CROSSROADS

December 2006

Cover Story

REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA - 15 YEARS SINCE THE FIRST DEMOCRATIC CONSTITUTION

Kiro Gligorov, Nikola Kljusev, Gillian Milovanovic, Doris Pack, Zhelyu Zhelev, Alain Le Roy, Umberto Vattani

---

Interview

SÜLEYMAN DEMIREL

Essays

HENRYK J. SOKALSKI, DANILO TÜRK, SRGJAN KERIM *on UN Reform*

MARC PERRIN DE BRICHAMBAUT *on OSCE in South Eastern Europe*

NIKOLA DIMITROV *on NATO*

BLERIM REKA *on Sovereignty*

Vol. I, No.1

CROSSROADS

CROSSROADS

Contents

Dear readers,

I would like to welcome you on the pages of the new publication of the Macedonian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. "Crossroads" – The Macedonian Foreign Policy Journal is projected to be the principal Macedonian periodical and a Macedonian web page in the area of International Affairs, Political Science and the Global Political Economy. This interactive publication is a unique blend of theoretical, academic, analytical and policy papers discussing the foreign policy of the Republic of Macedonia, as well as covering the issues of regional, European and global importance. The journal is also an information and policy hub for all the issues surrounding the foreign policy of the Republic of Macedonia and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Macedonia.

This first promotional edition of the "Crossroads" is dedicated to the 15th anniversary of the day when the first democratic Constitution of the independent Macedonian state was adopted. This date inspired us to reflect on the lessons learned during the 15 years of Macedonian statehood and its significance in the regional and wider European perspectives. However, at the same time this Journal aims to provide reflections and to offer visions for steering the future course of the Macedonian foreign policy, especially given its European and Euro-Atlantic dimension, as well as offering solutions for the challenges in the era of globalization.

The intellectual debate is critical for the foreign policy of every democratic state. The Macedonian Ministry of Foreign Affairs with this publication aims at promoting and deepening the debate in the Macedonian public on the issues of its interest, as well as to present the topics of the current global debates and to raise the awareness of the European, Euro-Atlantic and the pressing global issues in the Macedonian society. Therefore, I can only stress that this first edition of this publication was initiated and managed by creative workshop in the Macedonian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. However, the vision is to outsource this product completely to the civil society and the Macedonian academia, once we have a sustainable publication and a real journal of excellence. The first partnership was already achieved with the Macedonian Information Centre, an established Macedonian consultancy and a long-term partner of our MFA. In the next issues we will gradually increase the levels of partnership between the MFA and the Macedonian academic and intellectual community. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs welcomes the pluralism in the Macedonian think-tank community, regardless of their dominant political paradigms, and we hope that the tipping point for an ownership of this publication by the Macedonian academic

and think-tank community will come very soon. Furthermore, we would also like to witness the emergence of more specialized, analytical and creative think tanks, consultancies and intellectuals. Only this public-private partnership can assure the sustainability, quality and relevance of this Journal, not only in our national and regional public, but also in the wider European, transatlantic and global political, diplomatic and intellectual community.

We live in a time of constant and perpetual changes. The synchronization and integration in the globalized world are necessary for future sustainable and successful progress in this ever-evolving environment. Therefore, "Crossroads" – The Macedonian Foreign Policy Journal is the critical product for the knowledge management and exposure of the Macedonian debate to the currents of the European and global intellectual exchange. Eventually, this Journal will assist the full synchronization of the Macedonian society within the network of the globalized democracies.

Yours truly,
Antonio MILOSOSKI

15 YEARS OF INDEPENDENT REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA – REFLECTIONS AND PROSPECTS –

Kiro GLIGOROV

15 years of independent Republic of Macedonia, 15 years have passed since the Referendum at which Macedonian citizens spoke for independence of their state, 15 years since the adoption of the new Constitution of sovereign and independent Macedonia.

Pondering on these crucial historic evens, I must emphasize the circumstances in which these decisions were made, as well as the ensuing political commitments.

Following the fall of the Berlin Wall, the collapse of communism, and after the break up of the three former states - the USSR, Czechoslovakia and the SFRY- the political map of Europe was profoundly changed. Several new European independent states emerged. It is particularly important that for the first time in the history of the European Continent the changes were brought about not as a consequence of wars between states. Instead the changes resulted from the internal reasons of the former communist countries and the expressed will of the majority of their citizens.

The second key feature of those times was that the Macedonian nation, all Macedonian citizens did not want to be part of the wars and the blood quenched break up of the former SFRY. After all when establishing their state by the end of the II Word War, the Macedonian nation already paid the price of its statehood, with 24 thousand victims. It would not have been reasonable to again pay the same or even costlier price. At those times, as the President of the Republic of Macedonia I believed and I still hold the same view that the worst possible outcome of the Yugoslav crisis would be a break up of the former state through armed clashes taking victims and causing destruction, or by inciting hatred and severing long established friendships and ties, interrupting the peacetime economic development and cooperation. Unfortunately, this has come to pass. The essential point of my last effort supported by the former President of Bosnia and Herzegovina - Izetbegovic formulated in a joint platform, was exactly to avoid war, to preserve the functional ties among the former Yugoslav republics, which as independent states would have the right to international legal personality, and membership of the United Nations.

Mr. Kiro Gligorov was the First president of the Republic of Macedonia.
He was elected President of the Republic of Macedonia on January 27th 1991 and re-elected on November 19th 1994. Served as President of the Republic until November 19th 1999.

The third key consideration to be taken into account in this respect is that the European integration processes are the most positive development that has transpired in the Continent's entire history and that the Republic of Macedonia has had to keep the pace in becoming part of those processes.

My fourth consideration would be that the new geo-political setting in the Balkans demands a new approach in politics. In the Balkans, as rarely anywhere else in the world, several complex processes were opened. The balance of powers in the Region was disrupted. As a brief reminder: until the last decade of the XX century, in geopolitical terms the Balkans was the world in a nutshell – Romania and Bulgaria were part of the Warsaw Pact, Greece ad Turkey were (and remained) NATO members, the former SFRY was a non-aligned country, in fact one of the most active states in the non-aligned movement, Albania was a self isolated world of its own. The disrupted balance at the global level was inevitably directly reflected on the Balkan developments. There was security vacuum created which could have been filled only through enhanced presence and influence of NATO, coupled with the efforts to establish a new regional balance. And striking the right balance in the Balkans is not at all a facile endeavor. Indeed, at the outset, this process was burdened with unrealistic territorial goals under the nationalistic programs of certain countries, exasperated with the lack of resolve on the part of the newly established and existing regional countries in the search for their own foreign policy orientation. At the same time, in all countries in the Region, with the exception of Greece and Turkey, the process of internal democratic transformation or the so-called transition process started or was about to start. Long accumulated and suppressed disputes among the Balkan states and nations emerged to the surface in all their seriousness, encumbered with historic prejudices and stereotypes. This issue becomes even more serious in light of the ethnic ad other heterogeneous character of Southeast Europe and taking due account of the fact that there is not a single Balkan country not having on its state territory larger or smaller ethnic minorities, as parts of some of the neighboring nations. All these newly opened processes in the Region not only made the Region susceptible to strong external influences, but in fact enabled the attempts of global and regional factors to take advantage of the newly created circumstances and the security vacuum to pursue their own interests and agendas.

Against the background of such circumstances and considerations, the Republic of Macedonia decided to accomplish its independence in a peaceful, democratic, legitimate manner by way of referendum, adopting a new Constitution, reaching a negotiated plan for withdrawal of the former Yugoslav People's Army troops from the Macedonian territory, pursing good-neighborly relations etc. - or in short independence without wars, unnecessary victims, destruction and suffering.

As of the first moments of its independence, the Republic of Macedonia firmly committed itself to membership of the European Community, i.e. the European Union and membership of NATO. The country opted for policy of good-neighborliness and mutually beneficial cooperation with all its neighbors, implementing the concept of developing equally good cooperation with all countries in the Region. Such a

concept was based on the vital interest of the country and its citizens not to be engulfed in the maelstrom of war, but also on the inherent need to preserve the state independence in circumstances when it was under constant attacks and threats. The Republic of Macedonia was unequivocally resolved to patiently build trust and good-neighborliness, making efforts to peacefully resolve the historic disputes, existing misunderstandings and problems with other states, through dialogue, consultations and negotiations.

It was these positions and strategic commitments based on which the Republic of Macedonia requested the presence of UN peacekeepers on the Macedonian territory. The goal was to act preventively, to avert eventual spillover of wars that raged in the other parts of former SFRY.

The Republic of Macedonia was the first to establish friendly relations will all newly established states in the area of former SFRY. Despite the fact that previously the so called Badindteur Committee of the European Commission, singled out the Republic of Macedonia as one of the two former Yugoslav republics – together with Slovenia that fulfill the conditions for international recognition, the process of international establishment of the Republic of Macedonia and its membership of international governmental organizations was especially difficult. The reasons for this are well known, but let us remind ourselves once again: the initial objections by Greece to even accept the fact of existence of independent Republic of Macedonia, demonstrated in the uncompromising Greek endeavors to prevent the international recognition of the Macedonian state under its conditional and only name – Republic of Macedonia. Often times faced with fierce external pressures, economic embargoes, and direct threats, the Republic of Macedonia has gone through an ordeal and suffered immense damages. However, the process of its international establishment continued and continues irreversibly. The Republic of Macedonia has already established diplomatic relations with more than three quarters of the states worldwide, and more than two thirds of them recognize the constitutional and only name of our country.

15 years of its independence and the Republic of Macedonia has not changed its foreign policy priorities.

The integration of the countries of Southeast Europe into the EU and NATO is of political, economic, security, but primarily of civilization character and import.

The vital interests of each country in the Balkans, including thus the Republic of Macedonia, should be the stabilization of the situation in the Balkans and creating conditions for development and regional cooperation, acceleration of the reform pace in each country, dealing with numerous internal problems and creating realistic preconditions for EU and NATO membership.

The forthcoming membership of Bulgaria and Romania of the European Union has an evident positive impact on the situation in the Region. Now, the countries of the so-called Western Balkans make a double enclave, both in the context of the EU and in the context of NATO.

C o v e r S t o r y

THE ECONOMIC VISION OF THE FIRST DEMOCRATIC GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA

Nikola KLJUSEV

The economic erosion caused by the long lasting economic, political, and social crisis in former Yugoslavia from the 1980's onward devastated the processes of reproduction of the material manufacturing and blocked the dynamic of transition during this big historical reversal period. The big temptations that arose after entering the period of transition also created a theoretical confusion in the heads of many politicians and scientists, particularly of those dealing with social sciences, who acted laconically in the initial assessments of this transitional period. Many of them wanted to believe that it had to do with small modifications in the political and economic system. They still lived, both ideologically and emotionally, in a system that had to be abandoned. They started speaking loudly about modeling and reforming the socialist self-management system with the aim of not abandoning its foundations, but just reforming it instead. In the meantime, the Government was vigorously holding the positions that it was necessary to build a new political and economic system.

It is known that the proponents of these views at that time formed their party with reformists. This belief was also used for the reformation of the League of the Communists of Macedonia into the Social Democratic Alliance, and the Socialist Alliance into the Socialist Party.

This stratified understanding for making a reform of the existing status became the popular syntagm that was very often used in the presentations of our peak political and state leaders who were, in time, professionally responsible for the creation and explanation of the numerous reforms of the Titoist system.

Contrary to the above-mentioned positions, in the center of the conviction of the Government, there was the idea of dumping the futile destructive political and economic system and building a new, democratic and pluralistic system. The Government was the creator of its new political, economic, and social interpretation. For the Government, it was inexplicable and it presented political and economic nonsense to reform a system that had to be abandoned, to be buried down, and which had to become an economic, political, and moral purgatory.

Mr. Nikola Kljusev is a member of the Macedonian Academy of Sciences and Arts. He was the first prime minister of the independent and sovereign Republic of Macedonia from 27 January 1991 to 17 August 1992.

It was about abandoning a politically and economically inefficient and malfunctioning system that was atrophying in its own contradictions. It was a system based on utopist ideological postulates, a system filled with social conflicts in practice. The devastating repercussions of this system are the most evident in the technological depreciation of the economic and the overall social development, as well as in the horrible consequences for the economic and social essence on one hand and the moral erosion with a political and ideological satanization of individual freedom, thought, and creation on the other hand.

The proponents of the reforms, that is to say the make-up on the existing status, were understood by intuition. They were creating defense mechanisms for the existing system. They advocated the continuity of the system in a very cunning way. a non-transparent membrane in order not to discern and recognize its old anatomy wrapped its glaze. The old institutions and their personnel structures were jealously guarded.

Under such circumstances, the Government was in a constant hoop. It had a very narrow space for action. The economy was totally strained, without any financial or material stock reserves. The supplies for the population were becoming risingly dramatic because of the southern and northern blockades on our borders. The question related to elementary products supply like flour, oil, sugar, milk, oil derivatives, and so on was raised on a daily basis. The Governmnt was making enormous efforts working in conditions of an emergency state in resolving the raised problems. The population demonstrated a high moral and ethical dignity depriving itself of many indulgences at the cost of limiting its existence. This moral act of the people encouraged the Government in its consistency and persistency to find new solutions for the survival of the autonomous and independent state.

Motivated by the enthusiasm and high moral support of the people, the Government started to elaborate a macroeconomic poilcy, indicating that the accomplishment of the tasks of that policy would be under great influence of the entire instability, which implied needs for monitoring and adapting some segments for shorter periods of time of the year.

In the country, the economic activities continued quickly to fall as a consequence of the disintegration of the Yugoslav national and economic system and the broken-up reproduction-business relations of the regions in Yugoslavia with the other East-European countries. The national product of our country in 1991 fell by 15% compared to 1990, and the industry by over 20%. The use of the capacities fell significantly to 50%.

The non-liquidity of the economy was dramatically growing, that is to say the asymmetrically scheduled liquidity was acquiring upsetting rates. The economy could not normally cover the mutual debtor-creditor relations, including the covering of credit duties and paying wages, as well as other incomes.

The long-lasting trend of the fall in the investments, with disinvestments occurrences, threatened deep, long-lasting consequences and depression in the development capacity throwing the economy into technological inferiority.

The commercial and balance of payment deficit was rapidly growing reaching over 300.000.000 USD, while the unemployment rate was accumulating and reached the level of 165 thousand unemployed in October 1991.

On the other hand, the low level of efficiency and accumulation of the economy and the high deficit, losses, and other dubious situations were becoming long-lasting limitation factors and the most difficult problems of a material and financial character.

They stemmed, first of all, from the following occurrences:

- Losses in the current operations of the enterprises in 1991, together with the uncovered losses from 1990 amounted to 10.5% of the national product of the total economy in the same year, and the total losses were by 4.6 times higher than the expected accumulation.
- The losses in the non-economic, social activities in 1991 amounted to about one third of the accumulation in the economy;
- The deficit in the banks, due to losses and risky investments in 1991, was about 9% of the national product of the Republic for that year;
- The deficit caused by the exchange rate course differences for deposited hard currency savings in the National Bank of Yugoslavia (public debt) was about 967 million U.S. dollars, which was about one half of the national product of the Republic for 1991;
- The rates of growth were dropping tremendously and, in 1990, it was by 9.3%, while in 1991 – 10.7%. On the other hand, inflation was enormously rising: in 1990 it was by 120.5% and in 1991 – 229.7%, and so on.

These, as well as many other limiting factors, became the subject of thorough examination in the Government, particularly in the preparation and adoption of the macroeconomic policy.

Starting from these findings, the Government accepted the following basic tasks and directions of the macroeconomic policy for 1992:

1. Slowing the intensity of the decline in production and services;
2. Creating conditions for supplying the population with vital products and the economy with raw materials and energy;
3. Increasing export and maintaining foreign liquidity, and
4. Providing social protection for persons whose wellbeing depended upon it.

Moreover, due to the expected negative implications over our republic from the monetary policy of the rest of Yugoslavia, the government of the Republic of Macedonia started working intensively on designing its own monetary-credit policy and establishing its own monetary unit. At the same time, attention was concentrated on constructing a new fiscal policy (tax and customs system). The macroeconomic policy placed its research focus on the public consumption and the way in which

it was to be financed. In doing so, it was indicated that with this macroeconomic policy, the Republic of Macedonia would, for the first time, manage questions related to economic relations with foreign countries independently, especially as regards the policy of the exchange rate of the domestic monetary unit, the export-import regime, fostering and protecting production, credit-financial and foreign-economic relations, and the policy of hard currency reserves. In the program definition of the macroeconomic policy, the rights of the workers who stopped working due to the structural adaptation of the economy were indicated, as well as the possibility for greater employment in the future process of privatization.

In the preparation of the initial impulses of the realization of the governmental macroeconomic program, which, unforunately, lasted for a short time, its effects were felt. For instance, the buy-off of all the agricultural products from the 1991 and 1992 harvest was successfully finished, as well as the sowing program. We opened the border to Bulgaria for import of vitally important products from that country and from Turkey, which was tax and customs free. Later, we enacted the same policy towards Serbia.

The fact that FENI (Ferro-nickel industry, trans.rem) was reactivated was also rejoicing and the first 15.000.000 USD from export of ferro-nickel were earned.

At the same time, "Goldmak" was formed, our first company for production of gold goods. "Zito-luks" in Skopje, which constructed its new facility very quickly, offered new products from the assortment of dough and it started the construction of the most modern mill in the Balkans. Skopje Brewery enriched its assortment. Contacts with the famous "Coca-Cola" began for including the Brewery into its technological, production, and marketing net. New hopes were rising in the other sectors of the economy. Possibilities were opening for technological innovations with the introduction of digital technology in the Posta system. The program for export of lamb meat was accomplished with success. We overcame, in spite of great difficulties, the consequences of the oil shock, and REK-Bitola (mining and energy industry, trans. rem) and Oslomej (power supply station, trans.rem.) both operated resiliently. Dozens of small private enterprises that were formed every day started feeding the hungry market with a range of products and so on.

In all this effort, the Macedonian state got its Army that became the guardian of the Macedonian borders. A few days later, Macedonia got its monetary unit – the denar and it thus became a fully monetary independent state.

The Easter (1992) anti-inflation program started taming the galloping inflation that reached the level of 50% per month, while in April it reached up to 86%. The world's experience demonstrates that if inflation goes over 50% at a monthly basis, it is then hyperinflation with devastating consequences for the economy and the standard of living of the population.

The measures of the Anti-inflation program managed to refrain the inflation in May-June 1992 by 4 to 6% per month. As a result, there appeared tendencies for a small relaxation in the market, where peace was re-instilled with delayed payments for a large number of companies.

Just about the time the people started rejoicing the first successes of the anti-inflation program and the first steps of the operations of the government's macroeconomic policy, blows from low parties began to be felt over the government when the illegal law on the wages was passed in Parliament without the government's consent, which led to the breaking up of an anchor in the architecture of the program. This hasty and tendentious act was the precursor for the fall of the first government, which followed soon after.

Later, when the First Government had left, the leading personnel of the old system in all the structures of the social and national hierarchy shared the same opinion as regards the way of work and the method of behaviour, burdened by bribe and corruption and various privileges in the process of privatization of the state-owned capital. So, the old socialist directors of the Government of the Social Democratic Alliance (from September 1992) transformed these patterns in the process of criminal privatization into new capitalist owners.

Under such circumstances, in the first phase of transition in our country that, unfortunately, has been still going on in some domains for over a decade and a half, in the new conditions of the ruling (from the second half of 2006), it is necessary to mobilize the intellectual thought of the society in all its structures towards putting an end to the remnants of the transition.

If a general assessment is to be made, this phase is characterized with the following occurrences:

First, an accentuated political euphoria in which the thought and ideological determinations of every individual and his party affiliation or abstinence from affiliation is fermented until the rules and mechanisms of a pluralist political culture are built-up.

Second, social and class stratification according to insufficiently affirmed economic criteria. This is about the formation of a new social stratification in the society and, on these grounds, of a new political and ideological structure.

The social stratification of the population creates psychological and political repulsion towards the new entrepreneurs who emerge from the old nomenclature. The eyes of the people are filled with despise because of the fast way in which they are becoming rich. They are considered cheaters and thieves, a "class without culture, without national pride", which is little or not at all contributing to the society, people with dubious values and with only one goal – that of becoming materially rich via speculations, over the shoulders of the enormously impoverished population and impoverished state. They evade taxes, customs fees, and other taxes to the state. They do not register their employees, they do not pay them adequately for their labour, nor do they pay for their social, health, and pension securities. They are leading us back to the methods of exploitation of the 19th century, an era of primiive accumulation of wealth.

After all, the people are losing faith in the transiton. The despair and anger of the hungry is rising. The faith in the institutions of the state is lost because, fed by

ideological confusion, it is immitating the methods and organization of the old system whose carriers are the recognizable creators of the SDSM's nomenclature.

Third, there is the extremely irrational use of the factors of production that are at disposal, first of all the human factor and the technological capacities in conditions of insufficiently defined proprietor's relations and the managing-leading structures connected with them. Our manufactural capacities in the economy at that time were used by about 50%, while human resources were used by about 20% from the whole population.

Fourth, this is a phase of egregious expropriation, stealing, becoming rich, and of varous criminal acts in the process of implementation of the privatization and in the creation of the new market system with a mass impoverishment of the population. Low paid labour, the growth of an army of unemployed, more frequent liquidation procedures, the enormous number of people on social welfare, theft of social property, the "frozen" hard currency savings of the population, the uncleared housing relations in the proces of privatization, growing criminal activity, rapes, murders, and so on, have thoroughly eroded social security and the existence of the population.

