defense is becoming topical again, yet in a completely changed international context and with a new meaning. The borders between external and internal security are becoming blurred, necessitating a new trade-off between projection and protection.

In my opinion, **security** is further more about keeping the functional status of an entity within certain accepted limits/parameters. At the same time, security may be seen as the result of the evolution/developments between two dimensions: objective, i.e. the de facto status and subjective, i.e. the perception of threats and risks. One may also add a third dimension, namely the cooperation relations. Did security change after 9/11? I believe that the nature of security did not really change; what has changed or become more visible is the **range and hierarchy of risks and threats**. This in turn has implications upon the nature of security strategies and means requested/needed to deal with

---

[26] Duratin, J-F, Bartin A-C and Veneau , R., *Defense et securite en Europe*, in: Bernard, F. (dir.), *Dictionnaire de questions internationales*, Les Editions de l'Atelier, Paris, 1995, p. 187.

[27] Ibid., p.187.

[28] Ehrhart, H-G, *What model for CFSP?*, Chaillot Paper no. 55, EU-ISS, Paris, October 2002.

these new threats and risks. Nowadays, states no longer fear a massive attack characteristic for the Cold War era, but other challenges threaten their existence. For the Balkans the challenges are related especially to their weak economies, under developed administrative structures as well as to the soft security risks. That is why, before talking about "regional and local ownership" the West should think in terms of exporting to its frontier the most wanted commodity on the market, i.e. **development**. As one Romanian political analyst[29] rightly pointed out "the real democracy starts at a certain level of the GDP". Development enhances democracy. Prosperity and democracy creates stability and security. Which in turn attracts more investments and forges development. The stability and security virtuous spiral becomes reality.

Today's intrastate and transnational conflicts cannot be solved by way of simplistic policy. That is not to say that military means have no role to play in the fight against terrorism. However, as the related problems are of a complex, social nature, the response has to be differentiated in accordance with the precepts of international security governance[30].

Co-operation and integration – towards a clarification of concepts[31]

"While few people would dispute the necessity for international co-operation, it is challenging to define and assess the relationship between co-operation and integration"[32].

In fact, what one can witness nowadays at the (sub) regional level in Middle Europe/SEE is an incipient form of intergovernmental co-operation. According to Robert O. Keohane, the **intergovernmental co-operation process** is understood as *'entailing, at the most basic level, the presence of common problems and tasks that lead to a commonality of expectations and the overlapping of interests on the part of nation-state"[33].* Furthermore, common inter-state expectations and interests naturally give rise to multilateral negotiations out of which can emerge a common framework. Once policy co-ordination among nation-states is in place, then one state's objectives are realized through another state's conscious actions.

The **integration** of nation-states emerges out of intergovernmental co-operation, as a common framework and policy co-ordination lead to the forging of structural arrangements binding nation states together in increasingly concrete ways. Structural arrangements include not only political institutions, but also the formal and informal rules of operation governing inter-state decision-making processes. As these institutions and rules are constructed and evolve, intergovernmental negotiations are supplemented by elements of supranationalism.

Since both co-operation and integration can only be operative on the basis of bargaining and mutual adjustment, their propensity to describe similar and interrelated processes is obvious. In addition, the processes of both co-operation and integration are initiated out of concrete necessities. The establishment or the revigoration of intergovernmental – and, in the case of integration of supranational - bodies is linked to the perception of crisis or the experience of rapid change. Besides, intergovernmental - and supranational - institutions are the medium for negotiations, conflict resolution and confidence building among its members. At a time of uncertainty and change, co-operative and integrative measures are intended to provide a framework for the definition of common problems, provision of information, and co-ordination of tasks.

These situations above-mentioned seem to define nowadays Middle Europe/SEE and one will try to analyze within this paper, among other aspect, what are the implications and achievements of the existing sub-regional initiatives and to envisage a few possible future scenarios.

---

[29] Secares, V., op.cit. in note 5.

[30] From a neorealist point of view the post –modern understanding of security displays merely a lack of military power. See Kagan, R., *Power and Weakness*, Policy Review, no. 113, http://www.policyreview.org/JUN02/kagan_print.html.

[31] One will try to offer a possible explanation and to make a distinction between the two processes drawing on the experience of some scholars that dealt with these issues. In fact, this subsection is mostly based on the conclusion of a paper written by Welsh, H.A. and Willerton, J.P., i.e. *Regional Co-operation and the CIS: West European lessons and post-Soviet experience*, in: International Politics, Vol. 34, No 1, March 1997, pp. 33-61.

[32] Ibid., p. 35.

[33] Keohane, R.O., *After hegemony: cooperation and discord in the world political economy*, Princetown, , N.J., Princetown University Press, 1984, quoted in .Welsh and Willerton, op.cit., p. 35.

- **Security challenges in South-Eastern Europe**

<u>Regional security challenges and opportunities</u>[34]

The evolution of the strategic environment in Europe requires a redefinition of the role of international organizations and institutions, including through involvement in conflict prevention and regional crisis management. A comprehensive approach to security and stability encompassing all their aspects – political, military, economic, social, environmental etc. – has to be developed. This approach should lead to an integrated Europe without dividing lines and the enlargement processes of the EU and NATO are decisive factors in this respect. As far as the SEE is concerned, the last decade it has witnessed the continuing transition from authoritarian governments and centrally planned economies to pluralist democracies and free markets. At the moment, all countries in this region have democratically elected governments. The success of the democratic and free market reforms is crucial for the future.

Although significant progress towards peace and stability has been made, challenges still exist and no single state or international organization can deal with these challenges by itself. A concerted effort towards security and stability is needed. Consequently, regional and international cooperation and also the ongoing integration processes are indispensable to address challenges. An appropriate identification of the challenges to security in the region supported by well-defined principles of cooperation is needed to make this endeavor successful. The UN's limited success in managing several of the conflicts in the post-Cold War era, coupled with the resurgence of regional actors, have led to the emergence of a new decision-making architecture in which no single state or institution, its members, or its secretariat has a monopoly in dealing with matters of international peace and security.

The identified challenges to security are grouped under several categories. However, they are frequently interconnected and aggravation in one can exacerbate the others, with unpredictable consequences. While not all challenges specifically affect each country in SEE, they can affect other countries due to indivisibility of security.

<u>Political Challenges</u>

After the democratic changes in the region (end of the dictatorship of Tudjman, fall of Milosevic regime, amiable solution for [Union of] Serbia and Montenegro) it is highly probable that these countries do not have any reasons to perceive in the foreseeable future any direct threat of military aggression on the part of one state against others' national sovereignty, territorial integrity or political independence. However, risk factors playing into instability are present as a challenge to national, regional and Euro-Atlantic security, as follows:

- **Ethnic tensions** and failure to respect differing ethnic, religious and cultural values are important challenges for the region. Specific issues would include intolerance and xenophobia, non-compliance with democratic principles and practices, treaties and international agreements regarding the respect of rights of persons belonging to national minorities. The future stability and security in SEE will depend very much on successful management of inter-ethnic, inter-religious and inter–cultural relations.
- **Extreme and violent nationalism** – the outcome of the recent election in Bosnia and Herzegovina demonstrate that, in comparison to other countries (see Slovakia and Hyngary, e.g.) the Balkan states are still reluctant and able to ignore the "suggestions" of the West.
- **Terrorist activities and militant extremism** could also generate political challenges and instability. This could be aggravated by links between local extremists and international terrorist and radical fundamentalist groups, and attempts to use the region

---

[34] This sub-section relies on the *South East Europe Common Assessment Paper on Regional Security Challenges and Opportunities (SEECAP)*, endorsed on 29 May 2001 by the states of the EAPC at the EAPC Foreign Ministers Meeting in Budapest.

as a transit point for missions in third countries, as well as expansion of links with organized crime as a significant funding source.

- **Organized crime** constitutes a serious challenge to the security of the region. Money laundering, illegal trafficking of arms, narcotics, human beings, components and materials for WMD are menaces to many countries. Criminal networks in many cases operate across borders. They are often linked with corruption and finance terrorist and illegal armed groups activities.
- **Disruptions in regional, European and Euro-Atlantic integration processes** and consequent potential isolation of nations are potentially significant challenges. Integration in international organizations, particularly NATO and the EU, reinforces regional countries' national aspirations and provides essential impetus to democratic, economic and social reforms and cooperative security policies. So far, the European perspective has proven to be the most powerful incentive for reconciliation, cooperation and internal reforms in the region. However, a question arises here: how long can be postponed the EU's enlargement process? Regional cooperation may help to reinforce the principle that each state is free to choose its own security arrangements. Such cooperation based on shared values would promote transparency and productive regional initiatives that do not create new dividing lines. Fortunately, the latest declarations of the European leaders in relation to the Balkans brought new hopes for these countries. One thing is clear for sure: there is no single winning solution and each country is to be assessed on its own merits.
- **Insufficient early warning, conflict prevention and crisis management capabilities and cooperation structures** need to be addressed at the regional, Euro-Atlantic and global levels. Uncertainty and instability in and around the Euro-Atlantic area could evolve rapidly, endangering SEE as well. Decisiveness and political will of the regional countries and the international community to defend the principles of peaceful conduct is very important. The adaptation of regional and international organizations to improve early warning, conflict prevention and, where these fail, crisis management in the region is essential. Therefore, it is an imperative to use effectively the existing early warning and conflict prevention mechanisms or to create new ones as necessary. The launching of the various projects under the aegis of SEEGROUP, as well as the establishment of South-Eastern Europe Defense Ministerial Process (SEDM Process) and the Multinational Peace Force South-Eastern Europe (MPFSEE) are vivid proofs that the countries realized the way they should act/behave in order to be taken seriously by their Western counterparts.
- **The international perception of the region** as a source of insecurity and instability impacts negatively in a variety of fields of interest to regional stabilization and security ranging from economic investments to pace of European and Euro-Atlantic integration. Development of regional cooperation, economic opportunity and the rule of law with the active support of the international community would help improve this perception. The focus of NATO on its Southern flank, the progress in the process of regional cooperation in SEE may have improved the negative picture of the region.

Defense-Military Challenges

There is no perceived risk of military aggression between countries in SEE. At the moment, a number of checks and balances, including a number of arms control and non-proliferation arrangements and confidence and security-building measures are in place. Regional cooperation processes further increase military confidence and stability. The fundamental roles of the armed forces of countries in SEE are deterrence, protection, participation in collective and other security arrangements and contribution to international military operations. However, countries in SEE are required to deal with specific challenges in the security field that have significant implications for their armed forces and for Europe as whole, as follows:

- **Terrorism**. Protection of populations from the scourge of terrorism is an important task even for those states that are not immediately targeted by these groups. It is an important challenge and task to apply commensurate force under full democratic control and respect for human rights. The events on 11 September 2001 proved that terrorists do not make a distinction between countries "covered" or "not covered" by Article V of the Washington Treaty: they hit wherever they consider necessary in order to make their point. And SEE, as an area where terrorists have been active, could bring its contribution to the international efforts asked for by the coordination of the anti-terrorist campaign.

- **Providing full accountability of the armed forces to the civil society**. Democratic control over the armed forces is an essential element of democratic development. Enhancing this control requires placing decisions over resources for defense establishments within national public debate. External and internal transparency of defense plans and budgets is an important aspect of this accountability. Lack of accountability lessens incentives to develop reasoned and realistic national security strategies and supporting national military strategies, which should in turn justify force structure decisions and priorities. Training of competent civilian expertise to assume responsibility in defense issues is a requirement that needs sustained effort. Again, it is worth noting the efforts of SEEGROUP projects, as a follow-up to SEECAP.

- **Proliferation**. All the countries in SEE are committed to non-proliferation of WMD and their delivery systems. They have no national programs or intentions to develop or acquire such weapons. They are determined to upholding international non-proliferation regimes. However, preventing the illegal trade and transfers of material, including dual-use material and components, for WMD and their delivery systems pose a challenge. The recently launched initiative on "Counter terrorism, border security and counter-proliferation of WMD", under SEDM aegis, may help these countries in jointly addressing a large variety of risks.

- **Management of change**. After the end of the Cold War, new roles for national armed forces emerged, that required a deep transformation of their structures and doctrines. Defense reform is a necessity and a high priority in the region and has its own set of challenges. Already, processes of reform are underway to reorient, reorganize and downsize them.

  The advanced technical and technological skills required by the armed forces increasingly compete with those of the civilian labor markets thereby creating a brain drain from the military. Military personnel systems will therefore have to provide for adequate quality of life to retain skilled personnel.

  In the process of defense reform, and in particular in down sizing, many countries face the need to close military bases, which has active short-term economic and political consequences.

  Similarly, modernization, while expensive when procuring new hardware, is at the same time costly in terms of discarding old equipment as well as posing an environmental challenge.

  Overall, reform of the armed forces is politically sensitive and financially demanding and cannot be done without a clearly motivating prospect of improving the defensive capabilities and posture of the states, particularly through possible membership in an effective alliance such as NATO.

  Failure of this reform and disruptions in integration processes could result in negative consequences on regional and international security.

  The "Comparative Study on National Security Strategies in SEE" may play an important role in relation to this issue.

- **Further adaption of military and security strategies and doctrines** is an area which continues to require effort.

- **Conflict prevention and crisis management**. Although all countries in SEE agree the Euro-Atlantic security is indivisible and that security cannot be regionalized, establishment of effective regional conflict prevention and crisis management capabilities and mechanisms are required to complement broader arrangements.

  Multinationality is the organizing idea that would shape regional response capabilities and mechanisms. Regional cooperation processes, such as SEDM Process and South East Europe Cooperation Process (SEECP) are already exploring with success this area. MPFSEE is a successful example of emerging regional crisis management capabilities.

  There are challenges to fulfill this mission, which are mitigated by various international processes particularly the PfP. However, important challenges nonetheless remain.

Economic Challenges

The economic situation has a direct impact on the region's security and stability. Countries in SEE have been pursuing or are pursuing economic reforms in spite of enormous difficulties. They have generally liberalized the markets, as well as trade and foreign exchange systems. Institutional restructuring and reform including in governmental, industrial, financial or banking areas are fundamental priority for all states. Healthy economic development is an absolute pre-requisite to ensure the long-term stability of the region. While the economic trend in general is positive, some challenges remain[35], including:

- **Stabilisation and control of basic macroeconomic indicators;**
- **High unemployment;**
- **Problems related to attracting foreign investment;**
- **Significant economic disparities;**
- **Infrastructure;**
- **Existence of shadow economies;**
- **Brain drain and qualified labour force migration** pose a serious challenge;
- **Difficulties of transforming centralized economies.**

Social and Democratic Development Challenges

Countries in SEE have entered the new century following a decade of social upheaval. Important progress has been achieved in the consolidation of democracy. Protecting democratic development and sustaining progress in consolidating democracy and the rule of law remain important challenges for the security of SEE. The radical transformations of the social system and the consequences of conflicts and instability of the preceding decade continue to exert considerable strain on countries in SEE. The following challenges confront the region:

- **Social stability;**
- **Lack of institutional checks and balances to provide public accountability**, including fully independent judiciaries and the existence of a rule of law applied equally and consistently to all citizens.
- **Corruption** is an important factor affecting the development of societies in SEE. Corruption adversely affects the reform processes and establishment of market economy principles and mechanisms.
- **Illegal migration**, which is largely connected with organized crime, also challenges the internal stability of various countries and could create extra strains in their efforts to join the EU. Strengthening border control requires expertise and substantial resources. An important incentive in this respect could be the prospects of joining the EU, one of requirements to be fulfilled being related to the securitization of borders. Some of the countries in the region are still on the "black list" of the EU and do not enjoy the privilege of free traveling within the Union.

---

[35] These challenges will be also touched upon in the chapter dedicated to regional cooperation.

Environmental Challenges and Civil Emergency

The lack of consideration by totalitarian regimes for the environmental impact of industrial structures and energy systems as well as the difficulties in the last decade have made it imperative to focus closely on the rich environmental resources of the region and halt and reverse their degradation. Many environmental issues need to be addressed at the regional level, including through information exchange and joint coordination and cooperation framework. Civil emergencies caused by natural or technological disasters or as a consequence of conflicts also influence the region's stability and need a prompt and coordinated reaction. Some of the key challenges related to the environment or civil emergencies are set out below:

- **Management of civil emergencies;**
- **Disposal of military waste**;
- **Land and soil degradation**;
- **Coastal zone management.**

As we saw, there are a large variety of security risks and challenges to be addressed in SEE. The international community is preaching the "regional and local ownership" principle and expects greater involvement from the part of the countries in the region in solving their own problems. Nevertheless, there is still need for further development exports and coordination of efforts from the part of the international community at large.

The huge disparities in the Balkans (ranging from a less than 2,000 USD GNP per capita in Bosnia and Herzegovina to 16,000 USD in Slovenia[36]) feed social instability and political unrest particularly if magnified by modern mass media and exploited by ruthless politicians. Unfortunately, a recent report[37] stated that "unresolved disputes remain and tensions are not a thing of the past". The "cult of crime and corruption" cannot be eradicated from the outside, but Western policy towards SEE governments must include pressure to discipline them.

The key threats the world is facing are more diverse, less visible and less predictable than during the Cold War. They include international terrorism, proliferation of WMD, failed states and organized crime. They are significant threats by themselves but their combination constitutes a radical challenge to security. In order to tackle them properly there is a need to identify the proper instruments.