It was demonstrated in practice that at the beginning of the transition towards a market economy, those who became rich first, will not be the creators of a new production needed by the people. Those who became rich fast will be profiteers availing of the defaults of the market, the prices, and the missing mechanisms of the economic system. There will be fewer entrepreneurs in the material production, and significantly more private initiatives in the service, like: trade, catering, various services and mediators who, in the absence of a new tax, customs, and financial system, will make great profits through speculation.

In many post-socialist countries as in our country, it was affirmed that the larger part of the new capitalists are people of the old nomenclature who, using various manners, appropriate the social property that they used to manage during tenure as staff of the one-party rule. Unfortunately for the people and contrary to the people's will, they "started" the first market game. They have the authority, the power, the wealth, and the position. They buy-off – steal – the best companies and locations. Linked with the state bodies, they easily obtain the consent, the licenses for export-import, and they practice bribe and corruption.

The initial information in that period is very indicative, we can say filled with defeatism. According to many analyses (Poland, Hungary, Russia, and especially Romania, Bulgaria, Macedonia, and Albania), the ideological chaos and the psychological shock among the population indicate total surprise among the people. The people are not properly oriented; they feel to have been cheated by the initial euphoric moments on one side and the concrete practice on the other side.

Fifth, this is also a phase of organized state crime on the side of the ruling structures. At the same time, in this economic chaos, this is a phase that requires the development of a new economic strategy for the future property model in our country, beginning with discovery, identification, and irradication of the huge criminal personalities and bands through transparent legal proceedings.

Sixth, it is necessary to open space for developing a state ruled by laws and institutions that will enable a civil emancipation in practicing democracy. That is to say the rule of the people instead of national depression / disenchantment with the political process and parties' cults. In these frameworks, the foundation of the freedom of the individual, the introduction of the feeling for the individual values and dignity, as well as the development of a new scale of moral values and ethical norms of manners are necessary.

Seventh, this phase is also characterized by a negative influence of destructive external factors: Greece's blockade and negation of the state's constitutional name, Serbia's blockade, collateral damages from the wars in Yugoslavia, the imposed war from Kosovo with human victims and material and cultural devastations. All of this has conditioned a high-risk situation in the region that has been followed by an exodus of foreign investors, while inside the country there had previously been a high level of ethnic intolerance until the famous Ohrid Agreement was signed.

C O V E R   S T O R Y

A UNITED STATES PERSPECTIVE ON MACEDONIA

Gillian MILOVANOVIC

I am pleased to have been asked to contribute a short article to the inaugural edition of the "Macedonian Foreign Policy Journal." I applaud the editors for their initiative, and wish them sustained success in their efforts.

Establishing Independence

With the 1991 referendum on independence, the Republic of Macedonia dissociated itself peacefully from the former Yugoslavia, and it was this "freely manifested will of the citizens" that the country's first constitution invoked in codifying the principles upon which the country would be based. Fifteen years later, on the anniversary of the Constitution, an independent, stable, democratic, and free-market oriented Macedonia is seen internationally as of great importance, not only to Macedonia's own citizens but to the region as a whole. Whether serving as a model unitary inter-ethnic state or dealing generously with regional challenges—such as when Macedonia hosted more than 200,000 Kosovar refugees in 1999—Macedonia has proven to be a valuable partner in addressing local, regional, and global concerns.

Regional & International Integration as Keys to Stability

As the country emerged from the breakup of the former Yugoslavia, Macedonia's leaders and population alike viewed the country's future in other international and regional cooperative arrangements. They looked to membership in international organizations and Euro-Atlantic institutions to affirm and consolidate independence and as a way to address the pressing social and economic issues the young country faced. Macedonia today is a member of the World Trade Organization, the OSCE, and the Council of Europe. It is a NATO aspirant and a European Union candidate country. It works closely with the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank in pursuing its economic growth and development goals. Macedonia cooperates regionally through the South East European Cooperation Process (SEECP) and with

---

Ambassador Gillian Arlette Milovanovic is U.S. Ambassador to the Republic of Macedonia.

the United States and with its fellow NATO aspirants Albania and Croatia in the Adriatic Charter.

Forging the Future – Framework Agreement and Beyond

Confronted with the threat of continued violence and a divided society, Macedonia in 2001 faced a watershed decision. That decision led of course to the Ohrid Framework Agreement and the accompanying consensus that the way forward lay not in violence and conflict, but in dialogue, mutual understanding, political compromise, and cooperation.

Today, the letter and the spirit of the Ohrid Framework Agreement (FWA) remain as valid and as critical to Macedonia's future as on the day the FWA was signed. The United States is proud to have played a role, along with our EU, NATO, OSCE and other international partners, in supporting Macedonia as the country's leaders and citizens worked to begin transforming the FWA into a daily, functioning reality. We look forward to continuing our work with the central government, and with local governments, to help ensure that the FWA is fully and successfully implemented. The FWA has been and remains a solid foundation for the country's stability and future development.

The FWA-mandated decentralization process has transferred to Macedonian municipalities responsibility for a number of government functions, including urban planning, property tax collection, and management of social, educational, and select cultural institutions. Equitable representation, also mandated by the FWA, aims to ensure that Macedonia's ethnic minorities are represented in state institutions. It is estimated that currently as many as 20% of state employees are drawn from minority populations. We believe this figure should increase at a sustainable rate, encompassing a range of ministries and agencies, while at the same time ensuring—through a fair, non-partisan and transparent recruitment, hiring and promotion system—that only qualified personnel are engaged to fill state positions or promoted to higher levels of authority.

It is our view that the FWA, although it was a specific response to a specific set of challenges, corresponds to the aspirations of the overwhelming majority of Macedonia's citizens for a peaceful, stable, secure environment in which government is increasingly close to the average citizen. It is especially encouraging to note that public opinion polls over the past year have shown a steady improvement in inter-ethnic relations, with increasing numbers of members of all ethnic groups holding positive views of other ethnic communities.

We are encouraged that the government has included as a priority the continued improvement of inter-ethnic relations, and that it has stated its commitment to further implementation of the Framework Agreement. It is important now for all sides, those parties in government as well as those that are not, to work on reaching a consensus on how to approach legislative and policy priorities through dialogue, debate, and compromise in order to ensure the country builds on what has already been achieved and moves ahead on its path to integration in Euro-Atlantic institutions. Equally important is the further development of a culture of consultation among

government ministries; between municipal and national government; and among citizens, government employees, nongovernmental organizations, and the institutions charged with making decisions that affect them.

Essential Role of Economic Growth and Development

While they are necessary, equitable representation, decentralization, and inter-ethnic accord and consensus alone are not sufficient for Macedonia to forge its future. Economic growth and development, the primary stated focus of the current Government of Macedonia and a top-priority goal for my Embassy as well, is the additional key element. With a stable macro-economic climate characterized by low inflation, a stable exchange rate, and positive government debt ratings from international credit rating agencies, Macedonia should be poised for the growth. To achieve that growth, the government will need to sharpen its focus on making Macedonia an attractive destination for domestic and foreign investors. That focus should include ensuring full transparency and accountability in the remaining privatizations of state-owned enterprises, cutting through bureaucratic red tape to make it easier for companies to do business here, and convincing foreign and domestic firms that government tender processes will be conducted in a fair and transparent manner.

We at the United States Mission—whether the Department of State, USAID, Department of the Treasury, Department of Justice, or other U.S. government agencies—will continue our activities aimed at assisting Macedonian businesses to be more competitive. We will continue providing some of the tools for Macedonian firms to compete globally in the information age, and helping to provide much-needed liquidity in the financial system to give small and medium enterprises the capital they need to invest in streamlining and improving the efficiency of their operations. We will continue to support the government's efforts to promote Macedonia as an attractive tourist destination. And we will press the government to combat effectively the corruption at all levels that chokes off economic growth by strangling business competitiveness.

Contributor to Global Security in the 21st Century

Having come a long way from the early 1990s, when UN peace-keeping forces were dispatched to Macedonia, the country is now a contributor to global security. From the Global War on Terror, in which Macedonia's troops are standing shoulder-to-shoulder with ours in Iraq and Afghanistan, to its recent contribution to the EU peacekeeping operation in Bosnia-Herzegovina, Macedonia has proven ready to take on the security challenges of the 21st century. We encourage the government to continue those valued contributions and to do so in a sustainable manner that does not shortchange funding for continued defense reforms that are required for eventual NATO membership.

Macedonia continues to make progress in its efforts to be the strongest possible candidate for NATO membership at the next NATO Summit at which the Alliance decides to consider issuing invitations, perhaps in 2008. In particular, Macedonia's defense reforms to date have been impressive. As noted, it is making valuable

contributions to international security operations. The country recently passed an important NATO membership hurdle in conducting parliamentary elections in July that were considered to have largely met international standards despite irregularities, some of them serious, observed at some polling stations.

Preparing for NATO Membership

There remains much work to be done, however, in strengthening Macedonia's NATO candidacy. We look to the government to engage in diligent, non-partisan efforts to implement judicial reforms essential to strengthening rule of law, and to combat more aggressively and effectively corruption, trafficking in persons, and organized crime. We urge the government to work closely with religious authorities in Macedonia and with other appropriate stakeholders to craft a liberal law on religious communities and groups that meets international religious freedom standards. As mentioned above, we will work with the government, the municipalities, and the private sector to help create economic conditions conducive to attracting the investment necessary for creating and maintaining steady economic growth—growth that will produce jobs for Macedonia's citizens and also make Macedonia a more attractive candidate for NATO membership.

The EU Membership Challenge

Largely complementary to Macedonia's efforts to prepare for NATO membership have been its efforts to meet EU membership criteria. Having become an EU candidate country in 2005, Macedonia is moving ahead with determination to meet the EU requirements. It is our view, based on the experience of previous NATO and EU enlargements, that despite the very clear distinctions between the two institutions, progress in meeting the requirements of one would be seen in a favorable light by the other.

A Successful Future

Macedonia's entry onto the global stage as an independent country has been characterized by a number of challenges. It has also, however, been marked by undeniable successes. Whether it has been enterprising businessmen overcoming obstacles, political leaders whose vision ranges well beyond party concerns and who are willing to compromise and to commit sincerely to an agreement for the good of the country, or mayors taking advantage of decentralization to listen to and improve services to citizens, Macedonia is a testament to the spirit of human will and endeavor. Having lived in this country for over a year, and having had the good fortune to get to know many of its citizens, I remain convinced, as this journal is published on the 15th anniversary of the Constitution of the Republic of Macedonia, that this spirit of collaboration, good will, diligence, and success will continue to prevail.

Cover Story

MAZEDONIEN UND
DIE NEUE EUROPÄISCHE REALITÄT

Doris PACK

Mazedonien kann stolz sein auf das Geleistete seit der Unabhängigkeit. Als einziges Land, wenn man Montenegro ausklammert, geleng es ihm, ohne Blutvergießen seine Eigenstaatlichkeit zu gewinnen. Durch etliche Startschwierigkeiten behindert, aber auch mit vielen Möglichkeiten versehen, entwickelte sich, Kritikern zum Trotz, ein tragfähiges Staatswesen. Heute ist Mazedonien ein EU-Beitrittskandidat und auf einem guten Weg. Allerdings darf man nicht vergessen, dass die erstem Regierungen nach der Unabhängigkeit Fehler gemacht und Entscheidungen verpasst haben. Eine ganz Reihe der Mängel, die im Kommissionbericht des letzten Jahres noch aufgelistet wurden, hätten schon viel früher beseitigt werden können. Heute ist das nicht mehr so einfach wie vor zehn Jahren, da sich vieles schon institutionalisiert hat. Die Europäische Union hat gleich nach dem Zerfall Jugoslawiens die Notwendigkeit einer Integration des Westlichen Balkans erkannt. Leider waren weite Teile der politischen Elite eher mit sich selbst als mit einer weitsichtigen Politik zum Wohle für ihr Land beschäftigt. Lange Zeit vor Konflikt des Jahres 2001, als man in der Internationalen Gemeinschaft noch davon ausging, dass Mazedonien ein Musterbeispiel einer funktionierender multietnischen Gesellschaft sei, hätten die Politiker die Lebens-, Bildungs- und Arbeitsbedingungen der albanischen Bevölkerung angleichen müssen. Wir Abgeordnete im Europäischen Parlament haben dies immer angemahnt, der damalige Staatspräsident Gligorov hat uns in zwei Geschprächen Mitte der 90iger Jahre diesen Handlungsbedarf bestätigt und bedauert, dass die Regierung nichts unternähme. Das Ohridabkommen, an dessen Zustandekommen der leider zu früh verstorbene Staatspräsident Trajkovski einen hohen Anteil hattte, hat leider erst sehr spät die notwendigen politischen Schritte erzwungen. Solche Reformen und Maßnahmen gleich zu Anfang der 90iger Jahre hätten Mazedonien vor manchen bewahrt und schneller EU-tauglich gemacht.

Wenn die EU nach Bulgariern und Rumänien erst einmal keine andere Mitglieder aufnimmt, so bedeutet das nicht, dass man sich abwendet oder gar einer neuen Erweiterung verschließt – im Gegenteil! Die Europäische Union hat spätestens mit dem Scheitern des Verfassungsvertrages erkannt, dass sie sich selbst reformieren muss.

Doris Pack ist eine deutsche Politikerin und Mitglied des Europäischen Parlamentes (MdEP).

MACEDONIA AND
THE NEW EUROPEAN REALITY

Doris PACK

Macedonia can be proud of its accomplishments since independence. It succeeded as the only post-Yugoslav country, with exception of Montenegro, to gain its own statehood without blood being shed. Though hampered by early difficulties but also accompanied with opportunities, Macedonia developed a functioning political system, in spite of initial criticism and skepticism. Today Macedonia is a candidate for EU membership, and generally on the right track. However, it must not be forgotten that the first governments after independence made mistakes and failed to make right decisions. A lot of deficiencies, noticed also in the European Commission report, could have been eradicated much earlier. Nowadays, such errors are more problematic and greater in magnitude than 10 years ago, since many issues have already been institutionalized. Soon after the breakup of Yugoslavia, the EU had recognized the necessity of integration of Western Balkan. Unfortunately, a huge share of the political elite was preoccupied with its own interests, instead of creating farseeing policy for the well being of its citizens. A long time before the 2001 crisis, when the international community still regarded Macedonia as an exemplary model of functioning multi-ethnic society, the politicians should have directed more effort toward equalizing the living, working, as well as education conditions for the Albanian community. We, the members of European Parliament, sent our permanent reminders and the then President Gligorov confirmed to us during two conversation in the mid-90's that there is an urgent need for action and has complained about the Governments' sluggishness in this regard. The Ohrid Agreement, which was negotiated largely thanks to unfortunately too early deceased President Trajkovski, enforced belatedly the necessary political steps. Implementation of such reforms and measures right at the beginning of the 90's, would have saved Macedonia from some appalling experiences and made it EU-fit much earlier.

If the EU does not accept any more members for now, once Bulgaria and Romania enter the club, it does not mean that it plans to avoid or even to prevent the new enlargement – on the contrary! At least since the failure of the Constitutional Treaty, the EU has realized that it requires reforms. Therefore there are four good

---

Ms. Doris Pack is a German politician and Member of the European Parliamen

Für Mazedonien gibt es daher vier gute Gründe, warum diese institutionelle Reform der EU Vorrang vor weiteren Aufnahmen haben sollten:

1. Nur durch eine Reform kann die Europäische Union integrationsfähig bleiben und den Herausforderungen, die durch eine Erweiterung entstehen, erfolgreich begegnen. Erweiterungskommissar Olli Rehn machte kürzlich in Berlin deutlich, dass es keine Erweiterung vor 2009 geben wird. Damit hat sich die EU eine Frist gesetzt, um die notwendigen Reformschritte verwirklichen zu können. Ein Ziel der Deutschen Ratspräsidentschaft in der ersten Hälfte des Jahres 2007 wird denn auch ein neuer Anlauf für den Verfassungsprozess sein. Zudem sollte sich m.E. die Europäische Union deutlich zu ihren Grenzen bekennen; sie kann nicht den ganzen europäischen Kontinent umfassen, oder sie wird ihren Aufgaben, wie sie im Vertrag stehen, nicht mehr gerecht werden können. Dass der sog. Westbalkan zur EU gehört, belegt schon ein Blick auf die Landkarte; ab 2007 liegt er mitten in der EU, nur umgeben von EU Mitgliedstaaten.

2. Auf dem Balkan gibt es noch eine Reihe vo ungelösten Problemen. Das dringendste ist derzeit die Anwtort auf die Frage des künftigen Status des Kosovo. Die Stabilität einer ganzen Region hängt davon ab, daher sollte es im Interesse aller Nachbarländer sein, dass bald eine tragfähige Lösung gefunden wird. Da sich die EU ganz deutlich zu einer Integration Sudosteuropas bekannt hat, dürfte es auch im eigenene Interesse Mazedoniens sein, dass die Probleme vor einem Beitritt nachhaltig gelöst sind.

3. Mazedonien muss zunächst die Beitrittkriterien erfüllen und die Mängel, die der Kommissionbericht aufgelistet hat, beseitigen. Auch dazu bedarf es einiger Zeit, die Geschwindigkeit hängt allerdings von der Regierung und ihren Bürgern ab. Wer schon jetzt spekuliert, welchen Kommissar Mazedonien einmal bekommen soll, der hat nicht verstanden, worum es geht. Der Blick auf die Reälitat in Mazedonien ist daher genauso wichtig wie der Blick aud die Europäische Realität in Brüssel und Straßburg. Es wäre daher besser, sich auf die Reformen in Mazedonien zu konzentrieren und weniger Energie auf das Klagen gegen die Einschätzungen aus Brüssel zu verwenden. Die Spekulation mit Daten eines möglichen Beitrittstermins schürt Erwartungen und ist wenig hilfreich. Es dürfte jedem klar sein, dass Mazedonien innerhalb der nächsten drei Jahre bis 2009 die Kriterien noch nicht restlos erfüllen kann.

4. Ein fester Beitrittstermin für Kandidaten führte im Falle von Rumänien und Bulgarien zu mangelndem Reformeifer und teilweise Stillstand bei notwendigen Veränderungen, da man sich auf die zeitliche Zusage des Beitritts verlassen hat. Der Generaldirektor der Erweiterungskommission hat Mitte Oktober diesen Fehler eingestanden und erklärt, dass er kein zweites Mal gemacht werden wird. Die EU wird sich daher neben eigenen institutionellen Reformen auch darüber einig werden müssen, wie der

reasons to clarify to Macedonia why these institutional reforms should take priority before the new enlargements:

1. The EU can remain capable of dealing with further integration, notwithstanding the enlargement-related challenges only if it proceeds with reforms. The Commissioner for Enlargement, Olli Rehn, has put it bluntly recently in Berlin that there will not be a new enlargement before 2009. Therewith the EU has put itself the deadline to be able to implement the necessary reform steps. The goal of the German EU-Presidency in the first half of 2007 will be the new beginning for the constitutional process. Moreover, the EU must define plainly its external borders; because it is not able to encompass the whole European continent and risks to lose the power to perform its basic tasks, as they stand in the Treaty. One quick look at the map is fully sufficient to realize that the so-called Western Balkan belongs to EU; since 2007 it will be located within the EU, surrounded by EU-members.

2. There are a number of unsolved problems in the Balkans. Currently the most urgent among them is finding the answer for the question of future status of Kosovo. As the stability of the entire region depends on that question, sustainable solution of the problem should be a primary interest for all states neighboring Kosovo. Since the EU has affirmed its willingness for integration of South-Eastern Europe, it is also a vital interest of Macedonia these problems to be resolved utterly before the accession occurs.

3. At the outset, Macedonia has to fulfill the accession criteria and to eliminate shortcomings listed in the European Commission report. It is time-consuming but the pace of the process depends first and foremost on the performances of the Government and the citizens. If one speculates already, which Commissioner-position Macedonia will gain in the future, he surely misses the point. A realistic viewpoint on Macedonia is as important as a realistic viewpoint on "European reality" in Brussels or Strasbourg. Therefore it would be advisable to focus on the reforms in Macedonia and to spend less energy on moaning about assessments from Brussels. Speculating with dates of the possible accession stirs up expectations, which can prove counter-productive. It is obvious to anyone that in the following three years, Macedonia will not be able to fulfill all of the accession criteria.

4. Setting a firm accession date proved counter-productive in the case of Romania and Bulgaria because, since the announcement of that date, both countries showed lack of reform-eagerness and to some extent even standstill in regard to performing the necessary changes. The Director of DG-Enlargement has acknowledged this mistake in the middle of October and promised that a similar one will not be made again in the future. Hence, the EU besides its own institutional reforms will have also

Erweiterungsprozess optimiert werden kann. Es gibt keinen Zweifel, dass die Staaten Südosteuropas in die EU integriert werden müssen, allerdings nur dann, wenn es sorgfältig und nachhaltig geschehen kann. Mazedonien hat als Beitrittskandidat bereits seine Fahkarte gelöst.