- **The clash of civilizations in South-Eastern Europe - reality or utopia?**

The fall of the communist regimes in Central and Eastern Europe, followed shortly after by the Gulf War and the demise of Soviet empire were milestones in the evolution of the international system and the emergence of a new world order. Political analysts, academics and decision-makers have tried to understand the future landscape of the world from a "post-Cold War" viewpoint.

Among these attempts, two that are especially noteworthy and that have attracted the attention of the world's intellectual community are Francis Fukuyama's "The End of History and the Last Man" and Samuel P. Huntington's "The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of the World Order". Fukuyama's proposition is that liberal democracy, which first developed in the cradle of Western Civilization, is a universally acceptable concept, and that the world is now moving in a fundamental way towards embracing it. The essence of Huntington's theory is that world politics is entering a new phase in which the principal conflicts of global politics will occur between nations and groups of different civilizations.

A pertinent analysis in this respect, confined to the Balkans region, was undertaken by the International Commission on the Balkans. The thesis analyzed by the Commission were actually focused on three main issues: great powers ambitions, ancestral hatreds and a clash of civilizations. The latter looks for the origins of the war in the cultural and religious fault-lines described as a "clash of civilizations". Yugoslavia in general, and Bosnia in particular, are located in a region of

---

[36] Centre for European Security Studies, *Security and Defense in SEE. The ESCADA Report*, Harmonie Paper, Groningen, March 2003, p. 28.
[37] Ibid.

transition between Western Christianity, Eastern Greek Culture and Islam; after being suppressed by the ideological tensions of the Cold War, the traditional fault-lines between cultures were once again becoming evident. The "third Balkan war" was thus rooted in the fundamental cultural and religious incompatibility. This incompatibility is seen as all the more dramatic and compelling since the conflicting parties in Serbia, Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina all belong to the Southern Slav group of nations and speak the same language. In this view, the primary difference among the three cultures is religion.

Yet all this is far from being a religious war like those which wracked Europe in earliest centuries. Under Ottoman rule, the Balkan nations were identified by their religious communities (millet). The recent conflict occurred in largely secularized societies where religious practice had been declining steadily for a half century.

The Commission talks about a "Northwest/Catholic Arc", but shows clearly that the support expected from Slovenia and Croatia from their Catholic neighbors, i.e. Austria, Hungary and Italy was not at the desired level. The expectation gap seems to be filled up by the recent support for the integration of Slovenia in both NATO and the EU and the prospects offered to Croatia.

Neither in relation to a "Southeast/Orthodox Arc" things are not clear enough. The Orthodox nations (Serbs, Bulgars, Greeks, Romanians, Macedonians, and Montenegrins) represent the dominant religion in the Balkans (50 out of 70 millions). They sometimes see themselves as "boxed in" between Catholics in the North-West and Muslims in the South-East. Throughout the conflicts (including Kosovo crisis) Serbia hoped for a meaningful "Orthodox axis" from the Balkans all the way to Moscow. But it never materialized. The orientation of these countries to the West hardly fits into any Orthodox axis.

Finally, talking about a "Green transversal", linking Muslims in Bosnia, Sandjak, Kosovo, and Turkey, the Commission did not find strong evidence in this respect too.

The irony is that in the Balkan conflict it was precisely the Mulsims who came closest to defending a European ideal of a tolerant, open society against those who sought their eradication in the name of Christian Europe.

In conclusion, the Commission states that the main causes of war have to be sought elsewhere: in the sparks of aggressive nationalism fanned into roaring flames by some of the political leaders of the dissolving Yugoslav federation. The principal responsibility for the war in former Yugoslavia rests with those post-communist politicians throughout Yugoslavia who have invoked the "ancient hatreds" to pursue their respective nationalist agendas.

"*The true culprits are those who mislead public opinion and take advantage of people's ignorance to raise disquieting rumors and sound the alarm bell, inciting their country and consequently other countries into enmity. The real culprits are those who by interest or inclination, declaring constantly that war is inevitable, end by making it so, asserting that they are powerless to prevent it. The true culprits are those who sacrifice the general interest to their own personal interest which they so little understand, and who hold up to their country a sterile policy of conflict and reprisals*".

This is an amazing quotation from d'Estournelles de Constant's introduction to the 1914 International Commission on the Balkans. How many resemblances to the 1990s!

- **Conclusion**

Two years after the launching of SEECAP it seems that the process is well on track. There are a number of initiatives established din the follow-up to the SEECAP process. The reform of security sector (SSR) seems to advance at a steady pace. Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH) is doing its best to enter PfP. [Union of] Serbia and Montenegro decided recently to undertake measures in order to introduce a real civilian control over military as well as to reduce the military personnel and to suspend its "aid" to Republic of Srpska. In FYROM, the Strategic Defence Review (SDR) will also streamline the military forces and will enhance the security of the country.

The various analysis of the Balkans in terms of security tries to focus on the particular situation of the "trio" consisting of BiH, Croatia and Serbia and Montenegro. The usual conclusion in this respect seems to be the following: these countries do not see each other as guarantors of each

other's security[38]. Moreover, whereas territorial defense in Western Europe is no longer a pressing security issue this seems not to be the case in the thinking of the defense planners of these countries[39].

The elaboration of a comparative study on national security strategies in SEE will help both in enhancing the confidence level among these countries and will harmonize their efforts in combating more effectively the risks and threats challenging the security of the region.

The coordination and synergy of efforts in SEE is of paramount importance. A good example in this respect is the recently established SEDM initiative on CBSC (further details in the next chapter) and the Ohrid Regional Conference on Border Security and Management.

The recent elections in various countries in SEE (Serbia and Montenegro, BiH, Turkey), have demonstrated that the nationalism has not left the region. The nationalist parties won the bulk of the votes in Bosnia-Herzegovina, the Serbs boycotted the presidential elections (as a consequence of the suggestions made by Vojslav Seselj), in FYROM former UCK fighters are associated to the governance (SDSM-BDI coalition), the Justice and Development Party – AKP won the elections in Turkey etc. All these demonstrate that in SEE the west has not yet the same influence as it was the case in Romania, Slovakia and Hungary when/where the nationalist forces were winning popular support.

Chapter 2: South-Eastern Europe - between (sub)regional cooperation and integration into the Euro-Atlantic bodies and organizations

- **Overview**

The fall of the communist regimes all over Europe including Russia at the end of the '80s led to the emergence of a "security vacuum", especially in the Balkans. The social upheavals in the former communist republics freed these countries from the constraints of the soviet empire and opened a window of opportunity to assert their identity on the international scene according to the national interests. Unfortunately, short after the first euphoria moments the world witnessed their inability to overcome the ancient disputes and hatreds. Consequently, instead of following the mainstream in world politics (i.e. the increasing need for co-operation in order to deal effectively with the challenges posed by globalization, changes in the security paradigm and technological developments) the countries in SEE decided to follow an individual evolution path. The bitter experience of the Balkans conflicts after the break up of the former Yugoslavia, as well as the **conditionality** approach promoted by the international organizations (mainly EU, but also NATO and UN), "forced" these countries to think about the establishment of various co-operation schemes. And from the dormant Balkans spirit combined with the international pressure stemmed complex, complicated and often overlapping networks of regional co-operation initiatives.

While in Central Europe stricto sensu was created (in 1989) the so-called "Viszegrad Group" and a couple of years later the Central European Free Trade Area (CEFTA), it took much longer for the countries in SEE to realize the advantages of the regional co-operation. In my opinion, the beginning of a genuine regional co-operation process in SEE is dated back in 1993-1995 as a direct consequence of the Western involvement; the most important moments in this respect are as follows: European Councils in Copenhagen (June 1993 – accession criteria for EU) and Essen (December 1994 – Essen Strategy), North Atlantic Council in Bruxelles (January 1994 – launching of the PfP Programme) and the Study on NATO Enlargement (September 1995). The overall changes in SEE played also an important role in this respect (conclusion of the Dayton/Paris Agreements, direct involvement of the international community in the crisis management in SEE, advances on the human rights realm and democratization etc.).

---

[38] Ibid.

[39] A good example in this respect is related to the number of army and home defense forces. According to the Military Balance 2002-2003 the numbers are: Federation of BiH – 150,000; Republica Srpska – 80,000; Croatia – 140,000; FRY – 400,000.

The chapter paper will try to answer several questions or at least to envisage possible approaches in the context of regional co-operation: what are the most important co-operation schemes in SEE? Can we see any tangible results in this area? What role for the regional co-operation within NATO and EU enlargement processes? What are the most likely developments in the near future?

- **The relevance/importance of certain initiatives [not only in the field of (sub)regional cooperation] launched and supported by NATO and the EU: North Atlantic Cooperation Council (NACC) and Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC), Pact on Stability in Europe (1993), Europe Agreements, Partnership for Peace (PfP), South-East Cooperative Initiative (SECI), The Royaumont Process, SEDM Process**

The countries in the region are trying also to set up various politico-military and security initiatives. For sure such initiatives are not intended to cope with and to offer *hard* security guarantees. According to some authors "*for* **hard** *arms control (force reduction and ceilings) and for the development of joint crisis management forces* (…) *the existing groupings are both too small and too large*"[40]. However, in the meantime, there were established several sub-regional initiatives, in order to cope with the possible crisis in Middle Europe, in the field of peace keeping, humanitarian and rescue operations, environment protection etc. There are problems related to the financing of such initiatives and the structures they involve, but it seems that the countries in the region realized their importance and the process of building such groupings is on track.

The North Atlantic Cooperation Council (NACC)

The NACC was established in December 1991 in accordance with the decisions taken by NATO Heads of State and Government in London (November 1991). It brought together the member countries of NATO and, initially, nine Central and Eastern European countries (CEECs), in a new consultative forum. In March 1992, participation in the NACC was expanded to include all members of the Commonwealth of the Independent States and by June 1992, Georgia and Albania had also become members.

It was the deteriorating situation, continuing use of force and mounting loss of life in the territory of the former Yugoslavia which were the major causes of concern, marring the prospects for peaceful progress towards a new security environment in Europe. From the start of the crisis, the NAC and the NACC consulted and supported efforts undertaken in other for a to restore peace.

During the same period, discussion of measures designed to strengthen the role of the CSCE in promoting stability and democracy in Europe, including proposals outlined in the Rome declaration issued by the Alliance, culminated in the signature of the 1992 Helsinki Document ("The Challenge of Change") at the CSCE Summit Meeting in July 1992. The document described, inter alia, new initiatives for the creation of a CSCE forum for security cooperation and for CSCE peacekeeping activities, for which both the NAC and the NACC expressed full support.

The development of the NACC and the role of the EAPC that replaced it in 1997 are described in more detail in subsequent subsection.

The Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC)

(…)

Pact on Stability in Europe

This initiative emerged as a French proposal[41] submitted to the summit meeting of the European Council in Copenhagen, June 1993. The Inaugural Conference in May 1945 led to discussions at two regional tables, one for the Baltic States and the other for the Central European countries, whose results were summarized at the Concluding Conference on 20-21 March 1995, in Paris[42].

---

[40] Bailes, op.cit.

[41] Cf. Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (Ed.), *SIPRI Yearbook 1994*, pp. 247-249.

[42] Cf. Pact on Stability in Europe, adopted on 20 March 1995 by the 52 states of the OSCE at the Concluding Conference on the Stability Pact in Paris.

The aim of the Pact on Stability in Europe was to stabilize the CEECs which may eventually be associated to varying degrees with the EU. It was to deal with problems over borders and minorities in relations between the CEECs and in their relations with Russia. The document of the Inaugural Conference names nine "countries which seek admission"[43] (the three Baltic States, Bulgaria, the Czech republic, Hungary, Poland, Romania and Slovakia).

However, two important aspects were neglected (or carefully ignored), i.e. through this initiative the EU member states were declared stable (no hints to the situation in Northern Ireland, Corsica, Spain - ETA) and it was actually a sort of "self fulfilling prophecy", due to the fact that **it was no focus on the FRY** and aimed at bringing stability for already stable countries.

Among the most important achievement of the Pact on Stability it was the conclusion of the Slovak-Hungarian basic treaty. The Central European Table played any role in connection with the open issues in the Romanian-Hungarian basic treaty.

The Concluding Conference on the Pact on Stability in Europe adopted a document consisting of three parts: a political declaration on the principles of the good-neighborly cooperation; a list of about 130 agreements between the nine countries and members of the EU, as well as among the nine and between them and other neighboring states; an annex listing the assistance projects proposed by the nine at the regional tables and those financed by the EU as a part of PHARE[44]. The political declaration stresses "our efforts to ensure stability in Europe" but in its concrete portions concerns itself mainly with those countries "to which the European Council has offered the prospect of accession". The declaration mentions as a normative basis commitments undertaken in the UN, the OSCE and the Council of Euorpe, lists the most important relevant documents and once again cites the CSCE Decalogue of Helsinki 1975[45]. The Conference transferred responsibility for the further implementation of the Pact on Stability to the OSCE. After its transfer to the OSCE, the general feeling was that the steam seemed to have gone out of the Pact on Stability. This does not, however, exclude the possibility that the newly acquired instrument of regional negotiations might, if needed, be used again in the OSCE framework.

As a result of the imminent enlargement of the EU and NATO a number of the former target countries of the Pact on Stability will become a part of the Western 'interior' and thus no longer the object of stabilization efforts directed toward the outside ought to be concentrated on those countries which are not, or not yet, ready to become members of the EU or NATO. This refers, first and foremost, to an important part of the successor states of Yugoslavia. The main importance of stabilization, then, would be to avoid letting the borderlines which any incomplete integration leaves behind become lines of confrontation, but, rather, to bridge them in the most cooperative way possible. The Pact on Stability in Europe has provided important experience for this purpose.

Europe Agreements

(…)

PfP

(…)

South East European Co-operative Initiative (SECI)[46]

SECI is a sub-regional structure that aims at encouraging co-operation between the participating states and at facilitating their integration in the European structures. SECI has in view the co-ordination of regional development projects and provides a substantial presence of the private sector in the economy of the region countries and in environment-related issues, encouraging the transfer of know-how and the investments in the private sector.

This initiative was an American project, initiated and promoted by the ambassador Richard Schifter, former member of the National Security Council (NSC). It relies on the assumption that

---

[43] Inaugural Conference, 26/27 May 1994, cited above, pp. 10-18.

[44] Inaugural Conference, 26/27 May 1994, cited above, pp. 10-18

[45] Cf. ibid.

[46] Information provided by the '*OSCE and regional Cooperation Directorate*', Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Romania.

lasting stability in South-Eastern Europe, generally speaking, and in the former Yugoslav space, particularly, can not be achieved only through international presence and military means, but also requires enhanced co-operation among the states in the region, especially in the economic area. The other side of the coin is that it seems to aim at securing the American presence in the region, in the medium-long run, including the period after the retreat of the military forces in Bosnia-Herzegovina (no matters what could be the reasons).

The inaugural meeting took place in Geneva, on 3-6 December 1996. On 6 December the Declaration of Principles on co-operation within SECI was adopted. The signing states are as follows: Albania, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Greece, FYROM, Moldova, Romania, Turkey and Hungary. This initiative is supported by the European Commission, Economic Commission for Europe of the United Nations (ECE/UN), Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE), Organization for Black Sea Economic Co-operation (BSEC), International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD)/World Bank, EBRD, European Investment Bank (EIB). SECI co-operates with other sub-regional institutions, such as: CEI, The Royaumont Process, SEECP[47]. Dr. Erhard Busek, former Vice-chancellor of Austria, is the coordinator of SECI. The decision-making body is the Agenda Committee, made up from the national coordinators for SECI (which co-ordinate, on the national level, the participation in SECI projects).

On 26 May 1999, was signed an Agreement of co-operation on preventing and fighting cross-border criminality, including the Charter of a SECI Regional Center. Eventually, in February 2000, the SECI regional Center was set up in Bucharest, Romania.

In October 2001, in the wake of the terrorist attacks on 11th September 2001, Romania launched a new initiative to make use of the SECI Regional Center as a possible means for the fight against the international terrorism. This may be regarded a valuable regional contribution and a proof of the commitment of the countries in this area to the Euro-Atlantic values.

The Process of Stability and Good-neighborly Relations in SEE (the Royaumont Process)[48]

(…)

South-Eastern Europe Defense Ministerials Process (SEDM Process) and the Multinational Peace Force in South-Eastern Europe (MPFSEE)[49]

It is an initiative promoted in order to strengthen the regional co-operation and good understanding process aiming to secure the stability and security in South-Eastern Europe. The initiative started in the wake of the Ministers of Defense reunion in Tirana, March 1996. Afterwards it was decided to organize regular meetings in order to promote further co-operation and to decide upon further common developments.

Among the projects initiated in the framework of SEDM one should mention:

- The building of a Multinational Engineering Task Force aiming at participating in the process of reconstruction in Yugoslavia and taking part in the management of the humanitarian and infrastructure problems at a (sub) regional level.
- The building of a network for the information support of crisis management (Crisis Information Network - CIN).

Within the reunion of the Ministers of Defense in Sofia, 3 October 1997, it was agreed to be established a Multinational Peace Force for South-Eastern Europe (MPFSEE). Its main purpose is to promote politico-military co-operation and good neighborly relations in order to foster the peace and security in South-Eastern Europe. The countries participating in this initiative come from SEE. Croatia, Slovenia and US are participating in as observers. In 1998, in Skopje, it was signed 'The Agreement on the Establishment of the MPFSEE". On 1st May 2001, the South-Eastern Europe Brigade (SEEBRIG), created under the MPFSEE Agreement, was declared operational. Unfortunately, the full readiness of SEEBRIG is pending on the achievement of the Communication

---

[47] As one could easily notice the network of interlocking European organizations and institutions is quite a dense one and one will meet the same pattern studying the other sub-regional groupings.