Die mazedonische Regierung muss ihren Bürgern in der nächsten Zeit aber auch klar machen, wofür die EU steht, auf welchen Werten und Zielen sie beruht und wie sie die Zusammenarbeit der Mitgliedstaaten organisiert. Den Menschen in Mazedonien ist teilweise gar nicht bewusst, was es bedeutet, wenn ihr Land Mitglied wird. Ein Informationsprozess muss weite Teile der Bevölkerung erreichen und klar machen, dass zum Beispiel rund 60% der nationalen Souränitet nach Brüssel abgegeben werden. Für die Bürger der alten EU-Staaten ist dies nichts Besonderes mehr, denn sie sind damit auf- bzw. in den Prozess hineingewachsen und dennoch haben auch sie noch bisweilen Schwerigkeiten der Akzeptanz. Es muss auf alle Fälle vremieden werden, dass die Bürger sich plötzlich von Europa bedroht fühlen oder der Sinn nicht mehr verstehen. Am Beispiel der zehn neuen Beitrittsländer nach der Erweiterung im Mai 2004 hat sich gezeigt, dass aus einer EU-Begeisterung schnell eine EU-Skepsis werden kann. Die und auch eine neue Europäische Realität brauchen Verständnis und Zeit, die hat Mazedonien noch, muss sie aber gut nutzen. Der Zug, für den Mazedonien seine Fahrkarte gelöst hat, ist unterwegs. Parallel, auf einem anderen Gleis fährt der Zug der Europäischen Union. Unbestritten ist, dass beide Zuge noch ein Stück ihres Weges zurücklegen müssen, um in den Bahnhof einfahen zu können.

Ich bin jedoch zuversichtlich, dass die Europäische Union ihre Reformschritte so schnell wie möglich verwirklichen wird, um dann, wenn auch Mazedonien seine Beitrittskriterien erfüllt haben wird, es als neues Mitglied in der EU willkomemen zu heißen.

to compromise on how to optimize the process of further enlargement. Undoubtedly, the states of South-Eastern Europe have to be integrated in the EU. However this process must be conducted carefully and also be sustainable. Macedonian, as an official candidate for EU accession has already obtained the ticket.

In the short-term perspective, the Government of Macedonia has to clarify to its citizens, what the EU stands for, what values and goals it rests upon, and finally what is the substance of cooperation among its member states. People in Macedonia are hardly aware, what does it mean when their country will be a member. An information campaign must reach across the spectrum of the population and point out that, for instance, ca. 60% of the national sovereignty will be ceded to Brussels. Even the citizens of the old EU-states, who were born into the entire process have some obstacles with accepting the whole set of rules. Thus, we have to avoid such foreseeable scenarios – a backlash feeling among Macedonians of endangerment by Europe caused by a misunderstanding of the essence of EU membership. The example of ten new EU members after the enlargement in May 2004 shows that EU-euphoria can turn quickly into EU-skepticism. The new European reality requires understanding and time. Macedonia has to use efficiently the time it has at its disposal. The train Macedonia had obtained the ticket for is on the way. Parallel, on the other platform drives the EU-train. Unquestionably, both trains need still some time before they will able to arrive on the final station.

Nevertheless, I am fully confident that as the EU will accomplish its reform steps as soon as possible, and Macedonia completes its own reform agenda soon, the Union will be ready to welcome it as a new member.

COVER STORY

MACEDONIA TODAY AND THE FUTURE OF MACEDONIA

Zhelyu ZHELEV

BULGARIA WAS THE FIRST TO RECOGNIZE THE REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA

Even though Macedonia was officially recognized on January 15th 1992, its recognition wasn't a one sided step. There was a continued battle by our diplomats for the international-legal recognition and establishment of the Republic of Macedonia long before and after this date. As far back as September 1990, during the discussions in New York with Mr. Jovic at the time President of Yugoslavia, the so called Macedonia issue came to the forefront. I then told him that "we do not have any aspirations towards Yugoslavia. As far as we are concerned, this is an artificially created issue and it would be best if we restrained from exporting our internal problems. In that sense the right of the population to self-determination is a fundamental criterion in our policy regarding the issue of nationality.

No one in Bulgaria has the right to dictate to the population of the Republic of Macedonia what to choose as its nationality affiliation. That is their business and right, just like no one on the territory of Yugoslavia, including the Republic of Macedonia, has the right to impute to our population in the Pirin region how to identify themselves. Furthermore, in the case of Macedonia, the historic and political aspect of the nationality issue should not be confused in practice in order to avoid adaptation or falsifying of history, in an attempt to appease the political elite".[1]

As a result of all of this, these principles were permanently built into our policy towards the Republic of Macedonia. Towards the middle of 1991, when it became clear to everyone that Yugoslavia is heading towards disintegration, at the initiative of Greece, a meeting was organized between the Prime Ministers of Greece, Serbia and Bulgaria. This meeting was supposed to be held in Athens and the only issue on the agenda was to be the fate of Macedonia. I immediately opposed this and invited Prime Minister Dimitar Popov to a meeting. He was ready to go and it seemed to me that he would go enthusiastically. He certainly saw matters differently.

---

[1]   Presidential address towards the people and the Parliament, Plovdiv, 1997, page 41.

   Dr. Zhelyu Zhelev is a Bulgarian politician who was President of the Republic of Bulgaria from 1990 to January 1997.

I explained to him that even attending that meeting would be something quite awful. Regardless of the positions that will be defined there, the meeting seems like (reminds) of the most unpleasant episodes from the history of diplomacy when the neighbors of a country which is in a dire situation, to no fault of its own, are getting together to discuss its fate without inviting it to the meeting.

At the end, Dimitar Popov agreed not to accept the invitation, excusing himself with the explanation that such a meeting should be attended by the Prime Ministers of all Balkan states. Just in case, that same night I issued a statement on TV in which I explained why such a meeting should not be held. This foiled the attempt to hold this meeting behind Macedonia's back. We did not sit around with crossed hands while we were waiting for a decision by Robert Badinter's Arbitration Commission (at the time Badinter was President of the Constitutional Court of France), authorized by the European Union to develop principles and criteria that would be used to determine which former Yugoslav republics should be recognized as independent states.

Debates were going on in the Parliament and in the general public between various political forces. We also did not omit to probe foreign mood during visits by foreign delegations. The Commissions on national security and foreign policy of the 36th National Assembly had special sessions from which emerged the opinion that Bulgaria is obliged to be the first to recognize Macedonia or to be among the first to recognize its independence. I keep in my archives the stance of the Commission for national security, which "evaluates that the simultaneous recognition of the independence of the republics Slovenia, Macedonia and Croatia is of exceptional importance for European security. The commission is of the opinion that this recognition should be realized in an orderly manner together with the first states that will do that. We believe that it is necessary for this position to be officially made public in the days before January 1st 1992. At the same time in the days leading up to January 15th 1992 energetic diplomatic steps should be taken to secure maximum support for this position from Europe, including Russia, Ukraine, the Baltic States and others…"

The decision was reached with a consensus – 22 votes. The document is dated December 19th 1991 and is signed by Jordan Vasilev at the time President of the Commission on national security. A similar stance came out of the Commission on foreign policy, except that their proposal is dated January 15, 1992 i.e. the date on which Macedonia was officially recognized together with the other three former Yugoslav republics: "The Commission on foreign policy in the Parliament expresses its consent with the Government of the Republic of Bulgaria in its decision to recognize the independence of the republics – Slovenia, Croatia, Macedonia, Bosnia and Herzegovina. The Commission expresses its readiness to also recognize the independence of the republics – Serbia and Montenegro – immediately when they request it. Our position is based on an equal approach towards the former Yugoslav republics and the criteria for recognizing their independence adopted by the European Community, with its decisions from December 16th 1991 in Brussels and with the decisions of the Arbitration Commission of the Community from January 14th 1992. With the simultaneous recognition of the four Yugoslav republics we affirm the efforts

of the Republic of Bulgaria to support democratic processes, peace and stability on the Balkan, in compliance with the Concluding Document of Helsinki and the Charter of Paris for a New Europe.

The entire democratic public (I believe also a not so small part of the BSP)[2] was in favor of recognizing Macedonia and that if not the first then Bulgaria should be among the first that will recognize Macedonia. Later a story appeared that Stojan Ganev, Minister of Foreign Affairs, was against the recognition of Macedonia. That is not true. It is true that the recognition was done in his absence and without his knowledge. Objectively, in speeding to recognize Macedonia it happened that the minister of foreign affairs was sort of disavowed. I believe that anyone in his position would have reacted in the same way, if not worse, when he found out from the journalists at the airport that his Government recognized Macedonia without informing him. Similar was the reaction of Stefan Savov, Chairman of the National Assembly, who was abroad and was informed of the news immediately upon his return to Bulgaria. If there were no attempts to change things, I would not have raised this issue. However, when the truth is perverted and with shady goals is adapted to suite political conditions, it is everyone's duty to protect the truth.

If there is anyone who should be accused for these dramatic misunderstanding, then I think that should be Filip Dimitrov. For instance, he could have sent an encrypted message to Stojan Ganev and Stefan Savov about the Government's decision to recognize Macedonia.

In the entire situation with various vanities, which was created around the recognition of Macedonia, a certain role was played by Stefan Tafrov. He just moved from the President (where he was my foreign policy counselor) to start working for the SDS[3] as the first deputy to minister S. Ganev, and during this tense day he was overexerted between the three institutions – President, Government and Parliamentary commissions.

The report of the Arbitration Commission showed that Macedonia fulfilled all the criteria and requirements, especially having in mind that all social changes to that date were realized in a peaceful and democratic manner and it was the only republic on whose territory there were no military operations.

We decided that the official recognition of Macedonia would be made on January 15th together with the recognition of the other three former Yugoslav republics – Slovenia, Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina. In compliance with our constitution, the Government reached the decision early in the afternoon and later that afternoon Filip Dimitrov, together with the ministers from his Cabinet went to the Parliament to read the decision. As head of state, I attended this ceremony.

The MPs from the SDS and the DPS[4] accepted this decision with ovations, standing up. The MPs from the BSP were sitting down and frowning.

---

[2] BSP – Bulgarian Socialist Party
[3] SDS – Union of Democratic Forces
[4] DPS - Movement for Rights and Freedoms

That same evening I addressed the nation via TV:

"Dear fellow citizens,

Today, January 15th 1992, the Republic of Bulgaria decided to recognize the independence of the republics Slovenia, Croatia, B&H and Macedonia. This decision is entirely in compliance with the spirit of the report of the Arbitration Commission of the EU, lead by the President of the Constitutional Court of France Robert Badinter. Our decision is an expression of the principled policy of Bulgria which respects the right to free and democratic self-determination of every nation, including the creation of independent states.

This decision, once again affirms the aspirations of Bulgaria to be a factor of stability on the Balkan and to assist in the real uniting of Europe on the basis of the principles of international law and the values of democracy. Here meet the national interests of Bulgaria and the joint European policy.

Our policy is a logical consequence of our attitude towards the crisis to the west of our borders, a position which the Bulgarian state defended many times over. We are convinced that this decision is an important step forward towards closer cooperation with all our neighbors and for even closer integration within the frame of the general European process. This is an essential characteristic of our new foreign policy, which the Republic of Bulgaria will follow well into the future. I am convinced that the entire Bulgarian nation and all political forces support the decision of the state leadership of Bulgaria".[5]

We were greatly disappointed with the EU's decision, from April 6th 1992, when it recognized the other three former republics while Macedonia which more than the others fulfilled the criteria of the Badinter Arbitration Commission, was not taken into consideration for recognition. The recognition of its independence was postponed indefinitely.

We all knew that this happened because of the pressure coming from Greece. Having in mind that the EU reaches its decisions with a consensus, it was enough for one state to issue a veto and with that to block any decision.

This induced me two days later to make public a declaration, with which Bulgaria called upon Europe to recognize the independence of Macedonia.

"We were impatiently expecting the decision of the regular session of the Council of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the EU, which was held in Luxembourg. The recognition of Macedonia and Bosnia and Herzegovina was on its agenda. As it is known, a decision was reached on April 7th to recognize B&H while the recognition of the Republic of Macedonia was once again postponed.

---

[5]   Presidential address towards the people and the Parliament, Plovdiv, 1997, page 96.

We support the decision of the Council of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the EU to recognize B&H and believe that this will have enormous influence in reducing and stopping the military-civilian conflict. As you know, we also recognized the independence of B&H on January 15th together with the recognition of the independence of Croatia, Slovenia and Macedonia.

However, we are very upset because the EU, which for us is the strongest factor supporting the democratic processes in Eastern Europe, continues to be shortsighted and has a an unjust attitude towards the fate of the Republic of Macedonia in spite of the conclusion of the Arbitration Commission, lead by Mr. Badinter, according to which Macedonia entirely fulfills the international criteria for independence and statehood. I will point out that the conclusion of the EU's Arbitration Commission was at the center of the decision of the Republic of Bulgaria to simultaneously recognize the four former Yugoslav republics as independent states.

As far as we are concerned, the postponement in recognizing the independence of the Republic of Macedonia could have unforeseeable consequences for its security and could contribute to a new destabilization of the Balkan. Every postponement of this issue brings with it more risks and danger.

Because of this the Republic of Bulgaria appeals, in the name of justice, peace and security, at the earliest convenience, immediately at the next meeting of the Council of Ministers for the EU to adopt a decision to recognize the independence of the Republic of Macedonia".[6]

Having this in mind we continued to work on the recognition of Macedonia by other states. Of course, first of all by its neighbors. It is hard to imagine that there was anyone who lobbied more than us in Turkey, Greece, Romania, Serbia and Albania. We were of the opinion that the neighbors should be the first to recognize the independence of the Republic of Macedonia in order to introduce an element of security and stability in the region. The international-legal recognition of a state, first of all makes the state itself more stable. Second, it introduces an element of security and stability in the region where that state is located. Macedonia, which in all wars of this century was an "apple of discord" between the Balkan states, could now become the factor that unites them, the link between them, but only if in their foreign policies they aspire towards European principles and standards.

For the good of the Republic of Macedonia we worked with the EU member states, but also with countries which are not its members or are located far away from Europe. For instance Italy was close to recognizing Macedonia. The Government of Italy reached a decision on this, but at the last moment the European Commission reacted against the one-sided proclamation because it would violate the EU's principle

---

[6]   "Presidential address towards the people and the Parliament", page 106 - 107.

of consensus. Turkey, Belorussia, Russia, Ukraine and the Philippines, which recognized Macedonia before the European Commission, did so to a great extent because of our influence. I will tell you of two cases, primarily because they are so colorful.

I am talking about Turkey and Russia.

During the course of 1993, when the military conflict in Yugoslavia was flaring up, we were advocating for the deployment of NATO and WEU[7] military contingents on the border between Macedonia and Serbia, because only they could prevent the spreading of military conflict to the territory of Macedonia. Such contingents were deployed and as symbolic as they were, they fulfilled their mission.

When in 1993 and at the beginning of 1994, Greece unilaterally put in place an embargo on trade-economic relations with Macedonia in order to strangle it, it was Bulgaria which once again offered its hand of assistance when it opened pipeline of oxygen from Burgas to Skopje. Of course, all of this at the expense of once again straining its relations with Greece.

In gratitude towards our principled, consistent, un-relentless policy towards Macedonia, President Gligorov sent me letters on several occasions, some of them written in his own handwriting.

I will take the liberty of quoting the letter which refers to the Greek embargo.

> Skopje February 23rd 1994
> Dear Mr. Zhelev,
>
> At the beginning I would like to greet you and thank you for the support you gave us after the introduction of the unilateral measures of an economic embargo which the Greek Government introduced against our country. The closing of the border and as a result of that, the denial of access to the Solun port used in transportation of goods to and from the Republic of Macedonia, has seriously endangered the economic development of our country. This especially refers to the supply of gasoline, raw materials for the industry and other goods needed for our foreign trade etc. We must orient ourselves towards alternative routes which are more difficult and more expensive. This is an additional burden for our economy. That is why we highly regard Your readiness to assist us in overcoming these difficulties when we need it the most.
>
> We also greatly appreciate the support which the Republic of Bulgaria is giving us internationally. We will continue to need this aid and assistance in the UN, in the OSCE and in other international organizations where these issues will be debated.
>
> I would like to inform you that at this moment of special use will be any assistance your country and Government can give us through the opportunity to utilize in the most effective way possible the ports of Burgas and Varna for receiving, unloading and transport of goods to and from the

---

[7]   Western European Union

Republic of Bulgaria. A priority is liquid fuels, essential goods, as well as raw materials required by our industry. Besides railroad and road transport vehicles which you have at your disposal, it would be of use to place as needed at our disposal a certain number of road and railroad transport equipment from and to the ports. I hope that the Bulgarian organs will find understanding for certain priorities and alleviate certain formalities when our trucks and goods cross the border crossings on the Macedonian-Bulgarian border, lifting of the payment of taxes (excise tax) for goods in transit, alleviation of customs formalities and other. I would suggest that these and other issues become the topic of special meetings between the two Governments.

Mr. President, I would like to once again assure you of our most sincere friendship and faith in the successful future of our mutual relations.

Yours,
Kiro Gligorov

Turkey Recognizes Macedonia

After our recognition of the Republic of Macedonia on January 15th, together with the other former Yugoslav republics – Slovenia, Croatia and B&H – it was very important for other Balkan and European states to recognize the sovereignty, territorial sovereignty and territorial integrity of these republics. The international recognition of these parts of the dissolved Yugoslav Federation, introduces an element of security and stability. It is more difficult for a country to fall under foreign aggression or disruptive activities if it is recognized by a maximum of countries and is under the umbrella of the UN.

Guided by these suppositions we did everything we could for the international-legal recognition of these republics, first of all of Macedonia which at the time - under pressure from Greece - was almost neglected by the EU.

That is why I first of all addressed Turkey, more precisely the Prime Minister of Turkey at the time S. Demirel. In fact chance created that opportunity.

It happened during the traditional winter meeting in Davos/Switzerland, which is held every year in last days of January.

It was January 31st 1992. My last meeting before leaving, was to be with the Prime Minister of Turkey Demirel. He greeted us very affectionately. As is the custom they offered us Turkish coffee and treated us to baklava. Both sides expressed satisfaction with the good development of bilateral relations. We talked about unresolved issues related to assets owned by the diocese in Istanbul, delineation of the sea border near the river Resovska, about the perspectives of the Black Sea economic cooperation etc.

At the end of the discussions I asked Mr. Demirel would Turkey recognize Macedonia, explaining the principles which guided us in adopting that decision. Turkey is a country of key importance in the region and recognition from Turkey would play an important role in stabilizing the Balkan and each of the former Yugoslav

republics. This would also encourage other countries to follow suit. Demirel thought for a while staring at the ceiling. At that moment looking at him in profile, with a strong lower jaw thrust forward he looked like Mussolini in profile. It was funny to me because I knew how false that similarity was. Demirel has always been a well-intentioned person and politician.

- I firmly promise you, he said, the Government of Turkey will recognize Macedonia within one week.

And really, on the fifth day after our discussion, news came that the Government of Turkey officially recognized the Republic of Macedonia. In this way Turkey became the second country to recognize Macedonia after Bulgaria, just like us under the name "Republic of Macedonia".

As a result of that Turkey implemented an active and principled policy for consolidation of the Republic of Macedonia and the other three Yugoslav republics – Slovenia, Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina. In that sense Turkey played an exceptionally important role in stabilizing the Balkan during dramatic circumstances in the Yugoslav federation – dissolution and a civil war. There were even periods during which its policy towards Macedonia was more active and more elastic than ours, for which understandably there were objective reasons. Turkey immediately, without thinking about it, accepted young Macedonians to study in the military schools to become officers in the future Macedonian army, which due to language closeness could have been done more easily by Bulgaria. However Turkey's role in the stability of the Balkan does not end with the swift recognition of the four new states which emerged from the territory of the former Yugoslavia, up to the formal confirmation of their sovereignty and territorial integrity. Perhaps even more important and permanent is the role it plays as a barrier against Islamic fundamentalism. Turkey is the first barrier in its direction towards Europe and more immediately towards the Balkan. We are the second barrier.

What is unique in the case of Turkey is that it is a Muslim country / and a barrier against Islamic fundamentalism. Probably because of this, playing the role of barrier frequently takes on dramatic characteristics.

No less important is the role Turkey plays in the construction of the transportation and energy network of the Balkan. In that sense it has always been very active and open, constantly supporting EU transportation projects and the initiatives of its Balkan neighbors.

It wasn't by chance that in December 1995, President Demirel energetically supported the New York Presidential Declaration and called upon the presidents of the other countries through which the corridor "East – West" passes, to sign it. I believe that president S. Demirel is one of the few politicians who understands the key role played by the communications system (transportation, energy and telecommunications) for the permanent resolution of Balkan problems and its approximation towards Europe.

Russia Recognizes Macedonia

At my invitation, on August 3rd 1992 President Boris Yeltsin arrived on his first official visit to Sofia. During the visit it was envisaged that several bilateral agreements between Bulgaria and Russia would be signed, as well as a series of other agreements in the field of the economy, light industry, agriculture, trade, transportation and even military-technical cooperation. The official delegation which accompanied Yeltsin included Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin, the Minister of Foreign Affairs Andrey Kozyrev, the Minister of Defense Pavel Grachev and many others.

I went to the airport to greet them, as is the custom in such situations, and after the official ceremony together with Yeltsin we drove off in one car. The ceremonies were still going on at the airport in front of the VIPs there. After usual chit chat about his trip, health, the weather here and there, he told me that he arrived directly from negotiations with the President of Ukraine Kravchuk about the division of the Black Sea fleet.

He was tired but obviously pleased with the outcome of the negotiations which had lasted four and a half hours.

He said that because he is tired he would prefer instead of an official dinner, for the two families to have dinner together, so that we can openly talk without bothering with protocol. I told him no problem, even though the official dinner was on the agenda for tomorrow evening. Therefore, after they had an opportunity to settle in and take a break, somewhere around 19.30 we would have dinner. Because it was so hot, they gave us an aperitif under the trees behind House no. 7 in the residence "Bojana".

We talked about different topics, mixing in memories. Then during our second glass he gave me a compliment. He had heard that I was a serious politician because of two situations: from my categorical position against the August 19th 1991 coupe and second that I did not succumb to pressure from Gorbachev not to meet him during my official visit to Moscow in October 1991.