[48] http: // www.royaumont.org

[49] Synthesis on the basis of the documents provided by the Ministry of National Defence of Romania.

and Information System (CIS) Project. Due to the generous contributions made by Norway (USD 578,000), US (USD 2,5 mil), Romania (USD 300,000) and Bulgaria (USD 150,000), the process of integrating different components of CIS Project has already started and it is expected to be finalized by the end of summer 2003.

The MPFSEE will be available, depending on its capabilities, for employment in conflict prevention and in other peace support operations (PSO), including peacekeeping, peace-making, peace-building and humanitarian operations, but peace enforcement operations. The Force will be available for possible employment in UN or OSCE-mandated, NATO or EU-led conflict prevention and other PSO. It could also participate in '*coalition of willing*' type international initiatives. The force will also operate '*within the spirit*' of PfP. It will be an 'ON-CALL' Land Force, supported by elements from other services, as and if necessary. During the last reunions at the level of ministers they "*reaffirmed their commitment to contribute to the security of the region through concrete efforts*". The Ministers expressed their commitment to contribute to NATO's efforts to enhance security and stability in SEE. They also expressed support for SEEBRIG deployment in PSO and humanitarian missions, upon NATO request[50]. Consequently, one could say that the countries in the region are trying to build their own multinational military assets and capabilities in order to cope with possible future [low intensity] crisis and to take part in the process of reconstruction in Yugoslavia.

- **Stability Pact for South-Eastern Europe (1999), South East Europe Initiative, Stabilization and Association Process**
  The Stability Pact for South-Eastern Europe (SP)[51]

The Stability Pact for South-Eastern Europe was adopted at a special meeting of Foreign Ministers, representatives of international organizations, institutions and regional initiatives, in Cologne on 3 June 1999. It was officially launched in Sarajevo, in July 1999. The Pact establishes a political commitment to a comprehensive coordinated and strategic approach to the region. It is a forum for its members to identify measures and projects that can contribute to the stability and development of the region. While building on existing structures, the overall strategy of the Pact is to:

- Secure lasting peace, prosperity and stability for South-Eastern Europe (SEE).
- Foster effective regional co-operation and good-neighborly relations though strict observance of the principles Helsinki Final Act (1975).
- Create vibrant market economies based on sound macro policies.
- Integrate the countries of SEE fully into the European and Atlantic co-operation structures, primarily the EU.

A South-Eastern Europe Regional Table has been set up as a supreme governing body of the Pact and is made up of representatives of governments, international organizations and institutions. This Table reviews progress and provides guidance for advancing Stability Pact objectives. It is organized through three groups, or '*Working Tables*', which build upon existing expertise, institutions and initiatives in the following areas:

- *Democratization and human rights* (Working Table I).
- *Economic reconstruction, development and co-operation* (Working Table II).
- *Security issues* (Working Table III).

A work plan for the Stability Pact has been drawn up to establish priorities and identify a limited number of key initiatives and projects to be addressed by each Working Table.

The SEE Regional Table is chaired by a Special Coordinator, Mr. Erhard Busek, who is responsible for preparing and following-up the decisions of the SEE Regional Table and the Working Tables (and side tables).

---

[50] '*Joint Statement South-Eastern Europe Defence Ministerial (SEDM)*', Antalya, Turkey, 20 December 2001.
[51] Synthesis on the basis of the documents provided by the Ministry of National Defence of Romania and the following electronic resources: http: // domino.kappa.ro/mae/politica.nsf/PactulEng?OpenView&Count=999; http: // www.seerecon.org/RegionalInitiatives/StabilityPact/sp.htm.

There are 29 participants in the Stability Pact in addition to 11 facilitators and 5 regional initiatives, supporting the aims of the Pact and taking part in its structures (for further information see annex 1). This is probably the most important contribution of the Pact, because it brings together, in a semi-institutionalized framework, different countries and organizations aiming to secure lasting peace, prosperity and stability for SEE.

Consequently, in one way or another, an important part of the sub-regional initiatives in Middle Europe are involved in the activities of the Stability Pact and they could eventually prove to be an appropriate means to deal with the issues of the region.

NATO's South East Europe Initiative (SEEI)

SEEI was launched at the Washington Summit in order to promote regional cooperation and longterm security and stability in the region.

Participants: countries in the region (Albania, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, FYROM, Romania and Slovenia), NATO countries (Greece, Hungary, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Turkey, UK and US), Partners (Austria, Switzerland).

The initiative was based on 4 pillars: a Consultative Forum on Security Issues in SEE; an open-ended Ad Hoc Working Group (AHWG) on Regional Cooperation in SEE under the auspices of the EAPC in Political Committee Session; PfP working tools; and targeted security cooperation programs for countries in the region.

In relation to SEEI, a SEE Security Coordination Group (SEEGROUP) has been established to coordinate regional projects. SEEGROUP is designed to act as a framework facilitating the implementation of different regional projects within SEEI and WT III/SP. This mechanism interacts with both NATO's Clearing House and the EAPC/PfP, aiming at coordinating the international assistance in the field of security.

SEEGROUP/SEEI were not directly involved in the elaboration of SEECAP but followed closely this process. There are several projects to be developed under the aegis of SEEI and coordinated by SEEGROUP, projects foreseen in the follow-up process of SEECAP:

- Establishment of a virtual 'Balkans Defense College'.
- Elaboration of a Comparative Study on National Security Strategies of the countries in the region (SEESTUDY).
- Creation of a database on security issues.
- Exchange of political-military and other early warning, conflict prevention and crisi management information (SECHANGE).
- Review of SEECAP.

SEEI acts as a cathaliyst between NATO and the WT III/SP. The unique situation, during the first semester of 2002, when Romania acted as Chair in Office of the Coordination Committee of the SEE Defense Ministers Process (SEDM-CC), Co-presidency of WT III/SP and Presidency in Office of SEEGROUP represented an important opportunity to assure the necessary synergy between these processes and to eliminate the unnecessary duplication. Besides, it represented a good example and an exercise of coordination of the various regional initiatives and the efforts of the IOs towards the reconstruction and stabilization of SEE.

Stabilisation and Association Process (SAP)

As a direct consequence of the progress achieved by the countries in the Balkans as well as in order to support their efforts on the way to the EU, on 24th November 2000, in Zagreb, EU organized a summit for the Western Balkans[52]. That represented also the moment for the official launching of the Stabilization and Association Process (SAP), involving five countries in the Western Balkans.

SAP is a tailored-made, progressive approach that takes into account the individual situation in each country. It includes:

- Stabilization and Association Agreements (SAA): a new kind of contractual relationship offered by the EU - in return for compliance with relevant conditions - to Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, FYROM and Union Serbia and Montenegro. This

---

[52] See note 1.

represents a new dimension in the relations with these five countries, offering for the first time a clear prospect of integration into the EU structures;
- Asymmetric trade liberalization;
- Economic and financial assistance;
- Assistance for democratization and civil society;
- Humanitarian aid for refugees, returnees and other persons of concern;
- Co-operation in justice and home affairs;
- Development of a political dialogue.

The ultimate goal of SAP is to bring peace, stability and economic development to the region and open the perspectives of integration into the EU.

- **A partial conclusion – between (sub)regional cooperation and Euro-Atlantic integration**

One has seen so far that countries in Middle Europe endeavor themselves to set up different sub-regional initiatives which cover aspects ranging from politico-economic sector, through cooperation in common interest areas, to politico-military and security ones (in the sense of confidence and security-building measures, *soft* armament control, cross-border co-operation and organized crime).

In short, the objectives of the sub-regional initiatives in Middle Europe, in the short and medium term, are as follows:

- To diminish and eliminate the conflictual potential of the area.
- To encourage and support the development of democratic political regimes and prosperous market economies in the states in Middle Europe.
- To strengthen both the sub-regional and cross-border co-operation and the economic and political flows among the countries in the region and between them and the EU.
- To improve the interoperability and the capacity of the countries in Middle Europe to cope with crisis situation and to develop their skills for common action.
- To create the necessary conditions for the fully flagged integration of the region in the political, economic and security Euro-Atlantic structures.

Unfortunately, the lack of resources and the weak implication of the West in order to help solving the problems in the former communist countries in Middle Europe precluded the envisaged initiatives to attain their primary objectives. One should also add that it was and still is difficult to create consensus among all the countries in the area, both due to their different level of economic development and to their internal problems. There are still lots of overlaps among the above-mentioned initiatives, not only at the structural level, but also as far as their objectives and action methods are concerned.

The Yugoslav crises showed that the strategy of the West towards Middle Europe [as a whole] was not the appropriate one and the countries need to be helped and involved in the Euro-Atlantic security and stability process as an integral and equal part. The latest initiatives in this respect, the Stability Pact for South-Eastern Europe and the Stabilization and Association Process, would have become the first sign of successful co-operation both among the countries in Middle Europe and between them and the West. Consequently, there is an increasing need for *"further development exports"* from the West.

The Euro-Atlantic security is indivisible and cannot be regionalized. The establishment and strengthening of effective regional conflict prevention and crisis management capabilities and mechanisms in SEE are required in order to complement the existing broader security arrangements,

In the long run, effective regional cooperation should override the costs of ineffective reactions to crises and the subsequent social and economic costs of reconstruction.

The regional cooperation should represent only a preliminary and necessary stage in the process of integrating the European and Euro-Atlantic Structures.

However, in order to provide security and stability in this area, one should always bear in mind the necessity to include Yugoslavia in all the sub-regional projects and to fully support the building of a strong civil society. Its accession to SP and the Council of Europe, as well as its potential

membership within NATO/PfP, open the way for the full reintegration in the region and Europe. Given its historical ties as well as the experience gained within the transition process to a functional market economy, rule of law, respect for and protection of minorities, Romania can help FRY on its way to the reunited Europe. At the same time, it is worth noting that the international community should find as soon as possible a solution concerning the final status of Kosovo.

The only possible solution for the complex system of equations in the region could be found through the strengthening of co-operation and further Western involvement and expertise.

The resolution of the regional issues requires a regional approach, but the onus is on the countries concerned. Anything can substitute the political will to co-operate of the SEE states.

The integration of the countries in SEE into NATO and their accession to the EU is well on track. The Western Balkans states were given a clear signal during the last General Affairs and External Relations Council on the EU (Brussels, 27-28 January 2003) that the necessary political reforms need to be made before they have any prospects for EU membership: "(…) doors are open, but there is no free access and free tickets". It is against this background that we deem necessary the re-evaluation of the regional co-operation in SEE. This should not mean to decrease the level of involvement in such regional schemes, but to try to integrate them into the regional approach promoted by the most important international organisations. And the EU is instrumental for achieving the final objective of regional co-operation, i.e. reintegration into Europe. A Europe "whole and free". That is why we consider the regional co-operation in SEE as and intermarry but necessary step in achieving the "strategic aim of finalising Europe' s reconstruction, after a century of ideological division, dictatorship and war".

Comparing 1989 – annus mirabilis with 1999 – annus horribilis, Pierre HASSNER tried to warn the world: co-operation and communication among partners, relying on mutual trust and respect, may prevent the emergence of conflictual situations whose consequences are hard to predict and manage.

Motto for Chapter 3:
"In order for the evil to triumph it is enough for the good people to do nothing".
Edmund Burke

Chapter 3: NATO and the EU in the Balkans
- **The Balkans or the "powder keg" of Europe – historical overview**

The Balkans have been perceived the source of various cultural and ideological, inter-ethnic and religious conflicts that degenerated in bloody wars. In 1914, the International Commission on the Balkans stated that the Ottoman Empire acted as a "vast refrigerator" preserving the Balkan nationalism the implication being that the decay of Ottoman rule helped bring the dormant nationalisms back to life.

After the end of WW II, as a consequence of the "ethnical engineering" of the Machiavelic Tito, Yugoslavia was divided in several republics (six) in relation to the same number of "nations". Moreover, the Yugoslav constitution in 1974, was amended, providing for a large autonomy for the provinces of Kosovo and Voivodina (with a very important Albanian and Magyar minority respectively). After the defection of Yugoslavia from the communist camp, in 1948, Yugoslavia had a privileged status in relation to the West. Unfortunately, it was impossible for it to exploit this situation after 1989.

1989 and the fall of the communist regimes led to the dismantling of the artificial links between Tito's republics. The "snow ball effect" found its vivid expression in the area, the Balkans being again under "blood and ashes". The emergence of the ethnic and religious wars in almost all the former Yugoslav republics forced the international community to declare and implement economic and military embargoes on Yugoslavia. And because these efforts were not good enough there were also sent peace keeping then implementation and stabilization or monitoring forces, under UN or OSCE mandate.

The evil is there and the wounds are deep and still painful. It takes time to learn again how to live together. Up to that moment it will be more than necessary to benefit from the supervision and support of the international community, and especially the Western support for development.

As we already seen in the previous chapter, after a hesitant start, the West started to launch or support various initiatives aiming to the democratization, stabilization and development of this area.

Unfortunately, up to 1994, when the Union launched its Essen strategy promoting regional cooperation, the EU did not have a coherent and successful approach towards the Balkans. NATO, in turn, had mostly a technical approach to the region, its presence being really felt in 1995 when it brought a decisive contribution in bringing the warring parties to the negotiations table and, especially, through IFOR, SFOR and KFOR.

But another crisis was needed, i.e. Kosovo moment, to establish the SP aiming to bring peace, stability and prosperity in the region as well as to coordinate the efforts in the field of regional cooperation and those of the international community, with a view to the eventual integration of the countries in the area into the political-economic and security structures having a European and Euro-Atlantic vocation. Is this a realistic approach? Will it be ever possible to give up the well-known "Balkanization" term?

- **NATO and the EU – stances and actions vis-à-vis the former Yugoslavia**

    EU in the Balkans (1990-2003)

As already mentioned, the initial phase of the Balkan crisis was characterized by the lack of a coherent approach of the international community, in general, and the EU , in particular, towards this area. Facing the explosion of independence declarations from the part of the Yugoslav republics, the EU showed its inability to act as a distinct and important actor of the international system. The external immaturity of the EU was very clear when, in December 1991, Germany recognized unilaterally Slovenia and Croatia, in spite of the reluctance of the Union as a whole. This forced the Union to accept the de facto situation in January 1992. Maybe the lesson was learned, in April 1992, the European Community (still, by that time) recognizing the independence of BiH. Maybe these events led or at least gave a new impetus to the definition and implementation of a Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP), as materialized in the Treaty of Maastrischt.

In late August 1991, EC foreign ministers established a Conference on former Yugoslavia. One year later, at the London Conference, it was established an International Conference on the former Yugoslavia (ICFY). Once the war in BiH emerged the international community proved unable to manage the situation. The commercial, oil and air embargoes, as well as the naval blockade against Yugoslavia (made of Serbia and Montenegro) did not defuse the crisis. The peace plans of the international mediators were rejected one by one.

The moment June 1993, with the launching of the Copenhagen criteria for EU membership, did not mean also a change of attitude for the Union – the Balkans were not on the agenda and the need for a strategy addressing the grassroots of the conflicts in the region was further ignored.

1994 represents the moment of launching the Stability Pact on Europe (Balladur Pact), but the initiative aimed to stabilize regions that already got a certain level of stability, while the "grand malade" of Europe, i.e. the Balkans, was again neglected. However, some countries take action take action and the Contact Group was established. At Essen European Council, in December 1994, the Union put the onus on regional cooperation, but no reference to the Balkans was made.

1995 represented a turning point for the evolution of the crisis in the Balkans. NATO launched a series of air strikes in retaliation for the attacks of the Serb forces against the "safe heavens". The Contact Group prepared a new peace plan to be negotiated and endorsed in… Dayton/USA by the presidents Izetbegovic (BiH), Tudjman (Croatia) and Milosevic (FRY). One more time it was clearly shown that a US intervention was needed in order to solve .a crisis which would have been solved by Europeans. One more time it was demonstrated that CFSP was still "paper work" and the EU was not mature enough to support a coherent approach on the world stage. By signing the final agreement in Paris the Europeans were also involved/associated and saved somehow their face, but

it is worth mentioning the need for financing the whole peace process as a possible explanation for this approach. The Bosnian territory was divided in to entities. NATO forces were deployed (IFOR). The Balkans reconstruction was about to start.

The international community, via the EU, started to pump up important fund to the area. Unfortunately, it seems that a fundamental aspect was neglected, i.e. the inexistence of functional political-administrative structures, able to design plans and to implement policies. The Balkans became a black whole for the Western funds. Far from stabilizing the region it increased the need to successively prolong the mandates of the stabilization forces. They are still there!

1997 proved to be a extremely difficult year, this time for Albania. The failure of the "pyramidal financial systems" nurtured violent manifestations in Tirana; the Albanian population plundered the ammunition storages (in a country prepared for a "total war"). WEU, the operational arm of the Union in terms of crisis management could not act as a whole. The "coalition of the willing" was established and ALBA operation was launched; the situation improved. Again the EU was not up to the challenge.

Ten years after the breakout of the Balkans wars the Union felt the need for a coherent approach to the Balkans. At the EU summit in Cologne (June 1999), the SP was officially launched. After a promising start (at least on paper!) SP proved not to be a real "success story", although it helped improving the relations among the countries in the region and led to the launching of some projects.

At the Zagreb summit (November 2000), the Union officially launched the Stabilization and Association Process (SAP). For the first time it was stated that the EU strategy was to bring the countries in the region ever closer to the prospect of European integration.