My wife then returned the compliment with these words: On the other hand Boris Nikolaevich I have heard that you are a brave politician and that you will go much further than Gorbachev because of two things: first because you had the courage to get on an armed personnel carrier and from there to call on the citizens of Moscow to resist those who were supporting the coup and second because you refused to accept the medal "Hero of the Soviet Union" which Gorbachev offered you as reward for suffocating the coup…"

The whole time Naina Josifova was offering Yeltsin to start eating: "Try Boris Nikolaevich try!"

I understood that he might quickly succumb to the alcohol and tiredness, so I reminded him of our two previous discussions about Russia's recognition of Macedonia: in Istanbul in June and in Helsinki at the beginning of July 1992. In both cases he firmly assured me that Russia would recognize Macedonia.

The moment I mentioned Macedonia he told me that there is no need to remind him.

- Tomorrow – he said – I myself will state before the official delegations that Russia recognizes Macedonia and at the press conference I will show the decree with which this act is carried out.

Truly, the next day, during the official discussions in Bojana, without further reminding him, he stated that Russia recognizes Macedonia.

After the discussions between the two delegations which lasted at least an hour and a half, we had to sign with Yeltsin the new Agreement between the Republic of Bulgaria and the Russian Federation, while the ministers from both countries were to sign appropriate agreements for cooperation in various fields of the economy and defense. After this procedure finished we headed out to House no. 2 in Bojana for a press conference which raised a great deal of interest. The weather was very beautiful and sunny so I suggested that we walk to there. He agreed with pleasure. The two delegations headed out. Exactly half way I decided to remind Yeltsin not to forget to show the journalists the decree for the recognition of Macedonia. At that moment he stopped and called on the Minister of Foreign Affairs:

- Козирев…
- Что, Борис Николаевич?
- Пиши Указ!
- Какой Указ, Борис Николаевич?
- Указ о признании Македонии Российской Федерацией…[8]

Kozyrev fell into despair and clicking his hands started to explain:

- Знаете, Борис Николаевич, греки очень чувствительны на эту тему. Они на нас рассердятся…
- В данном случае, меня греки не интересуют. Болгарская позиция самая правильная. Пиши Указ! Я должен показать его журналистам…
- Но это невозможно сделать, Борис Николаевич, потому что печать осталась в самолете…[9]

Then Yeltsin turned to me and told me that before the journalists he will make public the recognition of Macedonia by Russia, then 10 minutes after liftoff of his airplane from the airport in Sofia the Decree would be signed, a seal affixed on it, after which they will announce this on the radio…

---

[8] *- Kozyrev…*
  - What, Boris Nikolaevich?
  - Write a decree!
  - What decree, Boris Nikolaevich?
  - Decree for the recognition of Macedonia by the Russian Federation…

[9] *- You know Boris Nikolaevich; The Greeks are very sensitive to this issue. They will be angry at us…*
  - In the given situation, I am not interested in the Greeks. Bulgaria's position is correct. Write the Decree! I must show it to the journalists…
  - But we can't do that Boris Nikolaevich because we left the seals on the airplane…

Truly, ten minutes after his airplane took off we received a radio message that the Decree for the recognition of the Republic of Macedonia had been signed and a seal affixed on it.

There was no need to make this news public the news had already reached all the agencies.

President Yeltsin remained true to his word both about the press-conference and about the signing of the Decree on the airplane. During the press conference he himself first started to speak about Macedonia and said something much stronger than I expected: "President Zelev and I personally call on the EU: recognize Macedonia. Support Macedonia, there will be less bloodshed if the country is recognized by everyone. Bulgaria can feel the Macedonian problem breathing down its neck and knows it better than any other country, including Russia. That is why we take the same direction as Bulgaria and support..."[10]

Greek diplomats reacted very nervously and in an un-restrained manner towards Russia's guest, taking it upon themselves to tutor Yeltsin about what he should and should not do. Kozyrev reacted to this in the only possible way he could: "We categorically reject the tone and expressions used in the declaration of the spokesman of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Greece regarding the decision of President Boris Yeltsin to recognize the Republic of Macedonia. It is absolutely unacceptable, even more so for a country with which we maintain friendly relations, to address Russia in this way, challenging the declarations and positions of our President. We hope that the Greek side will take this into consideration and therefore we believe that the issued statements were hastily given and are illogical.

Russia does not accept the claims that the recognition of Macedonia is 'a hostile act' against Greece. On the contrary we believe that this will be a step forward towards security and stability of all Balkan states."[11]

The declaration of the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs is interesting not so much because of Russia's categorical position about the recognition of the Republic of Macedonia, but more so because it is so analytical and well-thought out. It draws attention to the fact that Greece, with its blocking activities on the Macedonian issue, is creating a "dangerous security vacuum" in the heart of the Balkan. At the end it also speaks about the name of the new state: "As far as the name of the country is concerned, the solution depends on the wish and choice of its people. This does not exclude the possibility to seek a solution which will suit the neighbors of the new country."[12]

I was happy that Russia showed such deep understanding about our Balkan policy even in the part related to our policy towards Macedonia.

Similar understanding showed the ambassadors of the western countries. Many of them came to see me to especially express their understanding and support. But

---

[10] Ferreira, Louis Gonzaga, "A revolution in the East. A citizen of Portugal in Sofia", S., 1997., p.449.

[11] Ferreira, 1997., p.449.

[12] Ferreira, 1997., p.449.

because those were oral addresses I can not quote them. I will limit myself to what was written by the long-standing Ambassador of Portugal Louis Gonzaga Ferreira: "Just like in the past, today at the dawn of the independence of the young state, the Macedonian issue is once again becoming a Bulgarian national issue. Not in the sense of an ultimatum, which is an attempt by Greek irrationality, but as a real reminiscent of history, which decades ago witnessed the burning of what was the Macedonian land and the lands of the nations that surround them, and of blood lines, bad advice in moments when anxiety and passions run high and spread out.

That is why we owe so much to the wisdom shown and proven by the Bulgarian people and by its Head of State, to wisdom and a sense for the European belonging of the new Bulgaria. We are pleased to note that Greece, after it went to far with nationalism and massive demonstrations in Athens and Solun, now accepts the road to dialogue for a just approach towards the Macedonian issue".[13]

Bulgaria – Greece Relations And The Recognition Of Macedonia

It is a fact that because of the recognition of Macedonia, Bulgaria and Greece could often be found on different and sometimes on confrontational positions. This could create the wrong impression that we were searching for excuses to confront Greece, or that Bulgaria is guided by some behind the scenes goals and ambitions towards the Republic of Macedonia.

The main goal of our new foreign policy, with the recognition of Macedonia and the other three former Yugoslav republics, has always been the introduction of a security element to the Balkan. The faster a new state is internationally-legally recognized and established, the faster it becomes a factor of security in the region and chances are smaller for it to become the target of an aggression from outside or for internal disorder and unrest to appear.

Drawing conclusions from the tragic history of the Balkan during the 20th century, when in all the Balkan wars, during the I and II World Wars, Macedonia was the "apple of discord" we concluded that this time Macedonia should become the link which will connect us. But for that it first had to be recognized by its neighbors: Bulgaria, Greece, Albania and Serbia. That is why we insisted that they be the first to recognize Macedonia. In that sense Bulgaria was the first to start the dance. We wanted to set an example, knowing very well that at the end of things, recognition is unavoidable.

In a situation when a federation was falling apart, in a raging civil war, it was very important not just for Macedonia to be recognized but also how fast it would be recognized. The earlier that happened the less opportunities there are for it to become the victim of aggression or discords and from that to turn into an additional source of destabilization of the Balkan.

Bulgaria had its own reasons for being the first to recognize Macedonia. In this way with one stroke it cut the Gordian knot of complicated entangled relations from

---

[13] Ferreira, 1997., p.458.

the time of the Second World War, from the adventures of the Komintern immediately after the war and from the clash between Tito and Stalin after 1948. Second, with this it practically showed that it is implementing a new foreign policy in line with European principles and standards, in this case also with the criteria developed by the Badinter Commission. Third, no one in Macedonia can now say that Bulgaria was forced to recognize Macedonia because it saw that that the other European states recognized it. Even if such a politician and citizen appeared, in light of the facts his words will be unserious and unconvincing. There is even less room for claims that Bulgaria has dishonest thoughts and intentions towards Macedonia.

That our policy was based on principles and that in no way did we want to confront our neighbors, least of all Greece, can be seen from the fact that we supported Greece's request for article 48 of the Macedonian Constitution (which promises protection and patronage of the Macedonian minorities in the neighboring countries) to be changed in the spirit of European standards. I recall that during the meeting with Kiro Gligorov in Burgas in 1992, this question was the first we addressed and it took over one third of the meeting time. We told President Gligorov that Greece is correct about this request and that is why we support their request. If every Balkan state puts such an article in its constitution and starts to implement it into practice, then we might as well blow up the Balkan. Kiro Gligorov said that they don't at all give that meaning to this article in the Constitution, but that they are ready to give all necessary guarantees and to calm down the neighbors. Because it is very complicated and difficult at this moment to change the Constitution – it would require a two thirds majority – they would adopt a special Parliamentary declaration on this issue. We however remained firm on our opinion, that one does not exclude the other and that it will be more secure when the appropriate article in the Constitution is changed. That would be best both for its neighbors and for Macedonia.

In the epic about the recognition of Macedonia we perhaps made one fundamental mistake towards Greece – we did not warn Mitsotakis's Government and the Prime Minister himself. I am not talking about getting their consent or agreement for recognizing Macedonia, but rather simply about previously informing them so that they are not surprised and unprepared – which is exactly what happened. If that had been the case the Government of Greece would have had enough time to prepare a tactic and strategy and not to become the victim of the unbridled public mood. This was especially important because we are talking about a friendly party from that time "New Democracy"[14], which supported us from the first steps that Bulgarian democracy took.

Constantine Mitsotakis was the first Prime Minister and leader of a ruling party to came to Sofia and establish relations with the Union of Democratic Forces. "New Democracy" supported us in the elections for the Grand National Assembly, at the second parliamentary elections in October 1991, as well as for the presidential elections in January 1992; not to mention the humanitarian assistance which our Greek friends sent to Bulgaria during the difficult winter of 1990 – 91.

---

[14] *Nea Dhimokratia*

All of this indebted us to be at least more careful towards them. However, with my hand on my heart I can state that no one on our part imputed an evil thought in undertaking this step and no one allowed the recognition of Macedonia to be received as an act directed towards Greece.

Who could have guessed that Greece would react in such an upset and tempestuous manner to the recognition of the Republic of Macedonia under the name "Macedonia" half a century after that country existed under the same name within the Yugoslav Federation. Who could have thought that the Greek general public would object to the symbols of the new state as if though they are encroaching on their historic heritage – even more so because there is no serious historic evidence to support that. The Macedonian state of Alexander the Great and his father Philip II was never a Greek state. They waged wars with the Greek city states and conquered them one by one, after which with their support he started his campaign towards the East, conquering the whole ancient world. It is no coincidence that after the death of Alexander the Great, anti-Macedonian uprisings erupted in several Greek city states and the empire fell apart.

Of course the Macedonian state was under strong influence from Greek culture and civilization. But who in the 5th or 4th century BC was not under strong influence from Greek culture and civilization? This equally applies to the Thracians, Dacians and Illyrs, because central Europe at the time was Ellada[15]. Europe – that was ancient Ellada. It is not by chance that the Roman Empire, which came later, emulates Ancient Greece.

According to me, the Greek politicians made several wrong steps with which we could not agree. One of them was the unilateral embargo towards the Republic of Macedonia. This policy came from a position of strength whose goal was to economically strangle the young state, to throw it to its knees and to force it to accept conditions dictated by Greece. Such a policy, from a position of strength, at the end of the 20th century, in Europe, by a member of the EU, was absolutely unacceptable. That is why we rejected it and opened the road Burgas – Skopje so that the young state wouldn't really be strangled.

The members of the EU also unanimously condemned the embargo and made efforts to have it lifted. Besides principle reasons to have the unilaterally introduced embargo lifted, we were afraid of other things. If Macedonia was economically paralyzed, that would have also contributed to its political destabilization. Then it could have easily become the victim of foreign aggression or civil war on an ethnic basis, which would have practically meant that military activities would reach our western borders. In such a development, Macedonia could become the detonator for Kosovo and in that case it would have been difficult to predict Albania's reaction. In any event, the possibility existed that the war could spread outside of the borders of the former Yugoslavia and spread to the territory of other Balkan states.

I believe that a similar mistake was made with the entire racket that was raised over the name of the country. So what if it is called the Republic of Macedonia, even

---

[15] Ellada means Greece in Greek.

more so because it existed with the same name within the Yugoslav Federation for half a century? Could the state sovereignty of this small country threaten in any way Greece which besides all other advantages has the privilege of being the only Balkan state that is at the same time a member of the EU and NATO.

These consistent mistakes by Greece towards Macedonia have for me always been strange and inexplicable, because they hurt more the prestige of Greece itself rather than bring it any benefit or profit.

Second, Greece is the direct successor to grand traditions in leading foreign policy and diplomacy. In that sense it is the successor to the rich experience from ancient Ellada from before the new era, as well as the thousand year policy of Byzantine. Third, as the only country on the Balkan which is simultaneously a member of the EU and NATO, Greece has at its disposal great opportunities to favorably influence the processes going on in entire post-Communist Europe. I feel that instead using its historic chances and advantages it did the opposite. We are not just talking about the recognition of Macedonia. For instance we, their neighbors, besides support from NATO and the EU are hoping for a new and more intensive development of bilateral relations through the opening of the border crossings between the two countries. Even though we have been working for seven years on this issue and have always had the consent of our Greek friends, to date we have not noticed any significant progress. We are not talking just about Bulgaria. On the Balkan Greece could play a more important and more active role in the construction of the communication infrastructure in the region, in which all nations of the Balkan are equally interested. It isn't by chance that 10 (or so) highways that have to cross the Balkan Peninsula can be found in the plans of the EU. Obviously the member states of the EU know much better that the Balkan, as an inseparable part of the continent, should be Europe-ized so that Europe doesn't become Balkan-ized.

A View Towards The Future

When talking about the recognition of Macedonia, it is mostly said that Bulgaria was the first to recognize Macedonia. But it isn't just that. The diplomacy of the new democratic Bulgaria invested much more efforts in convincing the Governments of other countries to also recognize Macedonia. First of all the neighbors of Macedonia, the Balkan states, and later the other European countries which are not members of the EU and because of that are not bound by the need for consensus required by this economic community in adopting similar decisions. Besides Turkey and Russia, we tried to persuade Ukraine, Belorussia and the Philippines to recognize Macedonia.

During the course of 1992 – 1994, on several occasions we tried to convince American politicians, diplomas and generals, who visited Bulgaria in relation to the war on the territory of the Yugoslav federation which was falling apart. During these visits they would start by first commending our country, because in spite of the unstable circumstances in the region, Bulgaria remained an island of stability. I believe that these commendations were not the result of usual diplomatic courtesy - they were sincere because that was the truth.

At the very start of the dissolution of Yugoslavia, we clearly and precisely presented our position on several points: first Bulgaria will for no reason and in no way interfere in the events in Yugoslavia, nor will it try to exploit its difficulties; second, we called upon all neighbors to abstain from meddling, because anything like that could be the cause of the next Balkan war or would at least spread the military fire outside of the borders of the Yugoslav federation; third, for the war to stop the UN or NATO under the umbrella of the world organization must play a part. No one can accuse them of revenge, aggression etc. Unlike the Balkan neighbors of Yugoslavia, they are not and can not be burdened with such suspicions.

In these discussions with the Americans, we never omitted to call upon the USA to recognize Macedonia, explaining in great detail what a great contribution that would be not only for the new country, but also for the Balkan in its entirety.

In that sense I remember the discussion I had with Mrs. Albright, which came to visit the region on the same mission. After convincing her for half an hour, presenting all arguments in favor of our thesis and after explicitly insisting on indicating how important it is for the USA to recognize Macedonia, she said that this is an interesting idea which deserves to be seriously thought out and reviewed… and that she will work on it.

I don't know what Mrs. Albright did then as Secretary of State of the USA, but in spite of everything in practice there were no results. Last year President Bush officially recognized the Republic of Macedonia i.e. 15 years after Bulgaria, Turkey and Russia, the USA also recognized Macedonia under its constitutional name "Republic of Macedonia". As it is said in such circumstances: better late than never.

Everything we said so far is from the past and belongs to history. For us more important is what is happening today and perhaps more important is the future. Today, because we are still here and participate in it, thanks to which we can do and mend matters where it is needed and possible. The past can not be made and amended in any other way, except if it is falsified. I don't think that a serious person, be he politician, an intellectual or an ordinary citizen, could be engaged in such a wasteful and ungrateful work.

We don't know the future yet because it has not come yet – we don't have it. In the worst case, it could happen that it arrives and we are not here anymore. But having in mind that the future always grows from today, we can create a picture about its coming and development, based on some characteristics of today, even if that is not always accurate. In this way, to a certain extent we can influence the future.

On the other hand we can not analyze today, in any country only within the frame of its territory. We should try to review it in parts in a certain region, in which it is located, in the borders of the continent in which it belongs and of course all of that within a global context. In today's modern, more globalized world - that is simply essential.

From that point of view, I look at the future of the countries of the Balkan region with optimism, including of course the Republic of Macedonia. My optimism about the European future of our countries is based on two very important

suppositions. One is that those in power are being replaced in a democratic manner, that all Governments that today are in power were elected in a democratic manner – through free multi-party elections. This indicates that the political infrastructure of democracy (multiparty system, elections, a Parliament with an opposition, independent judiciary etc.) has been developed in each of our countries. Second, the foreign policy doctrines of all Balkan countries identify membership in NATO and the EU as a fundamental priority. Even though certain countries are at a different distance from the goal, these two suppositions are of exceptional importance. They do not divide and confront the countries in the region, but rather they unite their efforts and in this way they unite them even more.

There is also a third supposition, which is directed and works more and more for the Euro-Atlantic integration of the countries in the region. It is a fact that there are regional problems that can not be resolved without united efforts even outside the Euro-integration efforts. For instance, construction of the 10 intercontinental highways, which according to the EU will pass through the Balkan Peninsula. Let's take the most important of them – corridor 8 – which starts from Brindizi on the Italian coast, passes through Duress - Tirana – Skopje- Sofia- Plovdiv to Istanbul. This project can be realized only with the united capacities of the countries through which it passes, plus the financial support of the EU. More or less this also refers to the other major highways.

There is also another problem that will be difficult to resolve outside of the EU. I am talking about the ethnically based separatist movements which are gravitating towards independent states with their own borders, customs, army etc. I have in mind Kosovo, Republic Srpska, the Albanians in the Preshevo valley in southern Serbia, partially the Albanians in Macedonia. This tendency is also strong in the southern Caucuses. From 10 – 17 September 2006 I visited Azerbaijan, Georgia and Armenia. The dispute over Nagorno-Karabakh between Azerbaijan and Armenia, Southern Ossetia which has a population of 60 thousand people and which does not want to be a part of Georgia, similar situation in Adzharia etc.

All of this directs me to think that the real solution to this problem is not to make independent the minorities in separate sovereign states, but the solution is in Euro-integrations in which borders, even formal ones, loose their meaning and state sovereignty also looses its previous meaning.

What is the importance of state sovereignty and borders to an individual, when he can go to work wherever he wants to, to live wherever he wants to, to send his children to school or to get qualifications wherever they want to, in one word when he is a citizen of Europe with all the rights and benefits that Euro-integration secures him?

Besides, dividing countries on an ethnic basis is essentially a tendency that has an anachronous & anti-historic character if we have in mind that the world is moving in the opposite direction - towards integration in a larger community of the regional, continental and planetary kind. We are all talking about globalization while in fact we are not paying enough attention to the fact that we are not and can not be left out.

TÉMOIGNAGE SUR
UNE PÉRIODE DE TRANSITION

(Octobre 2001 - Novembre 2002)

Alain LE ROY

En premier lieu, je voudrais remercier le ministère des Affaires étrangères de Macédoine pour le grand honneur qu'il me fait en m'invitant à apporter mon témoignage à l'occasion de la parution de ce document célébrant le 15ème anniversaire de la Constitution.

Mon témoignage portera naturellement sur la période octobre 2001-novembre 2002, période pendant laquelle j'ai été le Représentant spécial de l'Union européenne à Skopje, succédant à François Léotard et précédant Alexis Brouhns, Michael Sahlin, Sören Jessen-Petersen et Erwan Fouéré.

Mon mandat consistait à être "facilitateur du dialogue politique" pendant cette période marquée par les évènements conflictuels du premier semestre 2001, puis par la signature des accords d'Ohrid en août 2001, leur approbation par le Parlement en novembre 2001, leur début de mise en oeuvre par la suite, enfin par les élections législatives d'octobre 2002.

Chacun connaît ces évènements; je me limiterai donc à rappeler ou souligner quelques faits ou impressions qui me paraissent à la fois significatifs et exemplaires :

. Alors que la guerre en Bosnie-Herzogovine a engendré plus de 200 000 morts, et que les évènements au Kosovo ont coûté plusieurs milliers de vies humaines, la Macédoine a su mobiliser son énergie, trouver des ressources en elle-même et démontrer son sens des responsabilités en résolvant, avec l'aide de la communauté internationale, un conflit potentiellement aussi violent que ceux de ses voisins, tout en limitant le nombre de pertes humaines à environ une centaine.

. Durant toute cette période troublée, et bien entendu jusqu'à aujourd'hui, la Macédoine a réussi à conserver à sa tête un gouvernement multiethnique, composé de partis macédoniens et albanais, cas unique dans la région.

. Les accords d'Ohrid ont abouti à l'approbation par le Parlement de changements majeurs dans la Constitution, y compris dans son préambule. Cette approbation fut délicate à obtenir, mais il me semble qu'aujourd'hui la grande majorité de la population

---

Alain LE ROY, Ancien Représentant spécial de l'Union européenne à Skopje
(octobre 2001 - novembre 2002)

TESTIMONY TO
A PERIOD OF TRANSITION

(October 2001 – November 2002)

Alain LE ROY

First of all I would like to thank the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Macedonia for doing me a great honour by inviting me to pen this testimony on the occasion of this journal's release commemorating the 15th anniversary of the Constitution.

My testimony will of course be related to the period between October 2001 and November 2002, during which I was the European Union's Special Envoy to Skopje, succeeding at that position Francois Leotard and preceding Alexis Brouhns, Michael Sahlin, Soren Jessen-Petersen and Erwan Fouéré.

I was assigned to "facilitate the political dialogue" over this period marked by conflict situations in the first half of 2001 followed by the signing of the treaty of Ohrid in August 2001, its adoption by the Parliament in November 2001, the start of its effectuation and eventually the parliamentary election in September 2002.

Everybody is familiar with these events. Hence I will focus on reiterating or highlighting a few facts or impressions that appear to me both relevant and exceptional:

While the war in Bosnia took a heavy toll of over 200,000 and thousands of people died during the turmoil in Kosovo, Macedonia knew how to harness its energy, seek out inner strength and manifest its sense of responsibility in resolving, with assistance from the international community, the conflict that was on the brink of becoming as violent as the conflicts in its neighbourhood and keeping its death-tool at about a hundred.

Throughout this turbulent period and of course afterwards to this very day, Macedonia managed to keep the multiethnic trait of its governments made up of Macedonian and Albanian parties, thus being the unique case in the region.

The Ohrid agreement, endorsed by the Parliament, led to considerable changes of the Constitution, including its Preamble. Reaching an agreement was no easy task, but I believe that today an overwhelming majority of the population considers that

---

Mr. Alain Le Roy served as Special Envoy of the European Union to the Republic of Macedonia from October 2001 to November 2002.

reconnaît que ces accords ont apporté paix et stabilité à la Macédoine, préparant ainsi les conditions de la prospérité future. Ils constituent désormais une référence dans la région, voire au-delà.

. Les élections législatives du 15 octobre 2002 sont venues parachever le travail de stabilisation du pays en se tenant de façon jugée pour l'essentiel remarquable par la communauté internationale.

. La sortie réussie du conflit me parait avoir contribué à augmenter significativement la confiance en soi de la Macédoine, confiance en soi, et dans le grand potentiel du pays, tellement nécessaire dans un pays dont l'indépendance et l'auto-gouvernement sont si récents.

. Cette période a aussi coïncidé, à mon sens, avec la maturité de la politique étrangère et de sécurité commune de l'Union européenne, tout au moins dans les Balkans, et singulièrement sous l'impulsion de Javier Solana. Alors que l'Europe s'était tant divisée sur les réponses à apporter aux graves questions posées dans les Balkans occidentaux au début des années 90, elle s'est montrée parfaitement unie dès cette époque concernant la Macédoine, facilitant ainsi grandement l'émergence de solutions aux questions posées.

. C'est en Macédoine que l'Union européenne a développé, pratiquement pour la première fois, ses nouveaux instruments comme la force militaire européenne commune avec l'opération Concordia, puis la force de police européenne avec l'opération Proxima.

. La Macédoine a été capable d'obtenir le statut envié de "candidat à l'Union européenne", par décision du Conseil européen de décembre 2005, soit à peine plus de quatre ans après la période troublée de 2001. A l'époque, peu auraient cru cela possible. Ce succès est dû certes à la stabilité retrouvée, mais aussi au remarquable travail de fond "européen" réalisé dans le pays depuis cette période, sous l'impulsion notamment du Ministère chargé de l'Intégration européenne.

Je me garderai d'évoquer les noms des très nombreux responsables avec qui j'ai eu des rapports très cordiaux, beaucoup d'entre eux ayant encore des responsabilités importantes au pouvoir ou dans l'opposition; mais je souhaiterais faire une exception pour l'ancien Président Trajkovski, prématurément et tragiquement décédé.

Pendant tout mon mandat, le Président Trajkovski m'a constamment laissé sa porte ouverte. Je peux témoigner qu'il plaçait l'intérêt supérieur de la Macédoine au-dessus de tout ; je peux témoigner de son émotion face aux évènements qui secouaient le pays, par exemple de ses larmes même, à l'annonce de la mort des trois policiers en novembre 2001, et surtout de sa volonté de résoudre les difficultés, certes avec fermeté, mais avant tout avec une grande volonté de dialogue, de l'écoute de tous et un grand sens du compromis, en véritable homme d'Etat.

L'émotion populaire si visible lors de ses funérailles nationales a été à la hauteur des éminents services qu'il a rendus à son pays. Il s'est inscrit ainsi dans la grande lignée ouverte par le Président Gligorov, dont les conseils et la profonde connaissance du pays m'ont toujours été fort précieux.

this agreement brought Macedonia peace and stability, thus paving the way for its future progress. They have already set the pattern for the region and beyond.

The 15 September 2002 election put an end to the process of the country's stabilization. The international community assessed it as excellent on the whole.

I trust that the successful resolution of the crisis contributed to a large extent to boosting Macedonia's self-confidence, which is highly important for a country having gained its independence and sovereignty just recently.

This period, as I understand, coincided with the coming of age of the European Union's joint foreign and security policy, at least in the Balkans, largely at Javier Solana's initiative. While Europe was being heavily divided over the thorny questions raised concerning the Western Balkans in the early 1990s, its policy turned out completely coherent in this period in regard to Macedonia, facilitating to a great extent the resolution of the open issues.

It was in Macedonia that the European Union developed, basically for the first time, the new instruments, such as the common European force with the Operation Concordia and later the European police force with the Operation Proxima.

Macedonia was able to win the desired status of a candidate country for membership of the European Union upon the decision of the Council of Europe of December 2005, only four years after the turbulent period of 2001. Few believed at the time that this was possible. This success is by all means a result of the established stability and also of the remarkable work on a European "basis" in the country after that period, the activities of the Secretariat for European Affairs in particular.

I would not go into listing here the names of all the officials I had very congenial relations with and many of whom are still filling high-ranking positions in government or in opposition. Yet I would like to make an exception, mentioning the untimely and tragically deceased president Boris Trajkovski.

Throughout my term, President Trajkovski's door was open to me at all times. I can attest that Macedonia's interests were his top priority. I can attest to his emotions in dealing with the events disturbing the country, his eyes welling up with tears on hearing the news of the three policemen's death in November 2001 and especially his will to overcome the difficulties with strength of course and, above all, with unwavering determination for dialogue, taking into consideration everybody's opinion, and an astonishing sense of compromise. A true statesman.

The national outpour of grief during his burial service matched the grandeur of his deeds in the service of his country. Thus, he engraved his name on the grand list headed by President Gligorov, whose advice and in-depth knowledge of the country were always of great benefit to me.

In the end, on a very personal note, let me say how happy I was in Macedonia, happy that I had the chance to tour this wonderful country so rich in cultural and tourism potentials, happy because of my numerous encounters with both Macedonians and Albanians, happy for the lasting friendships I made and happy for I know that I will always gladly return to Macedonia.

Enfin, sur un mode très personnel, permettez-moi de dire combien j'ai été heureux en Madédoine, heureux de parcourir ce merveilleux pays, si riche de potentiel culturel et touristique, heureux des très nombreuses rencontres que j'ai pu y faire, tant du côté macédonien qu'albanais, heureux des amitiés durables que j'y ai nouées, et heureux de savoir que j'y reviendrai toujours avec un grand plaisir.

Et surtout permettez-moi de dire ma grande fierté d'avoir contribué, modestement, avec tant d'autres, et chacun à sa place, à ce que cette transition des années 2001-2002 soit la plus pacifique et la moins sanglante possible, condition indispensable à l'élaboration d'un futur commun riche de promesses.

Pour terminer, je voudrais naturellement formuler mes meilleurs vœux en faveur de l'unité et de la prospérité de la Macédoine, le premier de ces voeux concernant bien entendu l'adhésion pleine et entière à l'Union européenne, le plus rapidement possible.

A mon sens, la Macédoine le mérite amplement.

I would also like to note how proud I am to have made a modest contribution, alongside many others, each in their own way, to making that transitional period of 2001-2002 as peaceful as possible avoiding bloodshed, which represented a prerequisite for building a much brighter common future.

Finally, I would like to express my best wishes for Macedonia's unity and prosperity, the first of those wishes being related of course to the country's full accession to the European Union as soon as possible.

In my view, Macedonia is completely deserving of it.

MACEDONIA
− PAESE IN RAPIDA TRASFORMAZIONE −

Umberto VATTANI

Fin dalla mia infanzia, iniziando a frequentare la scuola elementare, sapevo individuare la Macedonia su una qualsiasi carta geografica e sapevo anche indicare dove si trova la città di Skopje. Tutti i miei compagni di scuola erano molto stupiti, ma ancor di più cresceva la loro sorpresa quando la nostra insegnante parlava di Filippo il Macedone e di suo figlio Alessandro, che conquistò il grande impero Persiano.

Per questo motivo ho sempre avvertito, dentro di me, un grande interesse per questa terra.

A Skopje sono nato, a Skopje ho ricevuto nel giugno scorso, nel corso di una Cerimonia che mi ha molto toccato, la cittadinanza onoraria della Città, e porto nel cuore un profondo sentimento di gratitudine verso la Città di Skopje.

La Macedonia oggi è un Paese in rapida trasformazione. Una larga parte della popolazione è costituita da giovani che hanno tanta voglia di impegnarsi per contribuire allo sviluppo del proprio Paese, in tutti i settori: agricoltura, il settore industriale e quello dei servizi.

In tale contesto, l'Italia può svolgere un ruolo significativo, dando il proprio apporto alla crescita dell'economia laddove possiede una competitività riconosciuta a livello internazionale: in campo agroalimentare, innanzitutto, ma anche nel settore dei beni strumentali – e in particolare nel comparto delle macchine utensili – dove siamo in grado di venire incontro alle attese di un settore industriale in fase di sviluppo. A questi possono aggiungersi i settori tessile/abbigliamento, alta tecnologia e ICT, ambiente, dove l'Italia è in grado di rafforzare i già positivi rapporti di collaborazione industriale e di cooperazione commerciale esistenti con la Macedonia.

L'Istituto nazionale per il Commercio Estero, che ho l'onore di presiedere, sta facendo la sua parte. Il nostro Ufficio di Skopje, in sintonia con l'Ambasciata d'Italia, è impegnato a favorire i rapporti economici bilaterali e a fare conoscere le aree di reciproca collaborazione più promettenti, attraverso attività promozionali quali missioni di operatori e visite aziendali, la partecipazione a Fiere e numerose iniziative analoghe. A questo riguardo siamo tutti felici del successo che ha riportato la "Giornata della Macedonia", alla Fiera del Levante di Bari.

Non vi è dubbio, inoltre, che lo sviluppo del Paese sarà agevolato con gli investimenti stranieri, ai quali l'Italia contribuisce principalmente nei settori siderurgico e del gas tecnico e che offrono ottime prospettive, anche nei settori bancario, delle assicurazioni e della produzione di tabacco.

Il Sig. Umberto Vattani è presidente dell'Istituto Nazionale per il Commercio Estero Italiano. È stato Segretario Generale del Ministero Italiano degli Affari Esteri e Ambasciatore d'Italia nell'Unione Europea e nella Repubblica Federele di Germania.

MACEDONIA
− COUNTRY OF RAPID CHANGES −

Umberto VATTANI

Even in my earliest days as a student in elementary school, I was able to find Macedonia and the city of Skopje on every geographic map.

All my schoolmates were surprised, and their surprise grew even stronger when the teacher talked about Phillip, the Macedonian King, and his son Alexander who conquered the great Persian Empire.

For this reason, I have always nurtured a vivid interest for this country.

I was born in Skopje. There I was given honorary citizenship during a ceremony last June that touched me deeply and I bear in my heart a profound sentiment of gratitude to this city.

Today, Macedonia is a country of rapid changes. A large part of its population is young, willing to grow and to contribute to the development of the country in all sectors: agriculture, industry, and services.

In this regard, Italy could play an important role, contributing to the growth of the economy in sectors where its competitiveness is internationally recognized: such as agribusiness and industrial machinery – where we are able to meet the requirements of any developing sector. The same applies to the apparel sector, advanced technology, ICT, and environment where Italy is able and willing to boost the existing relations of industrial and commercial collaboration with Macedonia.

The Italian Institute of Foreign Trade, which I have the honour to preside, contributes to this concept. Our office in Skopje, in cooperation with the Embassy of Italy, is working to favour bilateral economic relations and to identify the most promising sectors for collaboration between Macedonian and Italian enterprises by organizing different promotional activities such as trade missions, company visits, participation on fairs and trade exhibitions, etc. In this regard, we are all very satisfied with the success accomplished during the "Day dedicated to Macedonia" on the occasion of the Levante Fair in Bari.

There is no doubt that the development of Macedonia can be facilitated by direct foreign investments, where Italy contributes primarily in sectors such as metallurgy

_____

Mr. Umberto Vattani is president of the Italian Institute for Foreign Trade (Istituto Nazionale per il Commercio Estero). He was Secretary General of the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Ambassador of Italy to the European Union and to the Federal Republic of Germany.

Ma le possibilità di sviluppo poggiano in particolare modo sulla realizzazione di una buona rete infrastrutturale, che gli stessi imprenditori italiani che intendono investire nella regione auspicano fortemente. Determinante a questo scopo sarà la realizzazione del Corridoio 8 che, partendo dalla Puglia e attraversando l'Albania, la Macedonia e la Bulgaria arriverà al Mar Nero, avvicinando la Macedonia stessa al resto d'Europa.

Per quanto riguarda i modelli di organizzazione industriale, l'economia italiana si avvale, come noto, di un'interessante struttura, i cosiddetti Distretti Industriali che riuniscono sul territorio numerose piccole e medie imprese, creando una piattaforma industriale solida e flessibile nello stesso tempo, in grado di fare fronte alle sfide della globalizzazione. E' un modello che ha molto contribuito al successo della nostra economia: stimolare la creazione di Distretti Industriali anche in Macedonia può rappresentare un contributo particolarmente efficace allo sviluppo del Paese.

Eccellenti sono i nostri rapporti anche a livello di società civile, che si accompagnano all'intensificarsi delle relazioni nei settori politico, economico, e culturale. Sono molto felice, a tale proposito, di constatare come ogni giorno aumenta il numero degli adepti della nostra lingua, presso il Dipartimento di italianistica della Facoltà di Filologia, nella prestigiosa e storica Università dei Santi Cirillo e Metodio; così come i frequenti incontri tra studenti e professori dei due Paesi favoriscono la conoscenza reciproca e una piena interazione culturale. Molto, quindi, è stato fatto e si sta facendo, ma molto di più si può fare e il nostro Paese non farà certo mancare il suo impegno!

Anche in politica estera – e, in particolare, in campo europeo – l'Italia ha svolto un ruolo di primo piano a fianco della Macedonia. In primo luogo a Bruxelles, dove ricordo di aver avuto io stesso occasione, nella mia qualità di Rappresentante permanente, di avviare e di rafforzare ogni iniziativa intesa a promuovere l'integrazione della Regione dei Balcani nell'UE. Anche il particolare impegno per la realizzazione del Corridoio Est-Ovest, ricordato poc'anzi, e per il conseguimento dei finanziamenti comunitari testimonia della forte volontà di coinvolgere l'area nel processo di progressivo allargamento dell'Unione Europea.

Analogo impegno l'Italia ha svolto nell'ambito atlantico, per la candidatura della Macedonia all'ingresso nella NATO, e non posso che salutare con grande soddisfazione il rafforzamento della sua candidatura all'adesione all'Unione Europea.

Non occorre certo che io ricordi i tanti, coraggiosi sforzi che il Governo ha fatto per accelerare il processo delle riforme e di adeguamento agli standards comunitari. La validità del Programma Nazionale per l'Adeguamento della Legislazione e del Piano d'Azione che è stato in grado di tradurre le raccomandazioni della UE in attività specifiche, sono stati ampiamente riconosciuti dalla Commissione.

Vorrei esprimere, però, l'orgoglio per i grandi progressi realizzati da questo Paese in cui sono nato, che ha saputo in così poco tempo riacquistare un ruolo importante nello scenario internazionale e che tanta ammirazione sta riscuotendo: con le sue politiche così aperte, anche in campi quali la giustizia e gli affari interni, il controllo dei confini, i diritti umani, contribuisce a rendere più sicuri i confini dell'Europa nell'area balcanica e a porre le basi di una stabilità da cui potrà trarre beneficio l'intera regione.

Aspettiamo tutti con impazienza che la Macedonia entri a pieno titolo nella grande famiglia europea, alla quale appartiene da sempre.

and technical gasses offering excellent opportunities, but also banking, insurance and tobacco production.

Opportunities for further development depend on the realization of a good infrastructure network. Italian companies interested to invest in the region strongly hope for this. The realization of this goal is determined by the completion of Corridor 8, starting from Puglia and crossing Albania, Macedonia and Bulgaria to the Black Sea, and bringing Macedonia closer to Europe.

Concerning the models of industrial organization, the Italian production system has an interesting structure, characterized by so-called Industrial Districts, "Clusters" that unite in one territory numerous small and medium enterprises creating an industrial platform, strong and flexible at the same time, able to face the challenges of globalization. This model has greatly contributed to the development of our economy. The introduction of the clusters in Macedonia might likewise prove efficient for its development.

Bilateral relations of the two countries are also excellent in the area of civil society, confirmed by intensified relations on political, economic and cultural levels. I am happy to see that the number of Macedonian students studying the Italian language at the Faculty of Philology in Skopje within the prestigious University of Ss. Cyril and Methodius is growing each day. The frequent visits and meetings of students and professors of both countries provide better knowledge of each other and strong cultural interaction. A lot has been and is being done, but there is still a lot to do and our country will certainly continue the efforts!

Concerning foreign policy and, European issues in particular, Italy played an important role in supporting Macedonia. I remember my personal experience as Italy's permanent representative in Brussels: I was strongly engaged in promoting the idea of full integration of the Balkan Region into the EU. Of particular relevance is the support for realization of the Corridor East-West and providing European financing for it – confirming once again the willingness to include this area in the enlargement process of the European Union.

Italy provided substantial support to Macedonia's accession to NATO, and I salute analogous support to the process of its integration into the EU.

I remember many courageous efforts that the Macedonian government made to accelerate the pace of the reforms bringing the country closer to European standards, such as, the National Programme for Approximation of the Legislation and the Action Plan that managed to translate the EU recommendations in specific areas.

Personally, I am proud of the important progress made by the country that I was born in, a country that managed to achieve in such a short term an important role and admiration on the international scene. With its open policy in areas such as justice, internal affairs, border control and human rights, it contributes to more secure European borders in the Balkans and sets a platform for stability from which the whole region will benefit.

We all wait expectantly for Macedonia to be fully integrated in the big family of the European Union, where it has always belonged.

MACEDONIA AS EU AND NATO MEMBER WILL CREATE ADDED VALUE FOR THE REGION

Interview with Süleyman DEMIREL

Süleyman Demirel is a Turkish political leader born in 1924. He was the 12th prime minister of the Republic of Turkey and between 1965 and 1993 presided over Turkish governments for seven times. He still holds the record for Turkey's youngest prime minister ever. Additionaly, only İsmet İnönü's tenure as prime minister was longer than his. In 1993 the Grand National Assembly of the Republic of Turkey elected Demirel Turkey's 9th president, the position he held for a constitutional term of seven years, until 2000. Demirel is broadly recognized and revered due to his tremendous efforts put into Turkey's social and economic development. It was during his last prime minister's term and to a large extent thanks to his personall enagagement that Turkey becamethe second country after Bulgaria to recognize independent Macedonia under its constitutional name in early February 1992.

1. Dear Mr. President, you were the Prime Minister and the President of Turkey during the time of tremendous changes in the Balkans, in the first half of the nineties. Could you make a brief overview of those years, having in mind the position of Turkey as a regional factor as well as your personal engagement for the peace and stability?

During the first half of the 1990's the Balkan region was trapped in a vicious cycle of ethnic and micro-nationalistic violence. The region was identified with armed conflicts, destruction and bloodshed. The Balkans experienced the thawing of the frozen conflicts that had been dormant during the Cold War years. Despite our insistent efforts, the proximity of the armed conflict to Western Europe did not accelerate the process of international intervention that finally ended the tragedy.

Turkey has always had close relations with the Balkans regardless of the state of affairs of the region. Turkey has consistently contributed to the stability of the region throughout its history. Indeed, I was the Prime Minister and subsequently the President of Turkey during those troubled years where Turkey, as a regional power

with close historical, cultural and human bonds with the region exerted great effort to help put an end to the bloodshed. Turkish public opinion was very sensitive to the sad developments in the region and was closely following all that was taking place. In 1992, the Turkish Parliament passed a bill that authorized the Government to send troops to the region as part of the UN Protection Force (UNPROFOR) to "resolve the tragedy of mankind". Turkish troops proudly served in this force with distinction. As the head of the Turkish Government, I personally devoted much time and energy towards mobilizing international intervention that would stop the tragedy, which is now left well behind in the dark annals of history as a very shameful period for humankind.