Meanwhile, in the beginning on 2001, two more crisis shacked the weak foundations in the Balkans: the conflict in Southern Serbia and the almost civil war in FYROM. The joint efforts of the EU, NATO and OSCE helped in defusing the crisis and preventing the civil war. It was a fist join t successful attempt and an example for the future.

The recently launched "Thessaloniki agenda for the Western Balkans" clearly shows the EU support for the preparation of these countries for their integration into the European structures.

Here there is a synthesis of the EU involvement in the Balkans:
- Financial contributions

Between 1991-1999, the EU contributed with more than Euro 17 billion in the field of development and humanitarian aid in SEE. Besides, Romania and Bulgaria receive in the process of negotiations around Euro 7 billion for the period 2000-2006.

80% of the trade exports from these countries enter tax free in the EU.

In December 200 the Council adopted a regulation providing for assistance to the countries in the Western Balkans. Within the Community Assistance for Reconstruction, Development and Stabilization (CARDS) programme, the Union will further support the return and reintegration of refugees and IDPs as well as the development of the region. For the implementation of CARDS the Union allotted fund amounting to Euro 4,5 billion for the period 2000-2006 (with Euro 200 additional million a year, as decided recently in Thessalonik).

- Reconstruction in FRY

Beyond the quick initial aid for FRY, the Union is from far the most important donor in Kosovo (around Euro 3,1 billion between 199-2000)

- Troops contributions

In military terms, the EU is also paying the lion's share:
- Around 65% of the almost 40,000 troops in KFOR come from EU countries (the percentage is up to 75 % whether one takes into account the European states contributions);
- In SFOR about 60% of the almost 19,000 troops come from EU member states.

Between 1999-2001, the EU contributed with Euro 4,9 billion to the military and peace keeping efforts in Kosovo, which raises its contribution in this province to around Euro 8 billion.

NATO in the Balkans (1990-2003)

The political base for the engagement of the Alliance in the former Yugoslavia was defined by the Final Communique of the NAC ministerial meeting in Oslo, June 1992. NATO expressed its availability to support, on a case-by-case basis and according to the internal procedures, peacekeeping activities under the responsibility of C(O)SCE. Later on that year, in December, NATO expressed its support for PKO under the authority of the UNSC. Within the new Strategic Concept adopted in Washington (April 1999), among the fundamental missions of the Alliance is also the one related to crisis management "to be ready, on a case-by-case basis and by consensus, in accordance with article 7 of the Washington Treaty, to contribute effectively to the prevention of conflicts and to get involved actively in crisis management, including crisis response operations".

Between 1992 and 1995 the Alliance took several decisions leading to its deep involvement in the settlement of the crisis in the Balkans. Beyond the monitoring missions and enforcement of the embargoes, the Alliance supported UNPROFOR and authorized air strikes in order to relieve Sarajevo and other UNPAs. Its decisive actions led to the signature of the Dayton/Paris Agreement in November/December 1995.

NATO has led, starting with December 1995, the following operations in the Balkans: Implementation Force (IFOR), Stabilization Force (SFOR I and II), Kosovo Force (KFOR), Task Force Harvest, Task Force Fox, Allied Harmony.

From a significant and strong force as IFOR (counting in the initial phase about 60,000 troops) to the "classical" Task Force Harvest (involving approximately 3,500 troops) NATO assumed great responsibility and perform very well in terms of stabilizing the troubled area of the Balkans.

NATO-led forces acted not only as stabilization forces but they also supported the reconstruction and nation-building processes in the countries of concern.

In time, due to the stabilization of the region or to the shift in security risks from military to "soft security" ones (related especially to organized crime, drugs trafficking, terrorism etc.), emerged a need for a strategic military review (SMR) both in terms of forces deployed (number, type) but also concerning the operations area and the missions/tasks to be carried out. This resulted in what one called a regional approach. The idea seems to be a significant reduction of the level of forces in both SFOR and KFOR. The Afghanistan operations and the Iraqi crisis postponed this process. Moreover, it seems that there are proponents for the replacement of some military forces by civil police/gendarmerie ones, more suited for the new risks above-mentioned.

The presence of the NATO-led troops in both Kosovo and BiH has played an important role in deterring the emergence of another crisis. However, it is hard to assess the moment when the peaceful coexistence of the ethnical groups no more requires such an international military presence.

(…)

After a period of stability, 2001 brought new crisis in Southern Serbia and FYROM. The Liberation Army of Presevo, Medvedja and Bujanovac (UCPMB) and the National Liberation Army (NLA), both made up of ethnic Albanians, provoked many troubles in the above-mentioned countries. Under NATO supervision, with EU involvement, and after months of negotiations, the UCPMB and the Serbian government signed a demilitarization agreement in May 2001. After intense weeks of negotiations, drawing also some lessons from the Southern Serbia crisis, the EU/US-brokered Framework Agreement of Ohrid was signed in August 2001 and opened the way for the launching of the NATO-led Task Force Harvest, dedicated to weapons collection. Actually, operations "Essential Harvest', "Amber Fox" and "Allied Harmony" were not peace keeping missions, but basically conflict prevention in the field of confidence-building. The special nature of these missions, which cannot be compared with the missions in Kosovo and Bosnia and Herzegovina, the aim in FYROM was not to end a fully ranging civil war by the deployment of peace forces, but to prevent the outbreak of such a war.

- **Bosnia and Herzegovina – the way from war to peace**

    (…)

- **Kosovo – an introduction**

    (…)

- **The crisis in FYROM - towards a new Kosovo?**

When fighting broke out in the Tetovo region of FYROM in February 2001, the Macedonian government appeared to be caught by surprise. Initially, it was unclear what the objectives of the attacks by NLA were, but eventually their demands came to echo those of Albanian politicians – insisting that Albanian become an official state language and that Albanians gain equal status with Macedonians. It might say that NLA thus effectively hijacked the political programme of the Albanian parties in Macedonia[53].

From the beginning of the crisis, the NATO liaison Office in Skopje was involved in trying to defuse it, liaising with the government and the other international organizations represented in the country. The international community embarked on a concerted effort to find a political solution, in cooperation with the Skpje government. As the crisis escalated, it became obvious that Skopje could not resolve it on its own. NATO received a request from president Trajkovki for help with implementing a plan for defusing the crisis, notably to assist with the disarming of the armed groups. NAC, following the military advice, stressed that any NATO operation NATO operation would have to be limited in scope, size and time. After weeks of negotiations the EU/US-brokered Framework Agreement was signed on 13 August 201, in the lake resort of Ohrid. NATO's weapons-collection plan, Operation Essential Harvest, could begin. As a follow-on to Essential Harvest, operation Amber Fox was established, superseded by Allied Harmony.

The general elections held in mid-September 2002 in FYROM produced a landslide victory for the opposition coalition (SDSM-LDP and DUI), a triumph, above all, "for the citizens of FYROM who have opted peacefully for change"[54].

Analyzing the situation in FYROM in November 2002, the International Crisis Group concluded that "a military presence such as NATO's TFF currently provides is still indispensable"[55].

In March 2003, after the conclusion of NATO-EU agreements (in terms of EU access to NATO means and assets, in accordance with Berlin Plus principles, as well as the security agreement), the EU launched its first military operation ever, by taking over from NATO the Allied-Harmony operation in FYROM, with a six months mandate.

Here there are some concrete recommendations aiming to improve the situation in FYROM:

- For the international community: continue provide FYROM interim security assistance, in particular by maintaining a small military force in the country, until it can assume full and effective control and ensure law and order throughout its territory;
- For NATO: provide further support for the EU military operation;
- For the EU: ensure that effective Military Liaison Teams continue to be backed up by extraction forces; increase the number of EUMM monitors deployed along FYROM's borders, further the work jointly started with NATO in the field of confidence-building (the recent Ohrid Regional Conference on Border Security and Management – Ohrid, 22-23 May 2003, is a good example in this respect.).

The 15 September 2002 elections have illustrated the gradual return to normal political life. The creation of a multi-ethnic coalition government is seen as a very positive indication of a willingness

---

[53] Engstrom, J., *Multi-ethnicity or Bi-nationalism? The Framework Agreement and the Future of the Macedonian state*, London School of Economics and Political Science, UK, Issues 1/2002.

[54] Carp, M. *Back from the brink*, NATO Review, Fall 2002 (electronic version available at http://www.nato.int).

[55] ICG, *Moving Macedonia towards self-sufficiency: a new security approach for NATO and the EU*, Balkans Report no. 135, Skopje/Brussels, 15 November 2002

to cooperate and compromise on later. "It will be crucial that all signatories of the Framework Agreement, including the opposition parties, continue on this path until its full implementation"[56].

- **The Balkans – partial conclusions; the way ahead**

What is the meaning of the figures, data and information presented within the previous sections?

Although the financial efforts made by the Union in the process of stabilizing the Balkans have been impressive, the EU has not got yet a reliable political-military structure in order to manage effectively crisis situations. That is why, the decision of the Union to have an autonomous decision capability, backed up by military capabilities for action in the field of the Petersberg tasks (as defined in the Amsterdam Treaty) has to be further supported. These efforts made by the Union under the European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP), launched at the European Council in Cologne (in parallel to the end of the Kosovo crisis!?) try to strengthen the European pillar of the Alliance and to help asserting the EU on the international scene. While the latter objective seems to be more or less tangible, the former is a bit tricky in the light of the Iraqi crisis and the stances adopted by some prominent EU member states.

The crisis in the Balkans showed the inability of the international community (and that of the EU, in particular) to act in relation to such an event, while NATO proved to be the best suited organization in this respect. At the same time it is worth noting that while the EU is paying the lion's share in terms of economic reconstruction of the region, it seems that the decision-making capacity rests further with the US and NATO. From this very standpoint, the EU has a lot to learn and act, the establishment of the RRF having an important role to play in balancing this situation.

The Kosovo crisis gave a decisive impetus both to the definition and implementation of a genuine ESDP, as well as to the drafting of a coherent EU strategy to the Balkans.

At the beginning of the Balkans crisis there were several factors that influenced decisively their evolution:

- The deep transformations at the level of the international system (fall of the communist regimes, end of the Cold War and the bipolarity);
- Lack of a clear and coherent strategy of the international community towards the new situation (maybe as a consequence of the unwillingness of its components to get rid of the "peace dividends" expected so long);
- Emergence and persistence of some divergences at the EU level (position of Germany vis-à-vis Slovenia and Croatia, e.g.). This process may be coupled with the efforts of the European Communities attempting to become the EU and the various steps towards a genuine CFSP;
- Transformation of the Alliance, suddenly deprived of its traditional enemy, and the emergence of new challenges stemming from the shift in the security paradigm;
- US reluctance towards an early involvement in the region, motivated somehow by the Gulf war;
- The inability of the former soviet satellites to cooperate in their race towards the West;
- The incapacity of the FRY leaders to adapt to the new post Cold War situation and their appeal to nationalism.

The effective management and settlement of a crisis situation depends upon the following factors[57]: there is a need for early involvement of the international community should a crisis arise; there should be a leader assuming responsibility and coordinating the efforts in order to avoid their ineffective duplication; politics back up military, force backs up diplomacy; there is a need for sound agreements and credible capabilities in order to implement them; enforcing the decisions adopted require also to pay attention and solve the possible emerging contradictions between the following principles: territorial integrity, sovereignty, self-determination, human rights.

---

[56] Commission of the EC, *REPORT FROM THE COMMISSION. The SAP for SEE. Second Annual Report*, Brussels, 26 March 2003, p. 31.
[57] Cf. ambassador OKUN, quoted in note 2.

The role played by NATO and the EU in defusing conflict in Southern Serbia and preventing civil war in FYROM may be regarded as milestones in the evolution of the relations between and enlarged NATO and an EU encompassing almost whole Europe (including the Balkans).

Before talking about "local and regional ownership" it is necessary for the West to further export to its frontiers, which will become sooner or later its Easters frontiers, the most wanted and suitable commodity on the market, i.e. development. Development facilitating the modernization of the societies at large.

What are the perspectives for NATO and the EU involvement in the Balkans, in terms of future prospects of the region? The most probable scenarios in this respect (to be dealt with within the last chapter) may be summarized under the following headings:

- Achieving the ultimate goal of Euro-Atlantic and European integration (or in a reverse order?)
- Keeping the status quo
- Return to the spheres of influence
- Withdrawal of the West/international community – return to chaos?

- **Possible final conclusions**

12 years after the outbreak of the Balkans conflicts, one may say that the results of NATO and EU involvement in the Balkans are mixed:

- There are a lot of initiatives launched by but mostly in support of the countries in the region, focusing on enhancing and strengthening regional cooperation, good neighborly relations, CSBM, coordination of the international community efforts towards stabilizing the region. The results achieved so far are under their potential;
- NATO was involved especially in the military management of crisis in the Balkans. It is worth mentioning also that the post-conflict strains are especially on the EU member states shoulders, paying the lion's share in this respect. At the same time, NATO proved to be the only organization (so far) able to act in need (and the US was deeply involved in the initial stages). The future presence of NATO will have, for sure, a psychological as well as a deterring effect;
- The EU contribution in the region may be qualified as very important in financial terms (more than Euro 17 billion for the stabilization of SEE, out of which Euro 4.5 billion only for BiH) but also through the launching of the SP and especially the SAP. However, the needs are exceeding by far the aid received, and a possible cut in funds will lead to collapse.

Which was the main conclusion after the outbreak and the eventual successful management of the Balkans crisis? Any crisis management/crisis response operation may is unlikely to become effective unless the following criteria are fulfilled simultaneously: existence of the necessary political will; existence of the concurrent civil and especially military assets and capabilities allowing for a timely and effective intervention on the spot; existence of common procedures and mechanisms (Standing Operating Procedures - SOP). The absence of any of these criteria may hamper the effectiveness of any CM/CRO. Up to now the EU lacked the necessary political will (with few exceptions at the outbreak of the Yugoslav crisis and nowadays through the launching of the EUPM and CONCORDIA as well as the prospects of taking over SFOR), but it showed to be resolved in developing both common procedures and capabilities (see the work of the EU Military Staff, e.g. and the establishment of the RRF). NATO has proved to be, so far, the only credible organization fulfilling the three above-mentioned criteria. The 9/11 tragic events raised some question marks on the political will of the allies to stay longer in the Balkans. Fortunately, in the light of the latest declarations of NATO officials it seems that the Alliance is further committed to support the region on its efforts to join the Euro-Atlantic structures. The same reasoning is valid for the EU.

In the run up to the Thessaloniki summit, the Greek Presidency of the EU prepared a document outlining the Union's priorities for the Western Balkans. While supporting the visibility and credibility of the European prospect, the document also mentions that progress of individual countries will be the results of their own efforts and performance. The launching of the "Balkans European Integration Process" will lead to the establishment of a new political forum that will increase the visibility of SAP and complement it politically by giving a clear public signal of the privileged relationship between SAP countries and the EU, and by promoting regional political cooperation.

In Prague the Alliance reaffirmed its support for the territorial integrity and sovereignty of all countries in this "strategically important region" as well the intention to further work with its partners in SFOR and KFOR and various international organizations to help "build a peaceful, stable and democratic SEE". At the same time, NATO expressed its expectations from the countries concerned: to continue to build enduring multi-ethnic democracies, root out organized crime and corruption; to cooperate regionally; and comply fully with international obligations, including by bringing to justice in the Hague all ICTY indictees. The reform progress that these countries make will determine the pace of their integration into Euro-Atlantic structures. Later on, during the meeting of the NATO foreign ministers in Madrid (June 2003), the Alliance confirmed its further presence in the region and assistance to the countries in SEE. Moreover, it was stated that NATO would play an essential role for the regional security.

While the Berlin Plus and the NATO–EU Agreement on Security of Information are hailed by both organizations and a NATO-EU Capability Group was established, it seems that the relations between the two organizations are staggering. The difficulties in defining a common approach in the field of security and stability in the Western Balkans, coordinating the civil emergency planning activities and the corroborating their efforts in the fight against terrorism seem to support the above-statement. Unfortunately, this is not the best news for the countries in SEE, which need each and every possible support.

Probably, in order to further coordinate their efforts in relation to the region, the EU and NATO will have to agree on a definition of the "responsibilities sharing and role specializations". For example, the Alliance may further be in charge for the overall security of the region, providing the security "umbrella" in this respect, while the EU would continue to further support the reconstruction efforts, acquiring progressively responsibilities in the military crisis management/post-conflict (CONCORDIA, SFOR type, e.g.). At least for the short run, it seems that the EU still needs NATO assets and capabilities in order to conduct CM/CRO.

Anyway, the prospects of European and Euro-Atlantic integration still offer these two organizations some leverage in order to supervise the reform and restructuring processes in the region. The question is: for how long?

- **Annex to Chapter 3 - The break up of Yugoslavia: a chronology of events (1918-2003)**

In December 1918, in the aftermath of the WW I, the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes was formed. It consisted of Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, Dalmatia, Montenegro, Serbia and Slovenia.

In 1929 the country was renamed by King Alexander Yugoslavia (the so-called **First Yugoslavia**).

WW II found Yugoslavia unprepared for war. Germany occupied it and the Yugoslavs organized themselves in order to fight against the aggressors. The Partisans led by Tito got the support from the West and eventually the German occupation ended.

In November 1945 Yugoslavia became a republic called the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia (The **Second Yugoslavia**). Only the Communist party was permitted. The country was organized in six republics and in 1974 the provinces of Kosovo and Voivodina were granted a great degree of autonomy.

Yugoslavia was torn apart by a bloody civil war during 1991, after a year of escalating violence between the country's two largest nationality groups, Serbs and Croats. Animosity among the

republics grew worse in 1991 when Slovenia and Croatia moved towards secession. Voters in these republics favored a loose confederation of independent place, while the leaders in Serbia wanted to maintain centralized federal control.

In June 1991, Slovenia and Croatia declared themselves independent. Serbian leaders ordered federal troops to preserve central control over the two breakaway republics. Slovenia put up strong resistance. After less than two weeks a truce was reached. The federal army switched to Croatia. Full-scale warfare raged through the summer and fall in Eastern Croatia. In August 1991 the leaders of the European Communities launched a peace conference. The UN also sought to settle the crisis but refused to send a peacekeeping force until fighting had stopped. In December, both Macedonia and Bosnia and Herzegovina formally announced they would seek independence.

In January 1992 the UN negotiator Cyrus Vance announced that both sides had accepted a UN PK plan providing *inter alia* for the creation of certain UN Protected Areas (UNPAs). Peacekeepers (UNPROFOR) became to deploy in late February 1992. Both Slovenia and Croatia were recognized by the EC in January (Germany did it already in December 1991).

Macedonia began to seek its independence in September 1991 and in March 1992 Bosnia declared its independence.

In April 1992 Serbia and Montenegro proclaimed the establishment of a new country under the name of Yugoslavia (The **Third Yugoslavia**). UNSC imposed trade and oil embargoes, followed by a naval blockade.

In 1993 the Third Yugoslavia was characterized by economic breakdown and political crisis for Milosevic.

In 1994 the war in Bosnia-Herzegovina continued.

The summer of 1995 brought the first attacks of NATO against Serb positions in Bosnia. This helped the settlement of the war. In November 1995, in US, the presidents of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia and Yugoslavia sat down together at the peace table and signed the Dayton Agreement providing for the division of Bosnia-Herzegovina into a Bosnian-Croat federation and a Serb republic. The peace was to be enforced by 60,000 NATO-led troops.

In 1996 the diplomatic relations of Yugoslavia with the other states successors of the former Yugoslavia were established.

In 1997, a group known as the Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA) stepped up its attacks on Serbian security forces in Kosovo.

Violence and ethnic cleansing erupted in Kosovo in 1998. This province, where 90 percent of the 2.2 million people were ethnic Albanians, enjoyed limited autonomy until 1990. The Yugoslav Armed Forces (YPA) began oppressive actions against the Albanian population. Hundreds of thousands of Albanians left the country.

In March 1999, NATO began bombing raids against Serbian targets. Collateral damages also happened. By June 1999 the Yugoslav resistance shacked deeply. Milosevic regime capitulated and Kosovo became another protectorate under UNMIK and KFOR rule.

After a short period of stability in 2000, the year 2001 brought new crisis in Southern Serbia and FYROM. The Liberation Army of Presevo, Medvedja and Bujanovac (UCPMB) and the National Liberation Army (NLA), both made up of ethnic Albanians, provoked many troubles in the above-mentioned countries. The UCPMB and the Serbian government signed a demilitarization agreement in May 2001. After intense weeks of negotiations, the EU/US-brokered Framework Agreement of Ohrid was signed in August 2001.

In March 2002, the EU brokered an agreement providing for the establishment of a new state "Union Serbia and Montenegro" to replace the Third Yugoslavia. In February 2003 the Parliament of FRY adopted a Constitutional Charter ending the ephemeral existence of FRY.

In March 2003 the Serbian PM Zoran Djindjic was assassinated underlying the fragility of the stabilization process in the Balkans.

Notwithstanding, the region seems to be back from the brink.

Motto for Chapter 4:
"If we can do this here, and if can say to the people of the world, whether you live in Africa, or Central Europe, or any other place, if somebody comes after innocent civilians and tries to kill them en masse because of their race, their ethnic background or their religion, and it's within our power to stop it, we will stop it".
William Clinton, Former US President[58]

Chapter 4: "*Hard security*" versus "*soft security*", "*hard power*" versus "*soft power*" in South-Eastern Europe - Kosovo, battle field and anteroom for the "*new world order*"? A Romanian perspective

- **Origins of the conflicts in the province**

The origins of the crisis have to be understood in terms of a new wave of nationalism that led to the rise of Milosevic and the official adoption of an extreme Serbian nationalist agenda. The revocation of Kosovo's autonomy in 1989 was followed by a Belgrade policy aimed at changing the ethnic composition of Kosovo.

From early 1990s onwards, governments and international institutions were aware of the impending conflict in Kosovo. Up to 1997, the non-violent resistance movement in Kosovo as well as some diplomatic initiatives managed to prevent large-scale violence. The decision to exclude Kosovo from the Dayton negotiations, and the lack of results achieved by the strategy of non-violence, led many Kosovar Albanians to conclude that violence was the only way to attract international attention. It was during this period that the KLA groups first made their appearance.

The armed conflict between the KLA and YPA/FRY lasted from February 1998 to June 1999 although it "escalated after March 1999 when NATO air campaign supervened"[59]. The findings of the International Independent Commission on Kosovo were daunting: between the start of NATO campaign and its end, the number of killings was estimated in the neighborhood of 10,000, with the vast majority of the victims being Kosovar Albanians killed by FRY forces. Approximately 863,ooo civilians sought or were forced into refuge outside Kosovo and an additional 590,000 were internally displaced. The same body stated that "the NATO air campaign did not provoked the attacks on the civilian Kosovar population but the bombing created an environment that made such an operation feasible"[60].

In the beginning of February 1999, the secretary of state Madeleine Albright delivered a lecture and statement of US policy, outlining the "lessons of Bosnia"[61]: "Kosovo is not Bosnia because we have learned the lessons of Bosnia – and we are determined to apply them here and now. We know (…) that the only reward for tolerating atrocities is more of the same. We know that the longer we delay in exercising our leadership, the dearer it will eventually be – in dollars lost, in lost of credibility and in human lives (…) Finally, we learned in Bosnia, and we have seen in Kosovo, that President Milosevic understands only the language of force. Nothing less than strong engagement from NATO will focus the attention of both sides; and nothing less than firm American leadership will ensure decisive action". The "war" was looming.

In terms of diplomatic efforts undertaken, some key conclusions are worth emphasizing:
- Multiple and divergent agendas and expectations and mixed signals from the international community impeded effective diplomacy;
- The international community's experience with Milosevic as not amendable to usual negotiations created a dilemma. The only language of diplomacy believed open to negotiators was that of coercion and threat.

---

[58] *Remarks by the President to KFOR Troops*, Skopje, Office of the Press Secretary, The White House, 22 June 1999.
[59] The Independent International Commission on Kosovo, *THE KOSOVO REPORT. Conflict. International response. Lessons learned*, Oxford University Press, UK, 2000.
[60] Ibid.
[61] US Department of State, Office of the Spokesman, "Remarks by Secretary of State M. Albrightat US Institute of Peace", 4 February 1999. See also http://www.usip.org/oc/events/Albright_020499.html.

- It is impossible to conclude that in spite of the existent weaknesses a diplomatic solution could have ended the international struggle over the future of Kosovo. The minimal goals of the Kosovar Albanians and of Belgrade were (and still seem to be) irreconcilable.
- Russia's contribution to the process was ambiguous. Its particular relationship with Serbia enabled crucial diplomatic steps, but its rigid commitment to veto any enforcement action was the major factor forcing NATO into action without mandate.

The Commission on Kosovo concluded that the "NATO military intervention was illegal but legitimate"[62]. It was illegal because it did not receive prior approval from the UNSC. However, it was justified because all diplomatic avenues had been exhausted and because the intervention has the effect of liberating the majority population of Kosovo from a long period of oppression under Serbian rule. NATO mistake was to believe that a relatively short bombing campaign would persuade Milosevic to sign the Rambouillet agreement. The conclusion was that "NATO war was neither a success nor a failure"[63]. It forced the Serbian government to withdraw its army and police from Kosovo and to sign an agreement on the aborted Rambouillet accord. It stopped the systematic oppression of the Kosovar Albanians. However, it failed to achieve its avowed aim of preventing massive ethnic cleansing. Milosevic remained in power. The Serbian people were the main losers. Kosovo was lost.

Talking about the Kosovo crisis, the Secretary General of NATO, Lord Robertson, stated that under a number of factors (such as the Yugoslav government's non-compliance with earlier UNSC resolutions, the warnings from the UNSG about the dangers of a humanitarian disaster in Kosovo, the unlikelihood that a further UNSC resolution would be passed in the near future, the threat to peace and security in the region) the Council agreed that a "sufficient legal basis existed for the Alliance to threaten and, if necessary, use force against the FRY"[64].

In terms of response to humanitarian crisis, both governmental and non-governmental agencies were unprepared for the scale of the refugee crises in the neighboring states of Albania and FYROM.

UNSC Resolution 1244 authorized the deployment of military forces, KFOR, to Kosovo, and the establishment of a civilian administration, UNMIK.

The conflict in Kosovo cannot be understood except in the broader regional context. It produced shock waves affecting neighboring countries as a result of the influx of refugees, the economic damage caused by disruptions to trade and production and the growth of criminality, as well as the political impact on fragile states as Albania, FYROM and Montenegro. Two important obstacles to regional integration further remain weak state institutions and widespread criminalization of the economy. It is also important to strengthen civil society in the region and to assist state-building processes.

Resolution 1244 created a unique institutional hybrid, a UN protectorate with unlimited power whose purpose is to prepare the province for autonomy and self-government – but in the framework of FRY/S&M. We shall see in the next section few scenarios for the future of the province. Four years after the end of the Kosovo crisis, it is still unclear what the future status of the province might be.

• **Kosovo – a roadmap**

Since Kosovo became an international protectorate under UN administration, back in 1999, much has been done to stabilize the province and set up a functional administration. Yet almost nothing has been done to resolve the question at the heart of the conflict in Kosovo, and which remains the issue of overriding importance for the province's inhabitants: the issue of final status.

The UN Resolution establishing the interim system in Kosovo left the issue of final status open. Nor has the international community shown any appetite to address it.

---

[62] The Independent International Commission on Kosovo, cited in note XXX.
[63] Ibid.
[64] Lord Robertson, *KOSOVO ONE YEAR ON. Achievement and Challenge*, Bruxelles, 2000.

Anyway, in order to move towards a resolution of Kosovo's final status, two distinct aspects need to be considered: an "external" and an "internal" dimension. The "external" dimension involves devising a process to address final status, including all of the different actors with a stake in Kosovo's future. The "internal" dimension concerns the development of Kosovo's own democratic institutions, the rule of law and human rights, so as to prepare Kosovo for whatever final status may eventually be agreed.

These two dimensions are intrinsically connected through what the actual head of UNMIK, Michael Steiner, may have defined [unintentionally] as the mantra of Kosovo, i.e. the well-known "standards before status". The elections (local and parliamentarians) as well as the adoption of the Constitutional Framework in May 2001 defining the Provisional Institutions of Self Government (PISG) represent building blocks in the process of achieving the required standards.

The final aim of the whole process is to create a stable, democratic Kosovo, standing on its own feet, peacefully integrated in the region, and with a clearly defined place in the international community.

Final status options[65]

The responsibilities assigned to UNMIK under UNSC Resolution 1244 include "facilitating a political process designed to determine Kosovo's future's status, taking into account the Rambouillet accords". The latter had the following wording: "Three years after the entry into force of this agreement, an international meeting shall be convened to determine a mechanism for a final settlement for Kosovo (…)". UNSC Resolution 1244 al so calls for an interim administration under which Kosovo would have "substantial autonomy within the FRY". There are arguments, above all Kosovo's unreadiness for final status and the still unstable regional environment, for not addressing final status for the time being. However, the stakes are simply to high to leave the issue unaddressed. In the next few lines, we will find some options for Kosovo's status that might be considered.

- *An indefinite protectorate*: UNMIK and KFOR will be needed in Kosovo for years to come. Building democratic institutions and civil society takes time. However this is not an argument for leaving the issue of Kosovo's final status unaddressed.
- *Partition*: this idea has been circulated by nationalist groups in Belgrade since the mid 1990s. Serbian deputy PM Nebojsa Covic floated also the idea in May 2001. Even the former Serb PM, Z. Djindjic was a supporter.
- *Autonomy within [Union of] Serbia and Montenegro*: the hope that Kosovo's Albanians might at some point come round to accepting a return to FRY/S&M ignores reality on the ground.
- *Full independence*: this has been the goal of the Albanian majority since the break-up of Yugoslavia in 1991. The reference in the Rambouillet accords to the Helsinki Final Act implies that any change in Kosovo status should, if possible, be by agreement. As long as Kosovo's record on the treatment of minorities remain poor, as long as internal and external security remain so problematic, there is no prospect of the international community accepting full independence as an option.
- *Conditional independence*: after supporting this solution as the most suitable for Kosovo final status, in September 2001 the International Independent Commission on Kosovo came with a "conditional independence revisited". The positive and negative developments in the Balkan region led to this approach (the fall fo Milosevic, corroborated to the coming to power of throughout the region of non-nationalist or/and moderate nationalists; the violent situation in Southern Serbia and FYROM suggesting that the "Albanian question" is far from solved). The proposal

[65] International Crisis Group, *A KOSOVO ROADMAP (I). Addressing final status*, IGC Balkans Report no. 124, Pristina/Brussels, March 2002. Electronic source: http://www.crisisweb.org. The issue was first of all dealt with by Rupnik Jacques, *Chapitre cinq: L'apres guerre et la question du Kosovo* in Triantaphyllou Dimitrios (dir.), QUEL STATUT POUR LE KOSOVO, Cahier de Chaillot no. 50, Institut d'Etudes de Securite de l'UEO, octobre 2001, Paris, pp. 75-92.

for conditional independence continues to be, in this context, the "preferred option"[66]. It is important to distinguish between self-government under UNMIK and conditional independence. Under the former, the UN administration retains detailed oversight over domestic policy, police and judiciary, as well as the entire gamut of international relations. These amount to vice-regal powers, appropriate to a colonial dependency, rather than to a self-governing people. Under the conditional independence the domestic powers currently reserved to SRSG would be progressively transferred to the Kosovo government; at the end Kosovo will be independent, however conditional, outside FRY/S&M. What would be the limits imposed on self-rule?

1. explicit renunciation of any change of borders, i.e. explicit renunciation of any project of Greater Albania, or Greater Kosovo.
2. a constitutional guarantee of human rights for all citizens of Kosovo.
3. the renunciation of the use of violence in settling internal or external disputes.
4. a commitment to regional cooperation, regional governance and enduring regional institutions.

Effective supervision of these conditions would require a continuing international presence in Kosovo, with special responsibilities for the protection of borders and of minorities.

Conditional independence is both a goal and a process. The goal is sovereignty and independence for the people of Kosovo, within limits prescribed by the international community. It is also a process of progressive devolution, under which powers currently held by the international community are progressively transferred to locally elected officials.

Two arguments against this solution are the domino argument (this could encourage demands from Montenegro, FYROM, Bosnia and Herzegovina) and the stance of the UNSC (attempts to move beyond UNSC Resolution 1244 would jeopardize the compromise with Russia – that Kosovo should remain within Yugoslav borders, important argument in ending NATO's military intervention).

In spite of the successful election in November 2001, situation in Kosovo, although improving steadily has not left enough room of maneuver for a decision in relation to the final status of the province. The PISG are in place, although they do not work pretty well.

Fully aware that the West is opposing Kosovo's independence, the Albanian parliamentarian groups adopted a declaration providing for the harmonization of their positions before voting any independence resolution. It was an agile maneuver to gain some more time under the pressure of the Kosovo citizens. Probably this approach was also influenced by the attitude of the former Serbian PM, Z. Djindjic, which made public the acceptance of "technical discussions"[67] on the future status of Kosovo, including the idea of a future ethnical partition of province's territory.

Of course, the issue of the Kosovo's final status is intimately related with the achievement of a certain level of internal stability. In other words, before being granted a new status, Kosovo has to solve the following internal benchmarks[68]: self-government institutions; the criminal justice system; minority communities.

---

[66] The Independent International Commission on Kosovo, *THE FOLLOW-UP. Why conditional independence?*, Stockolm, September 2001. http://www.kosovocommission.org.

[67] Ionescu, V., *Kosovo – a UN Protectorate*, in Balcanii Magazine, no. 32, Bucharest, April 2003.

[68] International Crisis Group, *A KOSOVO ROADMAP (II). Internal benchmarks*, IGC Balkans Report no. 124, Pristina/Brussels, March 2002. Electronic source: http://www.crisisweb.org.

- **The "just wars" doctrine**
    (…)

- **The EU, NATO and the international community's stance vis-à-vis Kosovo**
    (…)

- **The impact of the democratic changes in the region: Croatia and Serbia and Montenegro on the way to Euro-Atlantic integration?**
    <u>Croatia – preparing for NATO and EU membership</u>

The death of Franjo Tudjman in December 1999 gave new breath for Croatia. The process of restructuring and reform started over. The international stances towards Croatia improved a lot. In 2001 the country became a PfP member. Recently, the EU welcomed Croatia's application for membership. I would dare to say that, generally speaking, Croatia is on the right track, although there is a need for ongoing reform in some sectors ("judiciary remain an area of concern (…) progress is also required on refugee return"[69], e.g.).

(…)

<u>Serbia and Montenegro – a provisional establishment?</u>

With Slobodan Milosevic no longer in power (as a consequence of the free elections in September 2000), FRY had again before it the best prospects for a generation of building lasting peace and prosperity.