2. Turkey has actively supported the Republic of Macedonia from the very beginning of its independence. As a key actor of the Turkish policy in a long period of time, how do you estimate the Turkish-Macedonian relations and their perspectives?

Turkey was one of the first countries to recognize the Republic of Macedonia with its constitutional name. Turkey has always supported Macedonia, including during the period when it faced attacks perpetrated by extremists groups. The security, stability and prosperity of Macedonia as well as the preservation of its territorial integrity are of utmost importance for us. Turkey continues to also give active support to the Macedonian efforts to integrate with the Euro-Atlantic institutions. Taking all these into consideration, it is obvious that Turkish-Macedonian relations have a solid base to further build upon. Frequent high level visits realized between the two countries attest to the exemplary relations we enjoy. Macedonian citizens of Turkish origin constitute a bridge of friendship between our countries. I believe that their contribution is important in further enhancing our bilateral relations. The perspective of EU accession is another bond in our relations for the future. Turkey also looks forward to enjoying close relations with Macedonia as a NATO Ally in the near future.

3. Turkey strongly supports Macedonian aspiration towards NATO membership. What are your estimations concerning the importance of the coming NATO enlargement with the member countries of the Adriatic Charter (Macedonia, Albania, Croatia) for the further stabilization of the Region as well as their contributions for the new role of NATO in ever changing world.

Indivisibility of security in the Euro-Atlantic area is an important aspect of Turkey's approach and policies towards the region. Turkey's strong support for the integration of Macedonia and other members of the Adriatic Charter into Euro-Atlantic security institutions in general, and into NATO in particular, is not merely a reflection of the friendly relations existing between Turkey and these counties. It also testifies to the strong conviction that security in the region cannot be fully guaranteed if this part of Europe is left out of the existing security mechanisms.

This part of Europe witnessed untold human tragedies not long ago. Elements of instability still continue to exist. The main lesson learned from these unfortunate

events in the region is that war should not be seen as a way to pursue national interests. On the contrary, in today's globalised world, cooperation and seeking peaceful solutions to problems are key to achieving lasting stability, peace and prosperity.

Transparency, inclusiveness and elimination of dividing lines are the main components of a successful cooperation scheme. Therefore, I believe that any bilateral or regional cooperation scheme, or any organisation, be it NATO or the EU, that does not respond to current needs and realities, and that is not ready to embrace new partners is doomed to failure in the long run, if not sooner.

New partners also means new horizons and opportunities. In this vein, I do believe that the countries of the Atlantic Charter will not only make NATO more relevant, but also strengthen it with new assets. The fact that countries of this once war-ridden region are now able to contribute to peace support operations in other parts of the world, such as Afghanistan is a clear indication that these countries have also become exporters of security. This is a clear result of their cooperation and engagement with NATO.

I believe that these countries, once fit to join the Alliance, will provide even more extensive and valuable contributions not only to NATO, but also to the peace and stability on a regional and global plane.

4. You are a proven friend of the Republic of Macedonia and you have visited our country many times. What are your memories and impressions of Macedonia?

That is correct. I visited Skopje, Bitola and Ohrid as Prime Minister in 1970. I later had the opportunity to revisit the Republic of Macedonia on several other occasions. My warm memories are still vivid. I can still recall the beauty and charm of historical and religious monuments that constitute our common cultural heritage. I hope the Macedonian authorities will continue to do their best to protect and conserve these invaluable cultural assets.

5. There is a Turkish community in Macedonia, as well as a huge number of Turkish citizens originating from Macedonia. They have always been considered as a bridge between our two countries. How they can contribute to the strengthening of the Macedonian-Turkish relations in the future?

I have always perceived the Turkish community living in Macedonia as a solid human bond between the two countries and a valuable asset in our relations. They constitute the human dimension of our historical relations. As faithful Macedonian citizens, members of the Turkish community are expected to contribute not only to the well-being and prosperity of their home country, but also to furthering cooperation between our two countries. Equitable representation of Macedonian citizens of Turkish origin in every aspect of social life, in accordance with the Ohrid Framework Agreement, and the improvement of their well-being will serve also to further enhance our bilateral relations.

6. After the fall of the Berlin wall the experience of freedom and democracy prevailed. Now, these feelings are mixed with concerns. Are we going to live in a more insecure world? Could the democratic world find a proper answer to the new challenges we are faced with?

The end of the Cold War marked by the demise of the Soviet Union and consequent collapse of the bipolar system generated high hopes for a better and safer new world order.

Soon thereafter, however, we realized we confronted a whole host of new and unprecedented challenges to peace and security. No nation, regardless of its geographical location or wealth, feels more secure today than the other. 9/11 made it clear that we live in a world where the threats we face are no longer confined to national boundaries. This is also equally valid in terms of regional conflicts, economic crises, natural and man-made disasters alike. 9/11 also demonstrated a fact which Turkey has always stressed: that security is indivisible. In today's globalized world, no country is immune from asymmetric threats in the shape of terrorism, organized crime, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, illegal immigration and trafficking in narcotics and human beings. A sound collective effort is necessary to cope with these new security challenges. Moreover the prevention, containment and peaceful resolution of conflicts increasingly require inter-regional cooperation, as well as comprehensive and inclusive approaches.

We face threats and risks emanating from failing regimes, poverty-stricken cities and uneducated masses. Economic and social threats, particularly poverty, infectious diseases and environmental degradation, should be addressed by the international community as an integral part of global collective security. States can no longer provide physical or economic security to their citizens by acting alone. Close international cooperation has become an imperative requirement. Indeed, the multi-dimensional and indivisible character of the new global and regional environment compels us to adopt a comprehensive, multilateral and cooperative approach to world affairs. The international society has a responsibility to work towards eliminating the basic sources of grievance that contribute to the eruption of conflicts both within and among nations. The spread of common values of democracy, human rights, rule of law, accountability and good governance will certainly help to create a more receptive environment for greater universal cooperation to together redress our common challenges.

7. You have recently emphasized that Turkey is the only democratic country among the fifty five Muslim countries. There are so many discussions going on concerning the compatibility of Islam and democracy. Could the example of Turkey be considered as a proof that democracy, as a universal value be applied to the Muslim world, or is it more an exception?

The Turkish experience is indeed living proof of the compatibility of Islam with modernity, secularism and democracy. Turkey, with its rich historical legacy based on inter-religious tolerance, its secular and democratic foundations, its predominantly Muslim population and its strong vocation to become a full member of the EU, is clearly the litmus test that values of the East and West can co-exist.

8. In every occasion you underline the heritage of Kemal Atatürk. However, there have always been movements against the laicism and the republican order originating from the Islamic circles. President Sezer, in his recent allocution in the Turkish parliament warned on the rise of Islamic radicalism in your country. How strong their influence is in nowadays Turkey and can they be reinforced by the radicalisation of the spirits in the wider Islamic world?

The Republic of Turkey is the only secular country with an overwhelmingly Muslim population. The secular character of the state is safeguarded by the Constitution which stipulates that "Turkey is a democratic, secular and social state governed by the rule of law." Secularism which was introduced by Atatürk is an irreversible way of life for Turkey, widely supported by a vast majority of our population. I do not see some extreme or more pious segments of society as a threat to our secular system as long as this overwhelming majority remains the true custodian of the system.

9. What are the European perceptions of Ataturk heritage? Does Europe fully estimate Atatürk's role as a reformer?

I am not in a position to speak on behalf of Europe. I can however explain what Atatürk's legacy means for the Turkish nation and the underlying rationale of his westernization policy.

The modern Republic of Turkey has always had its face turned to the West. Atatürk was a visionary who saw that progress meant being a part of the universal civilization represented then by the West.

Atatürk's vision can be summed up as "a peaceful and prosperous independent Turkey as a member of the family of civilized nations in a peaceful world." In line with this understanding, western codes of law, norms, values and institutions were adopted and Turkey became a member of all western institutions such as the Council of Europe, NATO and the OSCE. Turkey was also one of the very first countries to apply for membership in the then European Economic Community as early as 1959. This policy of modernization which is synonymous to westernization has since been pursued by all respective governments of Turkey.

Today, membership in the European Union remains the primary objective of Turkish foreign policy. The realization of this objective would imply the full attainment of the fundamental western orientation which was foreseen by Atatürk.

I believe it would be fair to say that the answer to whether Europe fully appreciates the significance of Atatürk's legacy lies in where Turkey stands today after nearly 50 years in its process of accession to the EU.

10. Turkey and Europe or Turkey in Europe? The accession of Turkey risks to be the most sensitive question in the next phases of European enlargement. Your comments?

Turkey's accession process began over one year ago and is progressing smoothly. Negotiations on one chapter have already been opened and provisionally closed. The process is being conducted on a dual track, namely the negotiations on the technical aspects of the acquis and the political reform efforts. We are determined to conclude

the accession process successfully. We are confident that our EU partners will also honour their commitments in that regard.

By any measure, the opening of accession negotiations with Turkey is of historic importance. The positive effects of this process are already being felt beyond the borders of the EU. Observers across the globe have hailed this as a positive breakthrough. Turkey's prospective membership has a special significance as regards the pursuit of our common values.

It is my sincere conviction that Turkey's integration process with the European Union provides a win-win situation for both sides. Turkey's EU bid has to be viewed in a broad context, in the sense that it is not solely the issue of becoming a member of an international organization with a sui generis character. Turkey's European vocation has to be considered as an integral part of its modernization programme which dates back many decades.

In its most concise description, Turkey's foreign policy reflects a well-rooted tradition of realism, coupled with a contemporary understanding of idealism, which make Turkey a regional projector of stability and conveyor of universal values. Turkey's rich historical identity, its strong regional connections and its place within Western institutions facilitate the implementation of this policy.

The European Union and its citizens will benefit from the membership of Turkey, a modern country with solid democratic institutions and a secular state structure, with a majority of its population being Muslim. This will send a strong signal to the Muslim populations both within the EU and beyond. Having been home to many civilizations in its past, Turkey's rich cultural heritage will further strengthen European ambitions in promoting cultural diversity and will provide for a better communication and understanding between diverse cultures. Furthermore, in our contemporary world of comparative advantages, Turkey's young and dynamic population and the multiple opportunities provided by our ever-growing market economy are other aspects that the European Union will benefit from. Turkey is already one of the Union's largest external trading partners, with the bilateral trade volume fast approaching the 100 billion Euro mark.

The advantages of Turkey's membership for the EU are closely related to the future vision of the Union. Its location at the centre of "Eurasia" makes Turkey a key country. In light of its close relations with the regions of the Eastern Mediterranean, the Middle East, the Balkans, the Caucasus and Central Asia, Turkey has the historical and cultural accumulation, strategic location and influence to make positive contributions to the shaping of EU policies. Consequently, Turkey's accession to the Union will open new horizons and create new opportunities in the foreign relations of the EU.

Besides all these arguments favoring Turkey's accession for both parties, it has to be mentioned that our membership will prove that the European Union is not an exclusive club based on religious or other subjective considerations. It will provide a sound and credible basis for the possibility of different civilizations and religions to peacefully co-exist in a structure based on common values and shared visions.

11. What can Turkey do to convince the European partners and European public opinion of the credibility of its candidature?

We in Turkey acknowledge that we will have to make our case to European publics in the course of the accession process. The years ahead will witness the further intensification of contacts and interaction between civil societies in Turkey and the EU.

Civil society dialogue is one of the most important aspects of Turkey's EU accession process. It will not be wrong to say that along with the political reform process and the negotiations on the technical track, the civil society dialogue is the third important component of this process.

The last enlargement round brought to the fore once again the old discussion of widening vs. deepening. It is true that one of the lessons drawn from this last and the largest enlargement of the EU is that citizens in the EU Member States were not sufficiently informed or prepared. Enlargement has been mistakenly perceived as putting the successful functioning of the Union as well as the economic wellbeing of the European citizens at peril.

However, the history of the Union proves the opposite. The value added by enlargement has always been far greater in economic and political terms. As validated by a report prepared by the Commission, both the old members and the new members have benefited from enlargement.

Certain circles are trying to draw Turkey's EU membership into these discussions. The debate on Turkey's accession should be based on reason and facts, free from emotions or prejudice. Turkey's accession to the EU should be evaluated with a long term perspective taking into account all the economic and social changes Turkey and the EU will go through in this process.

We should clearly explain the fact that an EU to which Turkey will become a member will gain the potential to become a global power. We should also tell the public that a Turkey which has completed all of the chapters in the negotiations process with the EU will be a different Turkey than now. A Turkey that has successfully completed the accession negotiations covering all aspects of the acquis, a Turkey that completely fulfills the Copenhagen political and economic criteria will be a country that can bring only good to the Union and its peoples.

Nevertheless, the current debate in Europe seems to be diverted from the facts about Turkey's integration process to the EU. Difficulties that we encounter at every turning point in Turkey-EU relations are eroding the confidence of the Turkish public in the EU and providing material for anti-EU sentiments.

A strong, deep and sustained dialogue is therefore necessary to divorce the misperceptions from the facts. Only through such a dialogue can we ensure an awareness of the opportunities as well as the challenges of the future accessions, bridge the information gap, achieve a better mutual understanding.

For changing misperceptions, a well prepared communication strategy supported by people to people contacts will be most effective. Both Turkey and the EU have plenty of opportunities for an efficient civil society dialogue. From inter-parliamentary

contacts to student exchange programmes, from professional organizations to town twinning, there are many activities actually going on. The EU General Secretariat in Turkey is working on the Civil Society Dialogue projects which will be useful in this respect.

We attach great importance to civil society organizations in Turkey and in the EU building more direct contacts between themselves. Joint activities, such as panels, seminars, conferences should bring together people from all walks of life. Media also plays a crucial role in this respect: it has a crucial role in terms of passing the right messages to people. We will make every effort to ensure that the media becomes more involved in the positive aspects of Turkey's integration with the EU. In this respect, I believe the added value of Turkey's membership is increasingly acknowledged by more circles within the EU.

12. In which measure are the Turkish European perspectives directly connected to the Cyprus issue?

The Cyprus problem is not an issue which is directly related to Turkey's accession talks to the European Union. However, it is unfortunately being used by certain circles to hinder the process.

Turkey outlined clearly its policy vis-à-vis "Cyprus" while signing the Additional Protocol to the 1963 Ankara Agreement in July 2005.

Greek Cypriots wrongly based their strategy on obtaining unilateral concessions from Turkey during the stages of Turkey's accession course towards the EU. This inevitably tends to turn the Cyprus issue into a political matter between Turkey and EU.

We believe that fairness and objectivity should be our guiding principles in the relations between Turkey and the EU. In this connection, it becomes all the more important that this process is not contaminated by the Cyprus issue.

Despite the fact that the Greek Cypriot side voted against the Annan Plan, they were rewarded with membership in the EU. Unlike previous examples the Union did not oblige "Cyprus" to solve its border disputes before joining the EU. It is an irony that the Cyprus issue is now presented as a political problem which Turkey should solve before joining the European Union.

The Cyprus problem has been on the agenda of the international community for over 40 years. Throughout these four decades, certain parameters have become rooted in this issue. This being the case, Turkey wants a solution to the Cyprus problem under the auspices of the good-offices mission of the UN Secretary-General, based on these long-established UN parameters which are bi-zonality, political equality and equal status, a new partnership state structure. Any effort to solve the Cyprus issue outside the UN process is doomed to failure.

13. Is there any alternative for Turkey in case of delaying the negotiation process with EU?

Turkey's accession process is making progress. Although it will not be an easy or short journey, I have no doubt that the process will be brought to a successful conclusion, resulting in the full membership of Turkey. Turkey will use this process

to address any remaining deficiencies and shortcomings. The negotiations will be beneficial in terms of further aligning Turkey's standards with those of the EU.

Accession to the EU is a basic pillar of Turkey's foreign policy. Our bid for membership and European vocation are the culmination of centuries of modernization efforts. There is a wide-ranging consensus in Turkey among all segments of society that this process should conclude with full membership. Hence, Turkey's relations with the wider world emanating from its unique geo-strategic position should not be seen as "alternatives" to its long-standing relationship with the EU, but as elements complementing and mutually reinforcing its European orientation. With the cooperation and goodwill of our EU partners, I have every confidence that there will be no insurmountable obstacle in our accession process.

14. In the last years Turkey has achieved extraordinary progress in many field, including economic development. Turkey is a regional political power and strategic partner of the USA. What are the priorities and ambitions of the Turkish foreign policy on the regional and global level? What is the place of the Balkans in Turkish foreign policy?

The main objective of Turkish foreign policy is based on the famous motto of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk: "Peace at home, peace in the world at large". This guiding principle is still the underlying tenet of Turkish foreign policy. In line with this objective, Turkey proactively pursues the goal of helping to create an environment of security, stability, prosperity, friendship and cooperation on a regional as well as global scale. The host of major conflicts that we associate with the post Cold War period whether in the Balkans, the Middle East, Iraq, the Caucasus and Afghanistan have all taken place in our extended neighbourhood and Turkey has always pursued a proactive foreign policy for the peaceful resolution of these conflicts. In this context, Turkey is an active participant in many UN, NATO, EU and OSCE missions and peacekeeping operations. Accession to the EU and promoting friendly and mutually beneficial bilateral relations and cooperation with our neighbours are certainly top priorities of Turkish foreign policy. Further strengthening trans-atlantic ties and strategic relations with the US, enhancing our relations with Russia and cooperation with our kinsman in the Central Asian Republics and Azerbaijan are equally high on our agenda. Our relations with the Islamic World and desire to develop our relations with Africa, Latin America and South East Asia also occupy an important place in Turkish foreign policy.

Due to our historical, cultural and social bonds with the Balkan countries as well as our political and economic ties to the region, the Balkans have always ranked high on Turkey's foreign policy agenda. Turkey enjoys very special bilateral relations with the Balkan countries and we closely follow the developments in the region. The region is regarded as our gateway to Europe and consolidation of stability in Southeast Europe has always been a primary objective for Turkey. Southeast Europe has recorded significant progress in the political and economic spheres during the last decade. However, lasting peace and stability based on mutual trust and cooperation have not yet been fully guaranteed. Moreover, despite the notable progress in economic reforms,

regional economies are still stagnant and unemployment remains high. We believe that economic development and interdependence among our countries will help strengthen stability and prosperity in the region. "Cooperation" rather than "competition" should be the basic principle shaping our regional policies. Turkey is either co-founder or an active member of regional initiatives such as the South East European Cooperation Process (SEECP), the Stability Pact (SP), the South East Cooperation Initiative (SECI) and the prospective Regional Cooperation Council. I believe that strong regional economies with determined Governments seizing opportunities for cooperation will help Southeast Europe to become a prosperous geography enriched by its multi-ethnic and multi-cultural characteristics.

15. The Middle East: is there any perspective of peace and stability in this region and how do you estimate the Turkish contribution?

Despite the current turmoil dominating the Middle East from Iraq, Syria and Lebanon to Israel and Palestine, I continue to believe that peace and reconciliation can be the true fate of this region rather than conflict and discord.

Indeed, in the aftermath of turbulent chapters in history, during which great pain and loss occur, there emerges a real opportunity to tackle the deep-seated problems.

I believe such an opportunity is at hand following the episode of conflict witnessed in the region this past summer.

What should be done now is to seize this opportunity and create an environment conducive to bringing the conflicting sides back to the negotiating table to reconcile their differences through dialogue. Turkey seeks to assist in every possible way the revival of the peace process.

Deep-rooted historical and cultural ties, as well as the credibility gained as a result of a sound and balanced role in the region places Turkey on a different footing than that of many other countries to make a constructive contribution in this regard.

Turkey has supported the Middle East Peace Process since the very beginning and her presence in the international force in Lebanon (UNIFIL-II) today is an expression of its commitment to peace and stability in the region.

I believe that through resolute endeavors of each and every party and the concerted efforts of the international community, the cycle of war in the region can be turned into a cycle of peace.

16. You are the fervent supporter of the dialogue between the civilizations. How real is a danger of the global confrontations based on the religion differences?

The widening gap between Christian and Islamic societies is a regrettable fact. This is certainly not the best ground for a truly global society. But more importantly, I believe the actual danger of potential global confrontations lies in the irresponsible exploitation of cultural/religious differences by extremists on both sides who aim at dividing us along artificial cultural or religious fault-lines. The real fault-line however exists not among religions or cultures, but instead between democracy, modernity and reformism on the one side, and radicalism on the other. This is the real danger we have to overcome without any delay.

17. Can the Balkans be a model of peaceful cohabitation and dialogue between the civilizations?

The Balkans can be considered a litmus test for developments in the international arena. This region has always provided early indications for potential changes and has heralded new eras in world history. Micro-nationalism and ethnic conflicts which were on the rise after the Cold War were initially experienced in the Balkans. In short, the region became a test case for many of the dramatic post Cold War trends. On the other hand, it is the same Balkans that produced successful models of peaceful cohabitation, inter-ethnic and multi-cultural dialogue. The Republic of Macedonia itself sets a true example in validating this assertion.

18. You are a politician with extraordinary experience. After a brilliant career of civil servant, you become the youngest prime minister of Turkey, and after İsmet İnönü the most durable at this post. You were also the president of the Republic. What have been the most difficult times in your career and what have given you the strength to continue?

Indeed after long years devoted to public service in the State Water Works, I entered politics in the early 1960's. I served my country as Prime Minister seven times and as President of the Republic for a seven year term. Certainly politics is never an easy arena and there have also been challenging periods during my long involvement in the political life of Turkey. However my strong commitment to serve my country and people has always been the strength that I have drawn upon to overcome these difficulties.