After ten years of hidden or visible disputes between Serbia and Montenegro, in March 2002 was announced the imminent dismantling of the Third Yugoslavia and the emergence of a "new" state, [Union of] Serbia and Montenegro. The EU brokered the agreement signed by the FRY president, Vojslav Kostunita, the president of Montenegro, Milo Djukanovic, the Serb Premier, Zoran Djindjic, was also endorsed through the presence of the HR for CFSP, Javier Solana. The agreement put an end to the existing divergences between Serbia and the small Montenegro, the latter biased towards independence. The West, probably still afraid of another crisis, supported such an agreement and the EU may be seen as the guarantor for its further implementation. Through the adoption in February 2003 of the Constitutional Charter of the new state, the Third Yugoslavia disappeared from the map of Europe. "The federation is dead! Vive l'Union!"[70].

The assassination of the Serbian PM Zoran Djindjic underlined "how little progress Serbia has made in dismantling the Milosevic–era structures of power and breaking with the past"[71]. The international community needs to realize that now is not the time to disengage from the Balkans. While Serbia's politicians come to grips with the aftermath of the assassination a number of problems will remain. These include the ethnic Albanian majority parts of Southern Serbia, the lack of control over the armed forces, growing nationalism, and the overall state of economy. If the government and police succeed in eliminating at least part of the hidden structures of power, it will set the stage for Serbia's to make significant progress towards European and Euro-Atlantic integration. Should they fail, the country risks to become "the next Belarus"[72].

- **Romania between the Euro-Atlantic commitments and its historical neighboring ties**

The Kosovo crisis came in the run up to the Washington NATO anniversary summit. The candidate countries in the second wave, Romania included, were most probably expecting an invitation to join the Alliance. Consequently, they could not afford any mistake.

In the very beginning of April 1999, Romania was ready to deploy troops in order to guarantee the possible political agreement on Kosovo.

---

[69] GAERC, *External Relations*, 16 June 2003, Luxembourg.

[70] Ionescu, V., *Federatia a murit! Traiasca Uniunea!*, Balcanii Magazine, no. 32, Bucharest, April 2003, p. 23.

[71] ICG, *SERBIA AFTER DJINDJIC*, Balkans Report, no. 141, Belgrade/Brussles, 18 March 2003, p. 18.

[72] Ibid.

The president of FYROM, Kiro Gligorov, declared that its country was opposing to "any NATO intervention using FYROM's territory as an attack base".

In the same vein, and even more aggressive than needed, the Romanian president, Emil Constantinescu, stated on 22 March 1999 that "in the event of a failure in peace talks, Romania considers a NATO intervention, designed to end the ethnic cleansing, as necessary and legitimate…". The public opinion and the press, as well as the opposition parties disagreed with its too early agreement for a military solution to the crisis.

Meanwhile, NATO's allies (especially France, Italy and UK) asked for Milosevic's actions in terms of ending the offensive and accepting Rambouillet provisions.

When NATO launched the first bombs, the Romanian top military officials declared that "Romania will support NATO in settling down the Kosovo crisis".

Soon after the first NATO enlargement post-Cold War, the Alliance was launching its first military action. The situation within the Alliance was not so clear. Greece was fiercely opposing the attacks, while almost all the other members supported them.

The Romanian Government had to find an answer to a dilemma: how to please the US State Department and the Romanian people at the same time?. Some journalist already thought in radical terms: "US are no longer interested in enlarging the Alliance. The door is closed forever. The West and the rest". The Romanian minister of foreign affairs gave a plastic definition of the situation "we succeeded in convincing our foreign partners on our position in relation to this conflict. We failed to do it in relation to our domestic partners".

An opinion poll undertaken in the end of March 1999, showed that 71% of the Romanian population was convinced that this country should stay out of the conflict. The president of the main opposition party in Romania, Ion Iliescu, stated that "international law does not justify nor legitimate the intervention". In a special meeting, the Romanian Parliament supported the peaceful settlement of the crisis, expressed the hope that the reason will prevail, and reaffirmed the firm option for NATO integration.

In spite of Romania's proposal to stop the bombing during the Easter, they were further carried out. At the same time, Romania rejected the Yugoslav proposal to condemn NATO's attacks.

Unfortunately, the crisis affected the Romanian economy, already in crisis (according to an assessment of the Romanian MFA, the country lost around USD 50 million a week).

In mid April 1999, the main Romanian newspapers talk about the "divorce between authorities and population".

Within the Romanian Parliament there was "a huge gap between the proponents and opponents for NATO troops presence on Romania's territory". 84 percent of the Romanian population supports the immediate ceasing of hostilities, while the support for NATO membership reached a critical law threshold: 52 percent of the population (probably the lowest ever). However, it seems that Romania was just a bit above the overall European trend.

The president of the main coalition ruling party made a very strange statement: "the neighboring treaties have no value, as long as they do not provide for security (…)".

However, the Parliament approved the request for NATO access to the Romanian air space (99 abstentions – one third of the votes).

In the middle of the crisis, Pope Jan Paul, came to Bucharest, in the first visit ever of a Pope in a majoritarian Orthodox country.

In the turmoil, the Romanian newspapers quoted on front pages Soljenitin making no difference between NATO's and Hitler's actions in the Balkans: "NATO wants to establish a new world order and needs Yugoslavia as an example".

In summing up the Romania's stance during the conflict, president Constantinescu stated that "during the conflict Romanian was successful in preserving its good neighboring relations (…) we were not engaged in the conflict (…) we always supported the right side".

One of the most representatives journalists, was a little bit less optimistic: "actually, we faced the same managerial inability during a crisis (…) Albania, FYROM, Kosovo, Bulgaria and Romania

will be de facto NATO members, having to fulfill of the incumbent obligations, with no other right".

In conclusion, the situation in Romanian during the Kosovo crisis was characterized by the huge gap between the political class and the population, on the one hand, and within the political class itself, on the other. In terms of "realpolitik" the decision of the Romanian government seems to have been right (in the light of Prague summit decision, e.g.).

- **Conclusion**

The origins of the crisis have to be understood in terms of a new wave of nationalism that led to the rise of Milosevic and the official adoption of an extreme Serbian nationalist agenda.

The weak diplomacy before the crisis, corroborate to the irreconcilable goals of Kosovar Albanians and Belgrade regime led to the launching of the NATO attacks.

The "illegal but legitimate" NATO intervention, as the International Independent Commission on Kosovo concluded, seems to reflect properly the way the Alliance decided to manage the crisis.

Kosovo crisis put NATO in an awkward position: on the one hand, the Alliance has got a bad reputation due to the fact that this "experience" may be reproduced in any country in the region (fortunately, the latest developments in Southern Serbia and FYROM faded away this approach); on the other, the security guarantees offered by NATO membership are further sought by all the Balkans states (including FRY/S&M). The enlargement gave the Alliance a new leverage in influencing the evolution of the region and it probably also alleviated some of the above-mentioned fears. In other words, the Alliance will further remain and end in itself for these countries and will regarded as a security umbrella for this troubled area.

The economic clout of the Union put it in a better position towards the region; nobody in the region perceived a threat from the EU, while NATO has got its adversaries. The economic support of the EU to the region was well received, although lots of people criticized its limited impact. The political conditionality imposed by SAP/SAA was not always very well received by these countries, but it represents the only leverage for the Union in the process of reconstruction, transition to the market economy, rule of law, protection of and respect for minorities. Although the SP has not led to the expected results, the Union still has to play a leading role in the region. The economic dimension, completed by the progressive take over of some of the stabilization operations will offer the opportunity to the Union to implement its regional approach.

Notwithstanding, as already mentioned, at least in the medium term, NATO and the US should be further engaged in the area.

During the crisis Romania acted as a *de facto* NATO member.

The future status of the province is still unclear – the 9/11 tragic events shifted the attention of the international community on other areas of the globe (Central Asia, Persian Gulf, e.g.), while the conflict in Southern Serbia and crisis in FYROM in the beginning of 2001, as well as the "smooth" transition of FRY towards a Union, constitute stumbling blocks in the adoption of a decision on the final status of the province.

- **Annex to Chapter 4 – Kosovo: a chronology of events**

In June 1989, Milosevic holds a massive nationalist Serbian celebration of 600th anniversary of the battle of Kosovo, on the battlefield in the heart of Kosovo, with nearly 1,000,000 people attending.

In the official documents adopted by both the EU and NATO as a consequence of the Dayton Agreement the problems in Kosovo are not playing a significant role.

Between January and December 1997, the Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA) attacks on police stations, police patrols, and political figures in Serb-dominated Kosovo gradually increase.

In face of the KLA attacks Belgrade reacts with a strong hand. By September 1998 the internal displacement of 200,000 Albanians keeps the international community concerned about humanitarian issues in Kosovo province. On 23 September 1998, UNSC passes Resolution 1199. It requires the FRY to implement a ceasefire, withdraw forces deployed in Kosovo, allow access for humanitarian workers and offer full cooperation with the UN tribunal to investigate war crimes. The

very next day, NATO issues an Activation Warning for both a limited air option and a phased air campaign. Milosevic agrees the conditions as well as the deployment of an OSCE verification mission (KVM).

February and March 1999 – talks in Rambouillet, France. Slobodan Milosevic accuses the Americans of "sitting at the Albanian side of the table", and refuses to make any compromise.

The OSCE observers were extracted from Kosovo and bombing began on 24 March.

9-10 June 1999, the Military Technical Agreement was signed, and the 1244 UNSC Resolution, was adopted post-factum. The Kosovo quest for independence has started.

Chapter 5: Case study - Romania presented through the bias of the "Analysis grid of the risks challenging security"[*]

- **Self-definition of the strategic situation**

The history of Romanians starts back in the beginning of the first millennium (and even before), when the "Dacians" (characterized by Herodot as "the most braves of the Tracae") inhabited the present territory of Romania. The Roman Empire conquered large parts of this area and set up a Roman Province, in 106 a.D. The famous Trajan's Column in Rome still witnesses the historic victory of the Roman emperor. The barbarian invasions obliged the Romans to withdraw, between 271-274 a.D., beyond the Danube river that become a natural obstacle against the barbarians and the limit of the Empire. However, a large number of the Roman troops remained here and continued to live with the local population. From the mix of "Dacians" and Romans resulted the Romanian people, as the first Christian people in the region. This explains the Latin roots of the Romanian language.

Although scarce, there are enough historic proofs certifying the existence of the Romanian people over this territory between the withdrawal of the Romans and the 13th century a.D., when the presence of the local Romanian population starts to rely again on strong evidences.

Situated at crossroads, always "shared" the three clashing empires and civilisations, i.e. Russian, Ottoman and Habsburg Empire, Romania faced the history and preserved its place. "*Comme le roseau on a penché sous vent, mais on a toujours résisté*", could define very well the delicate Romanian position along the history.

In 1878 Romania became independent from the Ottoman Empire (endorsed by the Treaty of Berlin), although the dream of a "Greater Romania" had not yet been achieved[73]. It was 1918 and the end of the First World War (WW I) that made this dream become reality. Not for long: WW II and the Ribentrop-Molotov secret deal led to the new "sharing" of Romania: Basarabia (present Republic of Moldova plus some Southern counties belonging nowadays to Ukraine) and Northern Bucovina were taken away by the Soviet Union, while an important part of Transylvania was included in Horthy's Hungary.

The end of the WW II was also the beginning of a long agony: the communist era. Starting with 1947 Romania became part and parcel of the communist camp. The repression of the communist regime was assessed as being the most powerful among the former communist states in Middle Europe. However, one should never forget that during the Prague uprising in 1968, Romania was the only country from the Warsaw Treaty Organisation (WTO), which did not agree with the intervention of WTO and did not send any troops there (35 years later, Romanian was granted NATO membership in this very city!).

December 1989 represented a crucial event in the history of the Romanian people. The revolution led to the fall of the communist regime and raised high expectations for the Romanian society. Unfortunately, as often the economic and political analysts recognise, Romania started the transition

---

[*] Cf. Foucher, op.cit. in note 6, p. 12.

[73] In 1600 the Romanian provinces, i.e. Moldova, Valahia and Transylvania were united under the leadership of Mihai Viteazul (Michael the Brave), although for a short period.

at a disadvantage, with significantly worse initial conditions[74] than those prevailing in the leading reform countries, which suggests that its policy makers have also had less room for manoeuvre[75]. This was reflected in the late start for joining the EU, by adopting the Snagov Declaration (1995) gathering political support for the Romanian request to integrate the EU as well as in the pace of the internal reforms. Although Romania was the first country to sign the Framework Document of the PfP (1994), this enthusiastic attitude (based also on a large popular support) did not have a direct impact on the decision to enlarge the Alliance with only three member states (Madrid, July 1997). Furthermore, at the Luxembourg European Council (December 1997), Romania had to face the second rejection, this time from the part of the EU that decided that the country was not ready to open the accession negotiations.

The overall context has been changing, the decision of the EU to start the negotiations with all the remaining candidate countries (Helsinki, December 1999) being regarded as a milestone in the process of European integration. In the context of the Kosovo crisis Romania proved to be, one more time, a key stability factor in SEE, fully supporting (at least at the political level) the actions undertaken by the Alliance. Acting in the spirit of the Contact Group initiatives and supporting the Alliance as well as the international community's efforts, Romania has decided to enhance its role in regional co-operation initiatives and to increase participation in the existing multinational peace support operations in SEE. The international fight against the scourge of terrorism has also been fully supported by Romania and its people.

Twelve years after the fall of the communist regime one thing is for sure: Romania is a functioning pluralistic democracy. The successful achievement of two cycles of democratic, peaceful change of power (in 1996 and 2000), are strong supporters of the above-mentioned aspects. At the same time, the main instruments of a market economy are already in place and there is a substantial growth potential. The reform of the Armed Forces advances at a accelerated pace. All these efforts have a unique aim: modernising the Romanian society at large. Joining the European and Euro-Atlantic political, economic and security organisations will certainly help in the Romanian efforts. In this context it is worth mentioning the strong popular support for both the EU and NATO enlargement processes (ranging from 80 to 85%, it is the highest among the candidate countries). Because all the Romanians understood: there is only a way for Romania - the way to the EU and NATO.

- **Perceptions vis-à-vis specific political risks**

According to the latest report of the European Commission, released in November 2001, "Romania continues to fulfil the Copenhagen political criteria"[76]. At the same time, the Union warned Romania that "corruption remains a serious problem that is largely unresolved"[77]. In this respect the Government has launched a decisive offensive against this scourge damaging the international imagine of Romania and affecting the progress of the society.

Twelve years after pictures of its children shocked the world, Romania's childcare system may yet become "a role model for some more economically developed societies"[78], as the prestigious Financial Times noticed not long ago.

Respect for and protection of minorities could be also regarded as a model in Europe. The conclusion of a "Memorandum of Understanding between the Government of Romania and the Government of the Republic of Hungary concerning the law on Hungarians living in the neighbouring countries and issues of bilateral co-operation"[79] settled the problems raised by the "Status law" promoted by the Hungarian government.

---

[74] Romania practiced late Stalinism until the very end of the communist regime. Initial conditions can be related to the magnitude of resource misallocation, the institutional ingredients of a market environment, the existence of a private sector and a certain industrial culture.

[75] Cf. Daianu, D., *Romania*, in Journal of Southeast European and Black Sea Studies, vol. 1, no. 1, January 2001, pp. 203-218.

[76] *2001 Regular report on Romania's Progress towards Accession*, Commission of the European Communities, Brussels, 13 November 2001. Source: http://europa.eu.int/comm/enlargement.

[77] Ibid.

[78] McAleer, P., *Orphans give Romania hope of joining European family*, in Financial Times, 23/24 March 2002.

[79] The MoU was concluded in Budapest, on 22 December 2002.

All the treaties signed with the neighbouring countries take stock of the principles and values provided for in the UN Charter, EU Treaties, and Washington Treaty and OSCE documents. Romania has intensified the dialogue with the Russian Federation aiming to conclude without delay the Basic Treaty (this is to be signed in early July 2003). The bilateral relationship between Romania and the Republic of Moldova are intended to focus mainly on economic and cultural co-operation, irrespective of the different political orientation of the governments in the two countries. In spite of the provocative attitude of the authorities in Chisinau, the Romanian Government and Russian Federation declared that the two parties would refrain from any inference in the internal affairs of the Republic of Moldova[80].

Acting as Chairmanship-in-Office of OSCE, in 2001, Romania has been actively involved in the field of conflict prevention, crisis management and post conflict rehabilitation. The effective co-ordination EU-NATO-OSCE led to the successful settlement of the crisis in FYROM.

In the beginning of December 2001, the EU adopted a historic decision to abolish visas requirements for the Romanian citizens travelling in the Schengen states. It was a logic decision and Romania saluted it accordingly (until January 2002, Romania was the only candidate country subject to visas requirements within Schengen space).

- **Perceptions vis-à-vis specific economic risks**

Romania has also made progress towards establishing a functioning market economy. Notwithstanding, "it would not, in the medium term, be able to cope with competitive pressure and market forces within the Union, it has taken measures that would allow to develop its future capacity (…)"[81]. A growth rate of 1.6 percent in 2000 and a estimated 4.8 percent in 2001, according to the International Monetary Fund (IMF), gives Romania the second most dynamic GDP among EU candidate states[82]. The Romanian economy grew by 5.0 percent in 2002, the highest rate of growth in the region[83]. This picture would not be completed without mentioning the fall of unemployment and inflation rates as well as the increase of the trade exchange volume (with the EU counting, by far, for the most important partner of Romania; the EU accounts for 67% of the Romanian imports and for 57% of the Romanian exports[84]). The privatisation process is well on track: in 2001 was privatised the largest "black hole" in the Romanian industry, i.e. the steel maker SIDEX SA in Galati, and by the end of 2003 the largest bank in Romania, Romanian Commercial Bank, is expected to finalise this process. Consequently, the share of the private sector is to further increase from the present 64.5% of GDP[85].