20. What are your future projects?

As a public figure that has much accumulated political experience, I remain at the disposal of the Turkish people to share my knowledge when sought for the well-being of my country.

22. The Turks call you Baba which means "the father". Only one more person in Turkish modern history has deserved this flattery attribute. Mustafa Kemal Atatürk. How would you comment it?

I would never put myself in the place of Mustafa Kemal who was accorded the name "Atatürk", which means "the Forefather of the Turks", by the Turkish people. It is also however true that I am often referred to as "Baba" more as a term of endearment perhaps because I am regarded as a fatherly figure who has political wisdom the Turkish people always count on.

23. We make this interview for the first issue of the Macedonian Foreign Policy Journal, on the occasion of the 15ᵗʰ anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Macedonia. What is your vision of Macedonia and the Balkans in the 21ˢᵗ century?

There is no reason why the Balkans in the 21ˢᵗ century cannot both constitute a geography where different ethnicities and cultures coexist peacefully and set an example for the rest of the world. To help ensure this, I believe that the perspectives

for the EU and Euro-Atlantic integration of the countries in the region should be maintained. This seems to be serving as one of the main bonds holding the regional countries together. Economic interdependence among the countries will also be a determining factor in regional stability in the 21st century. Mutual investments among the Balkan countries have also gained momentum. This momentum should be preserved for the prosperity of the region.

I have no doubt that the Republic of Macedonia, with its Western inclination, will continue to be a net contributor to regional stability. With its persistent efforts to create and sustain effective multiethnic and multicultural state and social structures, Macedonia will take its well deserved place in the Euro- Atlantic institutions. I believe that Macedonia, currently an EU candidate and a MAP country will successfully complete its EU accession and NATO membership processes. This will also create an added value for the region's economic development and political stability. Macedonia as a NATO and an EU member in the future will be much better equipped to contribute to the well-being of its region.

MACEDONIA AND THE UN: FROM A CASE STUDY IN PREVENTIVE DIPLOMACY TO AN ACTIVE CONTRIBUTOR TO GLOBAL PEACE AND SECURITY

Henryk J. SOKALSKI

Introduction

One of the first steps that most governments of newly independent States take has been application for membership in the United Nations, which in many instances is their only protection and a kind of ennoblement by the family of nations. Indeed, thus far the United Nations managed to keep peace more successfully than is generally acknowledged. In all its work, the UN has been among the Member States' main instruments of choice, it has served as a vehicle and a forum for sovereign States to pool their efforts, coordinate their national policies, manage their disputes and overcome their differences. Most Member States have found a clear national interest in the collective interest within the world organization. Although in the past few decades the relationship United Nations - Member States has been considerably damaged by myth, misinformation and misunderstanding, by failures of performance, and by failures of political will, there is growing realization that the challenges we face cannot be addressd by any single nation, no matter how powerful, acting alone. By the sane token, we cannot take it for granted that multilateral institutions are strong enough to cope with all the challenges facing them.today. Despite its well-known drawbacks, the UN still embodies hopes for a peaceful, more just and equitable world. It remains the only global institution whose legitimacy is based on its virtually universal membership, the only institution whose mandate covers not only development and security, but also human rights and the environment, the only institution whose influence derives not from the use of power but from the force of values it represents. This also seems to have been the reasoning of the Government and the people of the Republic of Macedonia at the dawn of their independence.

Former Assistant Secretary-General and Special Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations in Macedonia (1995-1998); Senior Fellow at the United States Institute of Peace (2000-2001); author of the book, An Ounce of Prevention: Macedonia and the UN Experience in Preventive Diplomacy, United States Institute of Peace,Washington D.C. 2003 (in English) and Skopje 2005 (in Macedonian).

Macedonia's membership in the United Nations, however, had not been a forgone conclusion. Although the country met all the requirements of Chapter II of the Charter and accepted without reservation the Organization's purposes and principles, it unjustifiably took the Security Council and the General Assembly more than eight months to consider the application, in a procedure that normally does not take more than just a few weeks. The political exigencies of the time had considerably impacted the delay and Macedonia's initial status in the United Nations. Two factors, in particular – the role of UN peacekeepers and the question of the country's name and its international recognition - have left an indelible mark on the destinies of the fledgeling democracy. Let us summarize in brief some salient features of each of the two elements.

The two cornerstones

When the General Assembly adopted its resolution on the country's admission to membership in the United Nations,[1] the Republic of Macedonia had already hosted a preventive UN peacekeeping operation established at the request of the government and mandated by the Security Council, four months earlier.[2] At the time of the Balkan wars of the 1990s, during his visit to United Nations headquarters in New York, President Kiro Gligorov had conveyed to the Secretary-General a proposal for the deployment of UN observers in his country in view of his concern about the possible impact of fighting elsewhere in the former Yugoslavia. The request coincided with two important developments: one, a recommendation from Cyrus Vance and Lord Owen, co-chairmen of the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia (ICFY) Steering Committee, to deploy without delay to Skopje a small group of United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) military and police observers with supporting political staff. to visit Macedonia's border areas with Albania and Serbia and prepare a report detailing how a larger deployment of UN military police and personnel might help to strengthen security and confidence in Macedonia.[3] The other development was the publication by the then Secretary-General, Boutros Boutros-Ghali, in June 1992, of his major report titled An Agenda for Peace,[4] which revived the concept of preventive diplomacy and its application toward broadly conceived early preventive action to avert conflict. Seizing the opportunity of an improved climate in world affairs of the early 1990s, the Secretary-General promptly linked Macedonia's request with his own reflections in An Agenda for Peace and informed the Security Council that he would "envisage such a deployment, undertaken at the reuqest of the competent authorities of Macedonia, as being a preventive deployment of the kind discussed in paragraphs 28 to 32 of An Agenda for Peace.[5] At the heart

---

[1] GA resolution 47/225 of 8 April 1993.
[2] Security Council resolution 795/1992 of 11 December 1992.
[3] See the letter dated November 23, 1992 from the Secretary-General to the President of the Security Council, UN Document S/24851 (November 25, 1992).
[4] Boutros Boutros-Ghali, *An Agenda for Peace* (New York: United Nations, 1992).
[5] Letter dated November 23, 1992 from the Secretary-General to the President of the Security Council , UN Doc. S/24851 (November 25, 1992).

of his plan was paragraph 28, which outlined the concept of preventive deployment as a new tool of conflict prevention, unanimously approved by the Security Council. Basing on the opinions of the field mission to Macedonia and Scretary-General's proposals,[6] the Security Council authorized the SG to establish a presence of United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR), subsequently known as United Nations Preventive Deployment Force (UNPREDEP), "in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia."[7] A few weeks later, Macedonia became a testing ground and a case study in a new international experience in search of peace.[8]

The second factor of a multilateral nature directly related to UN-Macedonia relations was much less constructive: Right from the outset, the young Republic of Macedonia had to go through an uphill struggle for international recognition under its constitutional name. Strong opposition with serious political and economic ramifications came from neighbouring |Greece. Its political leadership contended that the very term "Macedonia" in relation to the new State was historically wrong and implied territorial claims, to say the least. After months of political wrangling, the General Assembly adopted its resolution 47/225 of 8 April 1992, which admitted Macedonia to membership in the world Organization but went a long way to accommodate the Greek position. The latter has been particularly true of an unprecedented statement by the General Assembly to the effect that the new Member State: (a) would be "provisionally referred to for all purposes in the United Nations as "the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia " (b) "pending settlement of the difference that has arisen over the name of the State." Thus, the General Assembly had not only created a problem

---

6 UN Doc. S/24923.

7 Security Council resolution 795 (1992) of 8 April 1992

8 Interestingly, in the same manner, in December 1991, a few months before the outbreak of war in Bosnia-Herzegovina and six months prior to the publication of *An Agenda for Peace,* Bosnian President Alija Izetbegovic asked for a preventive deployment of peacekeeping troops. to his country. The UN ignored the request, citing a procedure banning the dispatch of peacekeepers before an outbreak of hostilities (Alice Ackermann, *Making Peace Prevail: Preventing Violent Conflict in Macedonia,* Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press, 2000, 3). Paradoxically, this was not the first "international peacekeeping" project on the Macedonian soil. In 1903, as a reaction to Ottoman repression and to serve their own national interests, Russian Tsar |Nicholas II and Austrio-Hungarian Emperor Franz Joseph devised a program whereby Russian and Austrian civil agents would "assist" the Turkish governor of Macedonia. Responsibility for peacekeeping was apportioned among Austria, France, Italy, Russia, and the United Kingdom, which provided officers to command local gandarmes. The Young Turks, including many Macedonians, opposed the foreign officers. In 1906, they moved their headquarters to Thessaloniki and, two years later, seized southern Macedonia. They demanded restoration of the Ottoman constitution of 1876, which diminished the sultan's autocratic powers and established the principle of democratic equality for all its subjects. As a result, the international commission was dissolved and the civic agents withdrew. A counterrevolution succeeded briefly in 1909, but the Ottoman Empire continued to disintegrate and anarchy reigned in Macedonia (Julie Kim and Carol Migdalovitz, *"Macedonia" (Skopje) Recognition and Conflict Prevention* (Washington, D.C.: Congressional Research Service, January 11, 1993), 2.

by imposing a name upon a sovereign State, which in itself was inconsistent with the exhaustive conditions of Article 4 of the Charter, but also left its settlement at the mercy of protracted negotiations within an unspecified time frame which, regrettably, has dragged on for the past 13 years now. Although today well over one hundred States regognize the young country under its constitutional name, some portions of GA resolution 47/225 did not help to strengthen security and confidence in Macedonia. As a matter of fact, they represent a serious political blow to the overriding principle of selfdetermination of states, of which the United Nations had always been such an ardent proponent. Yet, patience and perseverence of Macedonia's successive presidents and governments as well as its public opinion to a large extent managed to neutralize the adverse repercussions of the Assembly's decision. Nonetheless, one cannot fail noting that whereas UNPREDEP symbolized United Nations' strength and determination in support of a vulnerable State, the handling of the question of membership and the country's name was less than successful.[9] Both UNPREDEP and the name issue will for long absorb researchers and politicians investigating the early history of the Republic of Macedonia. They may wish also to take note of an eye witness account that follows.[10]

The United Nations in action

UNPREDEP's mandate covered vital aspects of Macedonia's existence in the last decade of the twentieth century:

- to monitor, primarily in the northern and western border areas of the country, and to report to the secretary-general any developments that could pose a threat to the country;

- to deter, by the Force's presence, such threats from any source, as well as to help prevent clashes that could otherwise occur between external elements and Macedonian forces, thus helping to strengthen security and confidence in the republic;

- to use good offices, as appropriate, in cooperation with the host country's authorities, and to contribute to the maintenance of peace and stability in the republic.[11]

---

[9] General Assembly's damaging decision on the name issue sounded like the "arguments" advanced in December 1944 by US Secretary of State Edward Reilly Stettinius, Jr. to prevent Macedonia's accesion to Tito's Yugoslav Federation: "This (US) Government considers talk of Macedonian 'nation,' Macedonian 'Fatherland,' or Macedonian 'national consciousness' to be unjustified demagoguery representing no ethic nor political reality" (http://www.macedoniainfo.com/header.htm)

[10] Based on Henryk J. Sokalski, *An Ounce of Prevention: Macedonia and the UN Experience in Preventive Diplomacy*, United States Institute of Peace, Washington D.C., 2003.

[11] See Security Council resolutions 795 (1992), Dcember 11, 1992; 842 (1993), June 18, 1993; and 908 (1994), March 13, 1994.

As an operation in early prevention, functioning as it was in the post-Cold War era, UNPREDEP did not have any longer to confine itself to watching for cross-border intrusion or aggression alone. It also meant looking for potential national crises, usurpation of established democratic institutuions; and nonmilitary pressures, both external and internal. Its mandate implementation comprised institutional reform and social and economic development, including issues of social integration. The mission demonstrated an active interest in non-military aspects of the host country's situation, particularly true with respect for human rights, improved police and judicial systems, or other issues directly relevant to the structure and functions of civil society. Such an approach clearly distinguished between the preconflict peacekeeping as mandated to UNPREDEDP and the UN's more conventional troop deployment, whether pre- or postconflict. Accordingly, the work of the mission evolved into three distinctive pillars of action: troop deployment, good offices and political action, and the human dimension.

Troop deployment was the backbone of the operation. It assumed and performed a preventive function by its very visibility, which determined the value of troops as a minimal deterrent in an unpredictable environment. The use of force was limited to self-defense. The government was fully aware of our peace force's capabilities. The host authorities and the public at large realized that UNPREDEP would not be able to protect the country in the event of an armed threat.[12] Still, the focus of attention on this particular pillar was further enhanced by a continued immediacy of a potential military threat.

Good offices and political action created a new qualitative dimension that allowed UNPREDEP to expand the range of traditional preventive techniques available to the Force. Dialogue, discretion and quiet diplomacy were the basic tools of action. The mission developed and maintained active contacts with political forces and ethnic groups in the country as a means of promoting domestic stability. Constant efforts were made to reduce the level of mistrust among the country's ethnic actors and set in place a dialogue on questions regarding the rights of ethnic communities and national minorities. UNPREDEP was recognized as a significant instrument for facilitating dialogue, restraint, and practical compromise between the different segments of Macedonian society. UN troop patrols along the northern and western borders of the country effectively complemented such activities; this outreach had a calming and stabilizing effect throughout the area. The contingent of UN military observers and police monitors rendered eqaually invaluable services.

UNPREDEP's third pillar, the human dimension component, highlighted developmental and peacebuilding aspects of the operation. As such, it had been quite a novel idea for a venture in preconflict prevention. It was only a few years later that, in recognition of the significance of peacebuilding in peacemaking and peacekeeping

---

[12] In his periodic report to the Security Council, the Secretary-General stated that the "host country does not expect the United Nations to defend its borders and considers the very presence of an international force a deterrent sufficient to discourage potential aggressors," UN Doc. S/1995/987 (November 23, 1995), para. 38.

operations, the General Assembly established the Peacebuilding Commission.[13] In the case of UNPREDEP the human dimension had a positive spin-off effect in generating mutual trust when resorting to good offices and helping to forge solutions to sensitive political and interethnic problems.

What did UNPREDEP mean to Macedonia and the UN at large?

Preventive action is naturally not a panacea for every crisis around the world. Therefore, even in the case of UNPRFEDEP the mission was not meant to be a philosophers' stone to cure all of Macedonia's ills. The yardstick of its effectiveness was the extent to which it was able to implement its mandated tasks. The Force was neither an ephemeral nor a watershed phenomenon. Some expected too much from it, while others expected far too little. What, then, was UNPREDEP; and what did it accomplish?

First and foremost, the mission showed that, under appropriate circumstances, prevention can work. It proved to skeptics that the United Nations "can deliver." But the operation's successful outcome was not the result of its efforts alone. The mission was part of a larger communications network in which several factors were at work. Decisive among them was that, throughout the 1990s, the international community and Macedonia's political forces had been able to prevent the recurrence of the tragedy early in the decade that befell countries elsewhere in the region. This includes UN's partnerships with OSCE, NATO, the European Union, the Council of Europe, and numerous organizations and agencies of the United Nations system, as well as the NGO community. What UNPREDEP did, then, was foster these partnerships and integrate their distinct and overlapping functions into an appropriate peace operation.

Second, UNPREDEP demonstrated that a preventive operation can be an incubator in which newly independent or newly stable states can develop. In Macedonia, prevention was like incubation, a figurative illustration of what the international community can do to avert conflict. UNPREDEP's six years of service helped to give Macedonia an international personality; it helped the new country along the maturing process. Internally, UNPREDEP became a symbol of facilitated dialogue among political parties; it provided a forum that had never before existed in Macedonia. The mission brought with it the space for the renewal of political culture and filled a substantial part of the political vacuum in the host country. During the mision's presence, Macedonia made significant headway along the path of building a pluralist political arena based on democratic principles of civil society. There has been a profound evolution in respect of Macedonia's external and internal environments. The political climate along the young country's borders improved markedly, and UNPREDEP's first two pillars of action not only provided a tremendously symbolic commitment to Macedonia's sovereignty but also allowed some rather powerful bilateral initiatives to codify, as it were, the international community's equal commitment to

---

[13] See General Assembly resolution 60/180 of 20 December 2005.

the principle of the inviolability of borders. Domestically, however, the political actors involved in these processes were not yet able to turn their positive accomplishments during UNPREDEP's presence into a long-term peace or a real starting point for permanent cohabitation.[14]

Third, through UNPREDEP, the United Nations succeeded in drawing a "thin blue line" of security, and, for six full years, helped to confine a conflict by building confidence in highly polarized communities. The UN's presence allowed them to at least sleep better at night, knowing that the international community had a vested intrest in their seeking to work together. Considering the nature of such combustible cohabitation, this process in itself was quite an accomplishment.

Fourth, UNPREDEP revealed that a multidimensional and integrated approach to prevention is not only feasible but also effective. Accordingly, it proved to be a unique laboratory of prevention that, thanks to the record of United Nations standard-setting in different areas of human endeavour, managed to do without trial-and error experimentation.

Fifth, the operation demonstrated – especially with respect to the root causes of conflict - that if more interventions readily resorted to tools such as those UNPREDEP used, the international community could reduce the opportunity cost of many political options it has failed to seize in good time – particularly true with regard to the material costs of conflicts that were not caught at an early stage.

Finally, the United Nations preventive operation in Macedonia inspired and accelerated new efforts by the international community towards further expansion of preventive concepts and their practical application – as a blueprint for early noncoercive prevention. In the years to come, however, the global community will have to face new, more complex challenges. Transnational terrorism is one such threat that may increasingly call for more and more punitive forms of counterreaction and coersive prevention.

The international community invested years of effort and resources in peacekeeping and conflict prevention in the former Yugoslavia and learned many lessons during that time. These lessons have shown that imposing an order does not necessarily lead to the establishment of one. They proved that peacemaking can be plagued with difficulties, but that positive results are possible to achieve under clearly defined mandates and timely deployed missions, and that the premature withdrawal of an operation can prove harmful to its very purposes. In the case of UNPREDEP and Macedonia a number of important factors seem to have mitigated an outbreak of conflict:

- preventive action was taken early enough to avert conflict;
- there was unanimity in the Security Council;
- largely even-handed action had been taken on behalf of the international community vis-à-vis both domestic and external major political forces;

---

[14] See Lund, Michael S., and Guenola Rasamoelina, eds., *Impact of Conflict Prevention Policy: Cases, Measures, Assessments.* Baden-Baden, Germany: Nomos, 2000, 43.

- UNPREDEP played a deterrent role;
- there had been no "tradition" of armed struggle between the country's ethnic Macedonians and ethnic Albanians;
- there was gradual but effective progress of democratic reforms in the country;
- there was, and had always been, a strong ethnic Albanian component in Macedonia's postindependence period;
- having joined the government, political leaders showed readiness to make concessions of behalf of coalition partners representing other political camps.

The international community came to appreciate the fact that the longer UNPREDEP stayed in the country, and the more firmly it applied pressure for a solution of the existing interethnic conflict, the stronger the sense of security grew. That growth, in turn, allowed Macedonia's national deterrent potential to expand. It went without saying that, on a macro scale, any further international action would have to include an elaborate component of a well-coordinated developmental programme, with a view to combating poverty and countering the social exclusion that lay at the roots also of Macedonia's potential national conflict. Had effective international assistance been given to the country, a rapidly growing economy could have alleviated much of the interethnic tensions. Some notable beginnings had been made in that direction, but the overall effort was uncoordinated and plagued with what often appeared to be competing interests.

Abrupt termination

In early 1999, few could have expected that UNPREDEP might be abruptly terminated, at a time when it was most needed. On February 25, 1999, the Security Council met to consider "the situation in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" on the basis of the Secretary-General's most recent report which recommended an extension of the mission, with its existing mandate and composition, for a further six months, until August 31.[15] Macedonia's minister for foreign affairs supported the recommendation, having presented in his letter to the Secretary-General of January 29, 1999, a number of weighty arguments for extending the mission's mandate for another six months.[16] The eight-power draft resolution concurred with those recommendations.[17] Yet, when the resolution was put to a vote, it was not adopted: the People's Republic of China (PRC), a permanent member of the Security Council, exercised its veto. As of March 1, 1999, UNPREDEP ceased to function. The mission's termination took many by surprise.

---

[15] UN Doc. S/1999/161 (February 19, 1999).
[16] UN Doc. S/1999/108.
[17] UN Doc. S/1999/201.

A few weeks before, in expectation of generous economic assistance, the new government of Macedonia had established diplomatic ties with Taiwan. China reacted instantenously by severing its diplomatic relations with Macedonia. Observers immediately linked PRC's veto with Taiwan's recognition. The Chinese argued that they had always mainained that UN peacekeeping operations, including preventive deployment missions, should not be open-ended. In their view, the situation in Macedonia had stabilized over the past few years, the country's relations with its neighbours had improved, and the Security Council's original objective in Macedonia had actually been accomplished. Finally, the PRC contended that the UN's already insuficient resources should be used where they are needed most – for instance, in Africa and other regions plagued by conflict and instability.[18] Macedonia's officials were divided as to the reasons which might have led to UNPREDEP's termination.