Romania has continued to make progress with the adoption of the EU *acquis*. However, advances in legal transposition have not always been matched by improvements in administrative. In other words, there is still room for further improvements in the administrative sector in order to comply with the EU standards but also as a logical step in the overall process of modernising Romania and bringing it in the European mainstream.

- **Perceptions vis-à-vis specific military risks**

"Preparation for joining NATO is a catalyst of the reform, aimed at modernisation of the Romanian society and institutions"[86]. The ongoing 4th Cycle of the National Annual Plan (NAP), dedicated to finalize the preparation for joining NATO, is grounded on more pragmatism, on the qualitative dimensions of the assumed goals. Their accomplishment will be a progress in ensuring the necessary capabilities for national security, for participation in CRO, for developing a package of

---

[80] Cf. *The new Russian Ambassador to Bucharest suggest to President Iliescu to "leave the past to the historians"*, in Romanian Libera, 19 March 2002.

[81] Cf. *2001 Regular report on Romania's Progress towards Accession*, cited in note 73.

[82] Cf. Brzezinski, M. and Walls, T., *NATO's Southern Dimension*, in Financial Times, 26 March 2002.

[83] Cf. Ministry of Development and Prognosis of Romania; website: http://www.mdp.ro.

[84] Ibid.

[85] Ibid.

[86] Cf. Pascu, I.M. (minister of national defense of Romania), cited in *Romanian Armed Forces - Military Life Magazine. Special Issue*, Ministry of National Defense of Romania, Bucharest, 2001.

forces for collective defence missions, including those aimed at fighting terrorism. The final goal is to achieve, by the end of 2003, a leaner, more compact, higher performance, more efficient and flexible force structure, compatible with NATO standards. It will include 112,000 military personnel and 28,000 civilians (this figures are subject to further amendments as a direct consequence of NATO's invitation). This cycle benefits of the politically engaged financial support, so that the defence budget will be maintained at a level of at least 2.4% of the GDP. As compared to 1.8 % in 2000 it will be 2.4% in 2003, with a simultaneous growth of the GDP and the defence expenditures. According to the declared priorities and to the financial resources allocated for the defence sector, the restructuring process of the armed forces has been undertaken in two stages. *In the first stage* (2000-03), the process includes resizing of the armed forces and establishing the new force structure; the professionalization of the personnel; the modernisation and standardisation of training practices. During this stage, only acquisition programs whose funding is ensured will be implemented, all others being rescheduled. Still, while the new structures are put in place, the modernisation of the operational components will be carried out. *In the second stage* (2004-07), progress towards the planned operational capability will continue and major procurement programs aimed at the modernisation of the Romanian forces with support as well as combat equipment typical of the twenty-first century battlefield will be concluded. The democratic control over the military is a reality based on the existence of the necessary legislative framework in this respect, as well as on its effective implementation.

At the Capability Improvement Conference – CIC (Brussels, November 2001) Romania made a new, significantly increased offer in order to enhance its contribution to the achievement of the HHG. The new offer also included forces with experience in PSO. All these forces are ready to meet the interoperability requirements for the execution of EU-led operations and they are the same as those made available for NATO-led PSO. This approach was based on the financial and logistical capabilities requested for training and sustaining such forces in a theatre of operations, and on the criteria set by the EU bodies. The Romanian offer amounts to approximately 3,700 military personnel, by far the most important contribution from a candidate country.

The accession to NATO will certainly lead to a reassessment of the existing strategies and doctrines, which will also reflect in the structure of forces and their incumbent missions/tasks.

Since 1991 Romania has been actively involved in a large number of PSO[87] (more than 9,500 Romanian military personnel has been involved in PSO so far), gaining a significant experience in the field: 9 UN operations, 3 NATO-led PSO and 4 missions under the OSCE aegis. They include: Afganistan (ISAF and "Enduring Freedom"); Angola (UNAVEM III and MONUA); Albania (ALBA); Bosnia-Herzegovina (IFOR; SFOR I and II); Kosovo (KFOR); Iraq-Kuwait (UNIKOM); Congo (MONUC); Ethiopia-Eritreea (UNMEE); and OSCE missions in FYROM, Georgia and Kosovo. Presently, Romania's main efforts in PSO are directed to its participation in SFOR and KFOR (330 military personnel altogether), ISAF (around 50 military personnel and a C-130B transport aircraft), Enduring Freedom (more than 400 troops) and Iraq (the Romanian Parliament approved in June 2003 a significant package of forces to assist this country in the process of stabilization – around 650 troops).

- **Self-definition of the present security interests**

In December 2001 the President of Romania presented to the Romanian Parliament the National Security Strategy (NSS) of Romania[88], the document identifying and defining the national interests as well as the necessary means, capabilities and resources in order to preserve and further promote them. The main security problems of Romania are "those of economic nature" states this basic document. At the same time, it is recognized that there is no perceived risk of military aggression from a state in SEE in the current and foreseeable political environment. The main directions of action in the National Security Policy were defined as follows: political-administrative realm,

---

[87] Cf. *Romanian Armed Forces - Military Life Magazine. Special Issue,* cited in note 83.

[88] Cf. *National Security Strategy of Romania. Guaranteed democracy and fundamental freedoms, lasting and sound economic and social development, accession to NATO and integration into the EU*. Source: http://www.mapn.ro.

economic realm; social realm; realm of education, research and culture; realm of national security and law enforcement; realm of national defence; and realm of foreign policy.

As stability factor in the region, Romania has contributed actively to the establishment of various structures and partnerships covering bi-, tri- and multi-dimensional levels.

The treaties signed with the neighbouring countries constitute a valuable contribution to the development of peaceful and friendly relations, in the spirit of the EU legislation and according to NATO requirements.

Romania is an active part in trilateral co-operation arrangements involving Poland and Ukraine, Hungary and Austria, Republic of Moldova and Ukraine, Greece and Bulgaria, Turkey and Bulgaria.

At the moment the regional co-operation represents an important and active part of the Romanian policy as stability factor and security provider in SEE and Middle Europe. Initially started under the pressure of the international organisations (IO)[89], among which the EU and NATO played an important role, the process of regional cooperation is well on track, as a vivid expression of the "regional ownership" principle as well as a logical consequence of the need to provide credibility vis-à-vis the future allies. Romania's participation within various regional/sub-regional co-operation initiatives aims at contributing to the regional stability and security, fostering good neighbouring relations among the countries and bringing prosperity in the participating states and in the region as a whole.

The most important sub-regional projects in Middle Europe where Romania is an active member, could be summarised as follows:

- Stability Pact for South-Eastern Europe (SP).
- NATO's South East Europe Initiative (SEEI).
- Royaumont Process.
- Southeast European Cooperative Initiative (SECI).
- South-Eastern Europe Cooperation Process (SEECP).
- Central European Initiative (CEI).
- Central European Free Trade Agreement (CEFTA).
- South-Eastern Europe Defense Ministerial Process (SEDM Process) / Multinational Peace Force South-Eastern Europe (MPFSEE).
- Black Sea Economic Cooperation Organization (BSECO).
- Black Sea Naval Cooperation Task Group (BLACKSEAFOR).
- Romanian-Hungarian Joint Peace-Keeping Battalion.
- Multinational Engineer Unit between Hungary, Romania, Slovakia and Ukraine (Tisa Battalion).

As one could easily see from Chapter 2, the network of regional co-operation initiatives in Middle Europe and especially in SEE has become very dense.

By assuming the Chairmanship of SEDM Coordination Committee (SEDM-CC) and Political-Military Steering Committee (PMSC)/MPFSEE in 2001 (for a two-year-period) and of SEEGROUP (for one year), as well as the Co-Presidency of the SP Working Table III in 2002, Romania has been trying to provide the necessary and more coherent coordination among various cooperative initiatives in the region and to bring its contribution to the promotion of SEE on the European and international scene. In this endeavour, it took stock of the experience gained while chairing the OSCE in 2001.

---

[89] It is worth mentioning that the real start of the regional co-operation in SEE was a consequence of the EU "*Essen [pre-accesion] strategy*" (December 1994) that mentioned functional regional co-operation as a pre-requisite for accession to the Union. Furthermore, the "*Study on NATO enlargement*" (September 1995) mentioned again the need for good neighbouring relations as a must for the candidate countries.

- **Place of Romania within the security interests of: the neighboring countries, the USA, NATO, the EU, the EU member states…**

Among the fundamental priorities of Romanian Government's Program[90], the integration into the EU and the accession to NATO aim at creating the necessary conditions and bringing a valuable contribution to further development of these organisations as well as to the modernisation process undertaken by the Romanian society at large. The decision adopted in Prague to enlarge the Alliance to encompass seven countries form Middle Europe, corroborated with Copenhagen European Council commitments in terms of EU enlargement, represent building blocks within the complex process of reuniting Europe and strengthening the Euro-Atlantic security.

Romania is expected to remain further engaged in the EU-led operations in the Balkans, but also in other missions such as SFOR, KFOR, Afghanistan and will soon participate in Iraq.

Romania is situated at the crossroads: neighboring the Balkans and the Black Sea; part of the former "Silk Way" which seems to regain its security and geopolitical/geoeconomic importance (in relation to the transport of the important energetic resources in Central Asia/Caucasus to the West); avant poste for NATO in its Southern Flank.

The present situation in characterized by good neighborly relations, an important role being played in this respect by both the process of maturation of the political classes in these countries, but also by the standards imposed by the EU and NATO as prerequisites for accession/integration.

The Iraqi crisis tensed the relations of Romania with the EU (already affected by the decision of the Romanian Government to sign, in August 2002, a bilateral agreement with US on the Rome Status of the International Criminal Court). The former was siding the US-led coalition against Saddam and is expected to take part in the post-conflict management, while some EU member states clearly opposed the US intervention in Iraq.

However, it is worth recalling that, unfortunately, the candidate countries found themselves in a very awkward situation: waiting for a EU invitation, while the process of signing the accession protocols with NATO (followed by the ratification process) was also looming. "When elephants fight, small animals also suffer". It was a quarrel at the strategic level, and the candidate states were just figurants on the "Grand Chessboard". As a Romanian top official put it: "it is not right to force these countries to choose between either side of the Atlantic". Now, it seems that the US approach was correct and Romania's side the same. However, this does not mean that Romania is less pro-European than before. On the contrary, it further perceives and approaches the two processes (i.e. NATO and EU enlargement) as mutually reinforcing.

What is the main **conclusion** of the overall picture presented above? Although the situation in Romania is not the best among the candidate countries, the reform process is well on track and there are good indicators that catching up the more advanced candidates is not a utopia. The regional/sub-regional dimensions has become more and more important and these process has already paid off: all the countries in the region have democratic regimes, the confidence among the majority of the nations seems to be at a normal level, and the international community welcomes the efforts of these countries. However, one important aspect should not be lost of sight: the need for further "development exports" from the West; and this should materialise not only in pumping funds in the region, but also helping the countries in SEE to build viable administrative structures, to get used to respect democracy, the rule of law and their minorities, and above all keeping alive the prospect for European and Euro-Atlantic integration. In a world of "brand states"[91] Romania tries to portray itself not only as the "Dracula Land" but mostly as stability factor and security provider in SEE.

---

[90] For further details see http://www.gov.ro (web site of the Romanian Government).
[91] Van Ham, P., *The Rise of the Brand State*, in Foreign Affairs, September/October 2001, pp. 2-6.

Chapter 6: The future of the region – few scenarios for South-Eastern Europe

Any attempt to foresee the future of the region should take into consideration its evolution along history, encompassing three main stages:
- Instability – influenced by nationalism and fragmentation of the region relative to the spheres of influence (end of 19th century, beginning of 20th century).
- Stability (in the inter-wars period) – based on the Balkans cooperation as well as a response to more than a decade of bloody wars.
- Chaotical instability (of the 1990s) – characterized by contradictory evolutions and tendencies specific for a geostrategic marginalization.

Consequently, the following possible scenarios were envisaged (ranging from the most optimistic to the most pessimistic):

- **Achieving the ultimate goal of Euro-Atlantic and European integration (or in a reverse order?)**

This should be, of course, the most convenient outcome, both from the part of the countries in the region as well as from the international community's [at large] standpoint.

The latest developments in the region (to be presented in the **Final conclusions** section) may strike the right balance towards the achievement of this ultimate goal.

S&M are on their way to PfP, entered the Council of Europe and will try, for sure, to catch up in the process of preparations for future EU membership. However, the "issue" of Kosovo final status will probably have to be dealt with sooner or later (sooner than later).

Croatia seems best placed in this respect, with its application for EU membership (currently under consideration) and its position in relation to NATO.

The other three remaining Western Balkans countries still have problems to cope with: minority rights (BiH, FYROM), weak state institutions, criminalization, subsistence economies etc.

In the field of regional cooperation, things are also on the right track.

The massive involvement of both the EU and NATO, along with the reminded developments may act as a catalyst for this process.

Although the nationalist propensity has not yet completely washed away, and it is not crystal clear that US, Russian and EU interests in the region are not to collide, there are good indications that this scenario may happen in a 5 to 10 years timeframe.

Much depends upon the external evolutions and further Western commitment to the region, corroborated with appropriate "regional and local ownership".

Overall, the region seems ready for democratic change, regional stability, and integration.

- **Keeping the status quo**

This scenario would be on the following lines:
- All the countries in the region continue to support the orientation of the political class in their respective countries towards the West/integration into the Euro-Atlantic and European structures (however, this support is not unlimited, and the NATO intervention in Kosovo as well as the memories of the Balkan wars in early 1990s may still hamper the efforts of stabilization);
- At the same time, the West/international community continues to pump up money and to support the process of nation-building in these countries, promoting also local and regional ownership;
- The process of regional cooperation is further developed and refined;
- The antagonisms and regional conflicts intensity would cool down without coming to and end. As we recall, the confrontation between the "Green Transversal" and the "Orthodox Arc", between 1991-1995, was reduced to hostile crisis. Their repetition is not desirable, but this would constitute a far better perspective than the concurrent crisis in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

This perspective seems quite realistic, especially in the light of the socio-economic evolutions/parameters in the Balkans. The external context has changed, the public opinion wants to see an end to the conflicts, but the majority of states in the region still rely on a shaky economy which has in turn repercussions on the political situation and acts as a stumbling block for the building of a civil society. The nationalistic trends are still there (the most recent proof is related to the elections in Bosnia and Herzegovina, e.g.), the pro-West option coexists with the rejection of some views of the Western capitals etc.

There is a need to further export development in the region and offer a tangible prospect for integration. Probably, this state of play, with a pretty complicated evolutionary formula, might characterize the region within the next 3-5 years.

- **Return to the spheres of influence**

This scenario relies on the return of Russia to an antagonistic attitude towards the West, followed by the emergence of divergences in relation to the region.

The recent decision of Russia to withdraw its troops from the stabilization forces in the Balkans caught by surprise its Western counterparts. On the other hand, the ambivalence demonstrated during the Iraqi crisis, with president Putin playing well a weak hand, put Russia in a privileged position. Both the EU and NATO seem to be interested at the moment to have good relations with this former superpower. NATO probably wants to use the Russian support in the fight against international terrorism, while the EU does not want to loose the huge potential market and, why not, to use Russia as a caucus in the Union's efforts to create an autonomous and credible European military dimension. The idea is not to transform again the Balkans in a sort of barometer for world politics.

However, the joint NATO–EU efforts in devising a common approach towards the region (in spite of the delays in adopting and implementing it), corroborated with the recent involvement of the Union also in the field of crisis management (through EUPM and CONCORDIA) and the way the international organizations managed the crisis in Southern Serbia and FYROM, demonstrate the "futuristic thinking" behind this approach.

- **Withdrawal of the West/international community – return to chaos?**

    (…)

Final conclusions

In 1912 Baron d'Estournelles thought that Ottoman-ruled Albania and Macedonia were "more widely separated from Europe than Europe from America". Eighty-five years later the Bulgarian historian Maria Todorova published her book "Imagining the Balkans" in which she said for the West, and for Central Europe also, the region represented -in the unfortunate academic jargon- the "constituting other" in contrast to which one defines oneself: the pole of disorder, fragmentation, endless quarrels. In between, the Balkans were long labeled "the powder keg of Europe". On top, the word "Balkans" acquired a bag of pejorative connotations: conspiratie and revengeful, backward and uncivilized, incurably provincial and chronically poor, unreliable and intolerant.

Defining the Balkans is not an easy task. The "Western Balkans", as defined by the EU, completed by some countries in the region (Bulgaria, Romania, Slovenia, Greece and the continental part of Turkey) led us to the broader area of SEE. It is precisely here the project focused.

Unfortunately, in spite of the obvious achievements, the Balkans are still associated to the term of "Balkanization" (describing 'not the political fragmentation of the Balkan Peninsula but the emergence of several small new states to replace the Habsburg and Romanov empires. It would have been just as accurate to label this process the East Europeanization or even the Balticization of Europe'[92]).

---

[92] Glenny, M., *THE BALKANS 1804-1999. Nationalism, War and the Great Powers*, Granta Books, London, 1999.

These definitions (and realities) to the sensitive issue of security, at large, and the one of security in SEE, in particular. Even after 9/11 tragic events, security remains further about preserving the functional status of an entity within certain accepted parameters. When it comes to SEE, the recent assessments show that "there are few tangible extra-regional military threats"[93]. However, the level of non-military threats from within and outside the region has gone up, dramatically (the strategic crime being of particular concern). The problem here is that the "cult of crime and corruption" cannot be eradicated from the outside, but Western policy towards SEE governments must pressure to discipline them (including the security institutions and the military).

As for the so well known "clash of civilizations", the analysis provided that the roots of conflicts in the Balkans must be sought elsewhere, i.e. in the sparks of "aggressive nationalism fanned into roaring flames by some of the political leaders of the dissolving Yugoslav federation".

In a world of interdependency, globalization and knowledge sharing, it seems to become almost trivial not to talk about (or neglect) cooperation. At the regional level, especially in SEE, it is a common understanding that this process is a precondition for future Euro-Atlantic and European integration of the countries in the area (it should not become also an alternative). Before asking these countries for counting on the "help for self-help", the West should continue to further export development. The main obstacles to regional cooperation in SEE seem to be further weak state institutions and the widespread criminalization of economy. Consequently, both the EU and NATO have to continue to play an important role in the stabilization of SEE. After a long period of time, one may finally state that the countries in the region perceive cooperation as a building block on their way to the West.

In 1999, while the unfolding Kosovo crisis and conflict made "powder keg" seem still right, at NATO's fiftieth anniversary summit it was decided that the region should be encouraged and helped to "join the European mainstream".

A few months after this NATO event, the German Presidency of the EU launched the SP with a "mission statement" that spoke, among many other things, of increasing "the sense of security and thrust" in the neighborhood, of enhancing "transparency and predictability in the military field" and of "creating a new security culture" in the region.

NATO devised a Membership Action Plan (MAP) procedure to help would-be members in the Balkans and elsewhere to prepare for accession. This was soon up and running. On the other hand, the SP was assessed as having a bad start[94].

Nevertheless by mid-2001 there were enough good things happening for the EU's External Relations Commissioner, Chris Patten, to say that, while it was too far too early to talk about Mission Accomplished in the region, it was already clear that this was not Mission Impossible either.

At the Prague summit, in November 2002, NATO reaffirmed its support for the "territorial integrity and sovereignty of all countries in this strategically important region" and for a "peaceful, stable and democratic SEE" where all countries are "integrated in Euro-Atlantic structures". Further more, the Alliance confirmed its "continued presence in the region".

In the Working Document defining the "Greek Presidency Priorities for the Western Balkans", released in January 2003, it is stated clearly that the Union must "increasingly assume a leading role in the area" and the European prospect must be "visible and credible to the peoples of the region". Probably the most important decision in this respect was related to the launching of the "Balkans European integration process", a new political forum that designed to increase the visibility of the SAP and complement it politically. The latest attempt in this respect, i.e. the "Thessaloniki agenda for the Western Balkans (Moving towards European Integration)", clearly showed the EU support and interest in the region. This process, together with the previous EU instruments and the increasing role played by the Union in the field of crisis management in SEE (by launching the EUPM in BiH and the military operation "CONCORDIA" in FYROM, as well as through the prospect of taking over SFOR), might lead to an integrated approach to the region. The EU may

---

[93] The ESCADA Report, cited in note 36, p. 31.
[94] Ibid.

become the main "game" in town, but it seems that, at least in the medium run, its efforts in the field of CM/CRO have to be complemented by NATO (especially in terms of planning and command capabilities, but also in the realm of military means and assets).

Although the official document state that NATO is ready to tackle the regional security issues in conjunction with the Union, it seems that there are some strains on this strategic partnership, including its operational dimension:

- The first one is related to the delays in the elaboration of the common approach towards stability and security in Western Balkans/SEE. The development of a real, functional partnership between the two organizations is vital for the stabilization of the region.
- Secondly, the apparent divergences between NATO and the Union in the field of civil emergency planning and that of the fight against terrorism are not encouraging.

Anyway, the value and potential of such a strategic partnership has already been demonstrated in FYROM and Southern Serbia where the civil war was prevented and the conflict was defused respectively.

The crisis in Kosovo showed that human rights [violations] might be regarded as a possible reason for intervention in internal affairs of a sovereign state. The general assessment seems to be that NATO's intervention in Kosovo was "illegal but legitimate". It was illegal because it did not receive prior approval from the UNSC. It was legitimate because the human rights violations were taking place, all diplomatic avenues seemed to have been exhausted, Kosovo was liberated as a consequence of the intervention, the oppression of the Kosovar Albanians was ended, and all those who had been expelled by Yugoslav forces during the war were able to return to their homes. However, while the NATO air campaign did not provoke the attacks on the civilian Kosovar population it also seems that the bombing has created an environment that made such an operation feasible. Another lesson of the Kosovo crisis is that much more efforts need to be devoted to effective prevention. The issue of Kosovo's final status is intimately related to the achievement of a certain level of internal stability. Before being granted a new status, Kosovo has to implement a set of "internal benchmarks", in line with the "standards before status" mantra. As for Romania, the crisis in Kosovo clearly showed the gap between the political class and population. In the end, the support for the Alliance proved to be the winning card (although, not necessarily from all points of view – see the opposition of the Romanian population, e.g.).

Fulfilling the obligations assumed within the Euro-Atlantic and European integration processes constitute a crucial factor in modernising the Romanian society at large and consolidating the economic growth trends. In the long run, they will promote prosperity and will enhance the credibility of Romania. In Romania's view, joining the EU and NATO are mutually reinforcing processes, based on common values and responsibilities. It is not the fear of threats but the logical will to promote stability and enhance its role as security provider in SEE that guides Romania towards achieving these objectives. If the process of modernising the Romanian society at large had been only the result of the political pressures from the EU or/and NATO, even overcoming the economic difficulties Romania would have acquired forever a "political personality deficiency". Fortunately, it seems that Romania has avoided that trap.

The reasons for expanding NATO to include Romania fell basically under three main headings: enhancing regional security and even the security of Europe as a whole, promoting stability in the region, and fostering growth and integration. As for the EU enlargement the main *pros* are basically the same, probably in a reverse order. After 11 September the geostrategic importance of Romania for the Alliance re-emerged and probably constituted an important factor in shaping the decision taken in Prague. On the other hand, it is important that the EU enlargement should not discriminate against the potential ten "first wave" new members (agricultural and regional development funds distribution, e.g.). In this context, it is worth noting that Romania fully understood the meaning of the *"regional and local ownership"* principle as well as the need to strengthen its credibility. Romania's significantly increased participation in both KFOR and SFOR, the participation in

ISAF[95], the significant participation in "Enduring Freedom" operation and in Iraq (more than 1,000 troops altogether) as well as the additional contribution to the improvement of the EU military capabilities are salient proofs in this respect.

The latest developments in the region (fall of Milosevic and establishment of a new government committed to democracy in Belgrade, even after the death of Zoran Djindjic; spread of violence to FYROM and Southern Serbia – pretty well contained through the joint efforts of these countries and the corroborated actions of NATO, EU and OSCE; promulgation of a new constitutional framework for Kosovo as well as the elections in November 2001; the peaceful resolution of the issues regarding the international status of both Serbia and Montenegro; the elections in FYROM) are likely to speed up the process of enhancing stability and security in SEE, promoting democracy and bringing prosperity in a common effort to materialise the virtuous spiral of security and stability. It is also worth noting that challenges still remain high for the region (see the outcome of the last elections in BiH; the existence, at best, of weak state institutions; the poor status of economy; strategic crime etc).

As a recent assessment put it bluntly "political conditionality and the expectations and requirements of the EU and NATO have worked in the countries of the former Warsaw Pact, but only in those instances where the political leadership and the electorate were determined to <<enter the European mainstream>>. SEE cannot expect the international community to solve its problems for it"[96]. Governments should count both on further "help for self-help" but also on continuation -for as long as it takes- of the stabilizing presence of NATO and the EU.

The main recommendations stemming from this project may be summarized under the following headings:

- Conflict prevention, CM and post-CM could be successful only if a holistic approach is chosen, addressing in parallel the following sectors: the creation of a secure environment (with both NATPO and the EU having a decisive role to play); the promotion of a sustainable democratic system (OSCE and the EU being mutually reinforcing); and the promotion of economic and social well-being (with the EU best suited in this respect).
- These above-mentioned activities need to be embedded in an integrated regional approach and there is an increasing need for further cooperation between NATO and the EU in order to help solving the SEE system of equations.
- A strong incentive for implementing the often-painful reforms as well as fostering regional cooperation needs to be offered.

For the coming decade, the West needs to continue exporting in SEE the stability, security and prosperity created within the Euro-Atlantic area.

---

[95] International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan.
[96] The ESCADA Report, cited in note 36.

Selective bibliography (including electronic resources)

- **Books**

Garton Ash, T., *HYSTORY OF THE PRESENT. Essays, sketches and despatches from Europe in the 1990s*, POLIROM, Iasi, 2002.

Bennett, C., *YUGOSLAVIA'S BLOODY COLLAPSE. Causes, Course and Consequences*, Editura Trei, Bucuresti, 2002.

Codita, C. (ed.), *THE BALKANS - Coming Out of the Past*, Institute for Strategic and International Studies, Bucuresti, 1999.

Dufour, J-L, *LES CRISES INTERNATIONALE. De Pekin (1900) au Kosovo (1999)*, Editura CORINT, Bucuresti, 2002.

Foucher, M. (dir), *Les défis de sécurité en Europe médiane*, Fondation pour les Etudes de Défense, Collection Perspectives Stratégiques, Paris, 1996.

Glenny, M., *THE BALKANS 1804-1999. Nationalism, War and the Great Powers*, Granta Books, London, 1999.

Pavlowitch, A.V., *A History of The Balkans 1804 - 1945*, POLIROM, Iasi, 2002.

Prevelakis, G., *LES BALKANS. Cultures et geopolitique*, Editura CORINT, Bucuresti, 2001.

***, *NATO Handbook*, NATO Office of Information and Press, Brussels, 2001.

- **Papers**

Triantaphyllou, D. (ed.), *The Southern Balkans: perspectives from the region*, Chaillot Paper no. 46, Institute for Security Studies of WEU, April 2001, Paris. Also accessible in electronic format at **http://www.iss-eu.org**.

Triantaphyllou, D. (dir.), *QUEL STATUT POUR LE KOSOVO*?, Cahier de Chaillot no. 50, Institut d'Etudes de Securite de l'UEO, octobre 2001, Paris. Also accessible in electronic format at **http://www.iss-eu.org**.

- **Reports**

Commission of the European Communities, *REPORT FROM THE COMMISSION. The Stabilization and Association process for SEE*, Second Annual Report, Brussels, March 2003.

EU-ISS, Directorate for Strategic Affairs/Ministry of Defense of France, International Peace Academy, *The UN, the EU, NATO and Other Regional Actors: Partners in Peace?*, Paris, October 2002.

The Independent International Commission on Kosovo, *THE KOSOVO REPORT. Conflict*International response*Lessons learned*, Oxford University Press, New York, 2000.

The Independent International Commission on Kosovo, *THE FOLLOW-UP. Why Conditional Independence?*, **http://www.kosovocommission.org**, September 2001.

The International Commission of the Balkans, *UNFINISHED PEACE. Report of the International Commission on the Balkans*, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington, D.C., 1996.

International Crisis Group, *A KOSOVO ROADMAP (I). Addressing Final Status*, IGC Balkans report no. 124, **http://www.crisisweb.org**, March 2002.

International Crisis Group, *A KOSOVO ROADMAP (II). Internal Benchmarks*, IGC Balkans report no. 125, **http://www.crisisweb.org**, March 2002.

Special Coordinator of the SP, *2 ½ Years of Stability Pact: Lessons and Policy Recommendations*, Brussels, December 2001.

The World Bank, *THE ROAD TO STABILITY AND PROSPERITY IN SEE: A REGIONAL STRATEGY PAPER*, March 2000.

- **Newspapers**

Adevarul
Financial Times
Le monde
Romania libera
Ziua

- **Electronic resources**

<u>**International organisations**</u>

www.nato.int (NATO web site)
www.weu.int (WEU web site)
europa.eu.int (EU web site)
www.osce.org (OSCE web site)
www.un.org (UNO web site)
www.iwpr.org (Institute for War&Peace Reporting web site)

<u>**Research institutes and other institutions**</u>

www.sipri.se (web site of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute)
www.isn.ethz.ch/iiss/iisshome.htm (web site of the International Institute for Strategic Studies)
www.iris-France.org (web site of the Institut de Relations Internationales et Stratégiques)
www.iue.it (web site of the European University Institute in Florence)
www.rand.org (web site of RAND Corporation)
www.aspeninst.org (web site of Aspen Institute)

<u>**Reviews and journals**</u>

www.monde-diplomatique.fr (web site of "Le monde diplomatique" monthly journal)
www.lemonde.fr (web site of "Le monde" journal)
www.foreignaffairs.org (web site of "Foreign Affairs" review)
www.ft.com (web site of "Financial Times" journal)
www.ziare.com (web site of the most important Romanian journals)
www.defencenews.com (web site on defence news)
www.balkans.eu.org (web site of the electronic newspaper Le Courier des Balkans)

<u>**Other Internet resources**</u>

www.serecon.org (web site dealing with issues related to the stabilization and reconstruction process in the Balkans)
www.theepc.be (web site of the European Policy Centre in Belgium)
www.foreignaffairs.org/links.html (The Foreign Affairs Guide to International Affairs on the INTERNET)
www.crisisweb.org (web site of the International Crisis Group)
www.kosovocommission.org (web site of the International Independent Commission on Kosovo)

List of abbreviations

BiH – Bosnia and Herzegovina
CARDS – Community Assistance for Reconstruction, Development and Stabilization
CBSC – Counter-terrorism, Border Security and Counter-proliferation of WMD
CEECs – Central and East European Countries
CFSP – Common Foreign and Security Policy
CM/CRO – Crisis Management/Crisis Response Operation
CSBM – Confidence and Security Building Measures
(C)OSCE – (Conference) Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe
DGAP – German Council on Foreign Relations
EAPC – Euro-Atlantic Cooperation Council
EMU – European Monetary Union
ESDP – European Security and Defense Policy
EU – European Union
EUPM – EU Police Mission
FRY – Federal Republic of Yugoslavia
FYROM – Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
GDP – Gross Domestic Product
GNP – Gross National Product
GSZ – Ground Safety Zone
ICFY – International Conference on Former Yugoslavia
IDP – Internally Displaced Person
IFOR – Implementation Force
IPTF – International Police Task Force
IR – International Relations
ISAF - International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan
KLA – Kosovo Liberation Army
NAC – North Atlantic Council
NACC – North Atlantic Cooperation Council
NATO – North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NLA – National Liberation Army
NRF – NATO Response Force
PCC – Prague Capabilities Commitment
PfP – Partnership for Peace
PISG – Provisional Institutions for Self Government [in Kosovo]
PKO – Peace-keeping Operation
PSO – Peace Support Operation
RRF – Rapid Reaction Force
SEE – South-Eastern Europe
SFOR – Stabilization Force
S&M – [Union of] Serbia and Montenegro
SMR – Strategic Military Review
SOP – Standing Operating Procedures
SP – Stability Pact for SEE
SRSG – Special Representative of [UN] Secretary General
UCK – see KLA
UCPMB - Liberation Army of Presevo, Medvedja and Bujanovac
UN – United Nations
UNMIK – UN Mission in Kosovo
UNPA – UN Protected Area
UNPROFOR – UN Protection Force

UNSC – UN Security Council
UNSCR – UNSC Resolution
US – United States [of America]
WEU – Western European Union
WMD – Weapons of Mass Destruction
YPA – Yugoslav Popular Army

Annex - maps used (to be downloaded from http://users.pcnet.ro/natoeuinbalkans/maps.html)

Analysis grid of the risks challenging security[97]

1. **Self definition of the strategic situation of each state**
   - *Neighborhood*
   - *Inherited perceptions*
   - *Role and missions*
   - *Key-words/sentences and doxas*
2. **Perception of the specific political risks**
   - *Internal political risks*
     − Tensions between minority and majority
     − Religious tensions
     − Political orientations and tensions
     − Anarchy, anomie
     − Organized crime
   - *External political risks*
     − Border issues
     − Territorial claims
     − Fear or finding of interference
     − Fear or finding of migration
     − Fear or finding of isolation
     − Diffusion vectors
     − Environmental/ecological risks
3. **Perception of the specific economic risks**
   - *Internal structural economic risks*
     − Social costs of movements
     − Internal regional tensions
   - *External structural economic risks*
     − Perception of a retard
     − Dependence situation
     − Remoteness of the markets
4. **Perception of the specific military risks**
   - *Military risks*
     − Explicit risks within the new doctrines
     − Ratio armed forces/power/public opinion in the studied country
     − Armed forces ratio between neighbors
     − Relations with the international security organisms

---

[97] Cf. Foucher, op.cit. in note 6, p.12.

- *Military threats*
  - Near or far origin of the threats
  - Direct or indirect threats
  - Confirmed allies
  - Structural or opportunist neutrals
  - Lessons drawn out of crises; subsequent actions
- *"Systemic" risks*
  - Impact of a future accession to NATO, EU…
  - Impact of the existence of a lasting strategic risk
  - Impact of a de facto neutralization

5. Self definition of the present security interests

6. Place of the studied country within the security interests of…
- *The neighboring states*
- *The EU member states*
- *The United States of America*
- *NATO*
- *The EU*