Politics and diplomacy, however, often breed suspicion that in cases such as the one at hand hidden motives are at play. So, too, did the sudden manner in which UNPREDEP was brought to an end. The mere veto by a permanent member of the Security Council was not enough to convince some observers that "the Taiwan connection" might have been the genuine reason for the Force's premature departure. Whatever it was, one thing is certain: UNPREDEP came to an end not because the need ended, nor because it completed or failed its mission, but because of extraneous issues. Its termination in no way invalidated its work or its legacy. President Gligorov was very critical of his government's action, which he called "the direct trigger" of China's veto; he considered the move "wrong and, of course, the fault of our government."[19] The President's statement could raise the question of whether there might have been an "indirect trigger" of the pullout as well. The query is not easy to answer. This view was shared by a number of Macedonian politicians and observers of the couintry's poltical scene. One of them, who had asked for anonimity, believed that there was no way to avoid replacing UNPREDEP with NATO in its new role. However, he said, the manner in which this objective was arrived at proved harmful to the country's interests: we should have found a more sophisticated method. Indeed, UNPREDEP's departure left a vacuum of its own and a heritage that would be an error to ingnore.

A lame act of admission

The benefits which Macedonia had acquired from an early deployment of a United Nations peacekeeping Force were seriously affected by the negative consequences of GA resolution 47/225. Hugh Poulton notes that on the night of the admission, public reaction in Skopje was a mixture of satisfaction and anger. In parliament, only thirty MPs voted to accept the temporary name, while twenty-eight were against,

---

[18] For texts of statements on UNPREDEP's termination, see the Provisional Verbatim Record of the Security Council, UN Doc. S/PV/3982.

[19] Gligorov, Kiro, *Makedonija e se' sto imame* (Macedonia Is All We Have), Skopje: Izdavachi Centar Tri, 2000, 315.

with thirteen abstantions.[20] Ultimately, an early membership in the United Nations, even under a temporary compromise, proved to be a better solution than waiting for the final settlement of the name issue. Some authors believe – and righly so – that, with admission to the United Nations, Macedonia was no longer a "limbo zone" on a political vacuum.[21]

It does not take much imagination for a responsible analyst to conclude that GA resolution 47/227 has been based on misinterpreted conditions of admission of a State to membership in the world Organization. (Article 4 of the Charter). As early as on May 28, 1948, upon the request of the General Assembly, the International Court of Justice gave an advisory opinion on such conditions.[22] The question was answered in the negative: by nine votes to six. The Court enumerated five conditions that a candidate must fulfill for the Members of the Organization to pronounce themselves on the question of admission, and be: (a) a State; (b) peace-loving; (c) must accept the obligations of the Charter; (d) must be able to carry out these obligations; (e) must be willing to do so. The opinion noted that "all these conditions are subject to the judgement of the Organization, i.e. of the Security Council and the General Assembly and, in the last resort, of the Members of the Organization (…) These conditions are exhaustive, and are not merely stated by way of information or example. They are not merely the necessary conditions, but also the conditions which suffice"(emphasis added).[23]

Forty-five years later in the life of the Organizatikon, the Court's advisory opinion was to pass a test which with respect to the Republic of Macedonia it could not but fail. Security Council and General Assembly resolutions 817(1993) of April 7, 1993 and 225(1993) of April 8, 1993, respectively, set a precedent in inconsistency, to say the least, that can neither be defended on legal nor political grounds. On the one hand, the resolutions noted that the applicant fulfilled "the criteria for membership in the United Nations laid down in Article 4 of the Charter," which the Court had earlier recognized as "exhaustive" and "which suffice" (emphasis added); and on the other hand, they introduced extraneous elements of one-sided conditionality that,

---

[20] Poulton, Hugh, *Who Are the Macedonians?* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2000, 177-78.

[21] Dimitar Mircev, „Foreign Policy of |Macedonia," in Pettifer, ed., *The N ew Macedonian Question,* 216-17.

[22] The question of the General Assembly read: „Is a Member of the United Nations which is called upon, in virtue of Article 4 of the Charter, to pronouce itself by its vote, either in the Security Council or in the General Assembly, on the admission of a State to membership in the United Nations, judically entitled to make its consent to the admission dependent on conditions not expressly provided by paragraph 1 of the said Article? In particular, can such a Member, while it recognizes the conditions set forth in the provision to be fulfilled by the State concerned, subject its affirmative vote to the additional condition that other States be admitted to membership in the United Nations together with that State?"
(http://www.icj-cij.org/icjwww/idecisions/isummaries/isummary480528.htm).

[23] Ibidem.

practically, rendered the established Charter conditions for membership null and void. These were inter alia: (a) a difference (that) has arisen over the name of the State; (b) "which needs to be resolved in the interest of the maintenance of peaceful and good-neighbourly relations in the region;" (c) unjustifiable need for "good offices to settle the above-mentioned difference, and to promote confidence-building measures among the parties;" (d) undignified absence of the legally binding constitutional name of the applicant and sole reference to it as a "the State whose application is contained in document S/25147;" (e) "this State provisionally referred to for all purposes within the United Nations as 'the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia' pending settlement of the difference that has arisen over the name of the State." Five new conditons that put into question the "exhaustive" nature of the Charter criteria with the "settlement of the difference" pending for more than thirteen years now.[24]

World history knows few sovereign and unconquered nations that would change their consititutions for the sake of their neighbours. Yet, Macedonia is one of them which did so precisely for the sake of good-neighbourly relations with Greece. In order to meet the latter's concerns, the Macedonians went out of their way to accommodate their southern neighbours on a number of issues. The country's legislature adopted important constitutional amendments as early as January 1992, supplementing legislation that otherwise had met all the European Community's (later European Union) requirements for constitutional safeguards. The new clauses read:

- The Republic of Macedonia has no territorial claims against neighbouring states;
- The borders of the Republic of Macedonia can be changed only in accordance with the constitution and based on the principle of voluntariness and generally accepted international norms;
- The Republic shall not interfere in the sovereign rights of other states and their internal affairs.[25]

Several other important Macedonian concessions did not convince Greece either that a small, unarmed country like Macedonia would not use its name to stake historical claims on either Greek territory or the country's cultural foundation.

Inspiring lessons

Macedonia's discriminatory treatment with respect to the country's name and membership in the United Nations stimulated creative action on the part of the authorities of the young Republic. The lessons learned allowed to accumulate enormous experience in dealing with the challenges of the day. In just a few years,

---

[24] More on the subject, including other aspects of a serious derogation upon the legal personality of the prospective Member State, in Igor Janev PhD. *Some Remarks About the Legal Status of Macedonia in the United Nations*, Review of International Affairs, Vol. LIII, No. 1108, October – December 2002, (http://www.maknews.com/html/articles/janev/un_admission_of_macedonia2.html)

[25] Constitution of the Republic of Macedonia (English-language version), Skopje, 1994.

Macedonia developed an unusually active foreign policy and a high volume of travel to and from Skopje, signifying a new opening in Macedonia's quest for peace and stability in the region and internationally, notably in the context of the Stability Pact for Southeastern Europe. Hardly a day would go by without important foreign visitors arriving in Skopje. These visits have had a clear objective: attracting attention to Macedonia's plight for international recognition and paving the way into Euro-Atlantic and European security and economic structures. Other evidence of Macedonia's growing role in international relations included the country's entry into the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) and the Council of Europe, which made it a party to those organizations' human rights instruments and standards as well as to their relevant monitoring procedures. The new State ratified all United Nations sources of standards on human rights and the status of minorities. Macedonia also became bound by certain political conditions and by requirements for external monitoring as part of its aspirations to join NATO and the European Union. Its standing in international opinion has grown steadily, especially following the solution of the Kosovo refugee crisis of early 1999[26] and the signing of the 2001 Framework Agreement among Macedonia's major political forces, in the aftermath of an armed invasion against the country's territory, a few months earlier. The extent to which parties to the Agreement will be ready to implement it in good faith will now determine the pace of Macedonia's well deserved full membership in NATO and the European Union. In this latter regard, the recent NATO Summit in Riga, Latvia, could have certainly been more forthcoming in meeting Macedonia's concerns.

In the forefront of active contributors to global peace and security

When viewed from the vantage point of the past fifteen years, Macedonia today is an important participant of the regional and international dialogue. Its political role in the Balkans is by far greater than the country's economic potential. Its unique transformations can be best illustrated by the distance it covered from a recepient, hosting a United Nations preventive peacekeeping venture, to a troop-contributing country to such operations: special units of the Macedonian Army serve in international peace forces in Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Iraq.

---

[26] „The influx exerted immense pressure on the coalition government and Macedonia's population. Their willingness to rise to the challenge was a remarkable achievement that has not yet received the international recognition it deserves," *Macedonia: Prevention Can Work.* Special Report, no. 58 (Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace, March 27, 2000). More recognition of Macedonia's contribution came half a year later during the budgetay debate in the U.S. House of Representatives: "The managers note the crucial importance of a democratic, multiethnic Macedonia to stability in the Balkans, as well as the contribution made by that nation during the Kosovo air campaign. In view of these factors, the managers strongly support adequate resources for assistance for Macedonia for fiscal year 2001." Conference Report on H.R. 4811, Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs Appropriations Act 2001, 106th Cong. 2d sess., October 24, 2000.

Still ten years ago, many Macedonian politicians would view such a prospect with disbelief, as an impossible dream. In the mid-1990s, UNPREDEP was one of the few representations of the UN system in Skopje; today, local offices of eleven agencies and organizations of the system conduct programmes in their specific areas of action.

Basing on the rich experience and competence of its diplomacy, the Republic of Macedonia nominated its former Minister for Foreign Affairs and Permanent Representative to the United Nations, Mr. Srgjan Kerim, for the election to the post of President of the sixty-second session of the General Assembly of the United Nations. This, too, is a signum temporis. In a world of a crisis of values and challenging times for the United Nations, a small country chooses to send its representative to occupy for a few months the highest post in the Organization and give it yet another try. This would have not happened if Macedonia did not believe in the United Nations. But time has shown that Macedonia believes and Macedonia cares, just as many other small nations do, especially if at one point or another the UN helped them to consolidate their statehood or deter aggression. Such countries need reassurances that it is good to believe in the United Nations. Election of a distinguished Macedonian politician and diplomat to the post of President of the General Assembly would, indeed, be a tribute to the peoples of the Balkans and, at the same time, a form of compensation on the part of the United Nations for its unfair handling of Macedonia's recognition and the name issue.

In Macedonia's history, the United Nations marked an unfinished but momentous episode, helping to chart its future along the path that starts with the present. On a number of occasions the international community missed its opportunities to give Macedonia full credit by failing to understand that a country like Macedonia, having made a unique contribution to peace and stability in the Balkans, deserved a special "peace dividend," which it never received. This small country could and should have become a showcase for Western support of nascent democracies, as a linchpin for regional democracy and stability, as well as because of Balkan geopolitics. In some respects, the significance of Macedonia's current security needs matches Western states' perceptions of the prerequisite security conditions for the existence of an independent Israel. The awareness of this, however, has still to pave its way to foreign policy- and decision-makers. Hopefully, not too late.

Essays

UNITED NATIONS IN THE ERA OF REFORM: THE ISSUES OF THE UN SECRETARIAT

Danilo TÜRK

Introduction: the meaning of the word "reform" in the UN context

In its core, reform means improvement. A standard dictionary definition explains that improvement includes "removal of imperfections, faults and errors."[1] Reform of organizations can happen in a variety of ways: as a result of rational decision-making and deliberate design or as a result of practice and circumstances.

In the UN the word "reform" carries a variety of meanings. In a global organization of 192 sovereign member states and a diverse set of mandates different meanings are inevitable. Agendas and priorities diverge and a sense of common purpose is not easy to develop. Therefore, different "UN constituencies" – i.e. groups of UN member states, civil society organizations and different segments of the UN Secretariat have different perceptions on what needs to be done and when.

Historically, the UN has both resisted change and accepted novelty. Usually, the pressures of immediate needs were decisive. While a general conference to review the UN Charter has never been held – despite the requirement to that effect stipulated in Article 109 of the UN Charter- the Organization has evolved considerably. This has given content to the notion of the "living Charter" and made it possible for reforms to take place without a revision of the Charter. This type of approach – demand driven, gradual and without an overall design - is likely to continue in the future. In 2006 the Organization created two new decision-making bodies which epitomize the

---

[1] The Concise Oxford Dictionary of current English (1970) defines the verb to reform: "make (person, institution, procedure, conduct oneself) or (of persons or of body of persons) become better by abandonment of imperfections, faults and errors."

Ambassador Danilo Türk has devoted a major part of his professionallife to the United Nations and has been, over thirty years and in a variety of capacities involved in the work of the UN system. His most recent involvement was that of Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs (2000-2005). He was also involved in the work on several reports of the Secretary-general related to UN reforms.

Prior to joining the UN Secretariat, Ambassador Türk served (1992-2000) as the Permanent Representative of Slovenia to the United Nations in New York.

Danilo Türk is a professor of international law at the Faculty of Law, University of Ljubljana (Slovenia).

process of change: the Peace-Building Commission and the Human Rights Council. The creation of these two bodies demonstrates the recognition of new or expanded needs and the type of change designed to meet them.

One of the main characteristics of change in the UN in the recent times (i.e. after the ending of the cold war) is its growing operational capacity. The evolution of peacekeeping is an obvious example. In the recent report "Investing in the United Nations: for a stronger Organization worldwide" (doc. A/60/692), the Secretary-General explained that the UN has "undergone dramatic operational expansion in a wide range of fields, from human rights to development." The UN has a wide range of peacekeeping missions, a $5 billion annual peacekeeping budget, 80.000 peacekeepers in the field. This number could grow beyond 100.000 in early 2007 if all the mandates are fully carried out. The "regular budget" of $1.8 billion per annum is dwarfed by the mentioned peacekeeping budget plus $2.7 billion of extra-budgetary spending per annum (mostly in the form of various trust funds) devoted to humanitarian and other urgent tasks in the field. In short, the regular budget represents about 20% of the annual UN spending, not including the budgets of the UN agencies, funds and programs devoted mostly to operational activities.[2]

The current global figures relating to the staff (not including the military personnel) show the same pattern. The largest part (16,280) are deployed in field locations. Regional commissions employ 2,505 staff. The number of personnel in all the headquarters (New York, Geneva, Vienna and Nairobi) combined represents roughly one third: 10, 340 out of the total of 29,125 personnel.[3]

These figures show the extent to which the UN has changed (i.e. "reformed itself") under the pressure of practical need. The change from an inter-governmental, conference-servicing and norm-setting organization into a highly operational, heavily charged, expectations-creating (and usually under-funded) organization has been dramatic.

In fact, one could pose a question whether the Organization should not, first and foremost, give priority to its structures and modus operandi at the decision-making level so as to ensure its role as a serious deliberative organization capable of guiding its vastly expanded operational arm with the necessary wisdom and vision?

The answer to this question can only be in the affirmative. The organization needs a serious discussion and well thought out vision of the role of its principal organs, the balance among them and their composition. The discussion on the Security Council will have to continue despite the slowing down which followed the unsuccessful attempts at reform in 2005. The General Assembly is also in the need of substantial reform – it is too duplicative and needs better focus. The idea of three councils suggested in the Secretary General's report In larger freedom provides a possible point of departure: If the three councils – the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council and the Human Rights Council are developed into effective executive arm of

---

[2] Figures from the Report of the Secretary-General »Investing in the United Nations:for a stronger Organization worldwide (A/60/692), paragraph 6.

[3] Ibidem, paragraph 24.

the UN's decision making it would be logical to develop the General Assembly into the principal body which guides and supervises the work of the Councils. This would require changes in the way the Assembly works today including, importantly, the need to abolish the main committees (except the legal and the financial committee) and to focus on the consideration of reports of the three councils.

A vision such as this may take time to mature and will require a great deal of debate. But right now there are a few issues related to the work of the Secretariat and its management which need not wait. Quite to the contrary, the newly appointed Secretary-General would be well advised to accord them a priority status. Some among them are discussed below. They all relate to the issue of management of the Secretariat, an area where improvement is both necessary and possible.

Finance: some basic issues

Management doesn't take place in a vacuum. In the UN the political context and the omnipresent issue of political will define the scope for managerial decisions. The extent to which the Secretariat has become an independent international service has been largely defined by political circumstances. The ending of the cold war has been a major contributing factor to improvement. In addition, the state of political play is expressed in financial decisions and, sometimes, in financial crises. The crises in the early 1960s, mid 1980s and the second half of 1990s defined the conditions in which the decisions on management of the Secretariat were taken. The policy of "zero nominal growth of the UN regular budget" was an expression of a political attitude and not only a principle of financial policy. Delays in payment of contributions which rarely reach the UN accounts in full and on time are an important indicator of Member States' commitment – or lack thereof – to the UN. Management can be improved, i.e. reformed. However, the nature of improvement will be fundamentally affected by the state of the Organization's finances.

The Secretary-General's report "Investing in the United Nations: for a stronger Organization worldwide" addresses a number of issues of budget and finance. But the report, for understandable reasons, avoided some other issues which need to be reflected upon. One among them is the question of the scale of assessments for the regular budget. While it is true that the regular budget represents only about 20% of the current UN annual spending, it is still the basis for the functioning of the Secretariat and for its management. The scale is based on the principle of the "capacity to pay" - which is calculated on the basis of a Member State's GNP with various adjustments. The minimum assessment for the least developed countries is 0.001 per cent of the total regular budget and the maximum (USA) 22 per cent.

The principle of the capacity to pay is, in its essence, an expression of the idea of fairness: The richer should pay more and the poorer should not pay beyond their capacity. On the other hand, however, this financial principle is also a departure from a basic principle of the Charter of the UN, that of sovereign equality (Article 2, Para. 1. of the UN Charter) on which the UN structure is based. This discrepancy creates a situation of tension: the minority of Member States who contribute the most to the

UN budget feel entitled to have a decisive say in matters of finance and, indirectly, a strong influence on matters of management. The majority of States, who (being sovereign and equal, according to the Charter), feel excluded from the real influence in the organization and a strong need to assert themselves by withholding (some of) the decisions in the area of budget and administration. This dispute[4] has had an adverse effect on the process of administrative reforms for a number of years by now and there is no real solution in sight. Partial solutions and occasional compromise do not provide a solid basis for the Organization's future.

A reformed scale of assessments, one which would reduce the differences between the high end contributors and others, would go a long way towards an organization which enjoys the necessary commitment of its members. It would also reduce the danger of a financial crisis which can be caused by delays in payment by the major contributors. The questions of the scale of assessments should become a matter of serious discussion. The ideas from the past, including the proposal to set the ceiling much below 20%, need to be revisited.

Another basic problem is posed by the dependence of the Organization on the timing of contributions and the resulting difficulties in the cash flow. The Member States' budgets are subject to a variety of pressures and often payment of dues to the UN is not a priority. The Organization does not have the right to borrow or to charge interest on arrears. This too has an effect on the overall management and will have to be addressed in this context. Proposals were made in the past to allow the UN to borrow commercially, but they were rejected by the Member States, partly based on sound, albeit conservative financial objections to the possibility of a UN debt, and partly on the political view that the organization should not be allowed to develop this kind of financial independence. For the same reason the ideas of a "UN tax" on air tickets or on international financial flows did not succeed before and are not likely to be successful today. Nevertheless, ideas like these must not be ignored in a discussion which aims at improvement of the UN management: it goes without saying that a financially stable organization is likely to be a better managed organization.

In addition to these fundamental issues of finance there are aspects of budgeting which have a direct bearing on the quality of management in the UN. The budgeting process is necessarily complex and time consuming but the same can be said of any budgeting process in a national system or in a large international organization. What the UN process needs, however, is a better strategic guidance. The Secretary-General's reports need to express the proposed strategic direction. Probably, as the Secretary-General himself has suggested, this would be more easily achieved if there were fewer reports expected by the General Assembly so that discussion could focus more clearly on the main issues and, consequently, on the evaluation of results.

There is a need for innovation in this domain. Much of the current information on financial flows in the organization can be put on websites so that member states could have an immediate and continuous access to the necessary figures. The reports, on the other hand, should focus on aggregates and trends. This would improve

---

4   The problem is recognized in the Secretary-General's report (A/60/692), paragraph 15.

transparency and allow the options to be discussed in a more comprehensive manner. The evaluation of results could also be more easily improved. So far this kind of financial reporting has been successful in the area of humanitarian assistance which relies heavily on voluntary funding and has an added reason to make the financial reporting continuous and up to date. But the techniques thus developed could be used for other budgetary needs as well.

Finally, as the organization expands it needs a stronger auditing capacity. The experience of the Iraq programme has shown that the organization was not prepared for all the problems of the management of vast sums generated by the sales of Iraqi oil and spent on the purchase of humanitarian goods. The Oil for Food Investigation (the "Volcker report") has clearly shown that the existing UN auditing capacities were not adequate. But the readers of the "Volcker report" have also understood that the alternative at the time was not a solution either: It is ironic indeed that the external auditor considered for the task - Arthur Andersen - no longer exists following its involvement in the Enron irregularities.

A technically strong external auditor does not necessarily guarantee success. The UN must develop its own auditing capacity, one that will be accountable to the Member States and will be thoroughly familiar with the specific financial features of the UN – an intergovernmental and multilateral institution which has to undertake new tasks without sufficiently long periods of financial preparation and often in circumstances on the ground which change unexpectedly.

Leadership

The Charter of the UN defines the role of the Secretary-General as the "chief administrative officer" (Article 97) and as a principal organ of the UN who may "bring to the attention of the Security Council any matter which in his opinion may threaten the maintenance of international peace and security." (Article 99). The Charter thus gives rise to duality of Secretary-General's administrative and political functions making his job particularly difficult and complex. Moreover, as an astute commentator once observed - while the political influence of the Secretary-General has been severely circumscribed by the permanent members of the Security Council, his administrative authority has been withheld away by the majority in the General Assembly.[5]

This, in brief, are the conditions in which the Secretary-General is expected to exercise leadership. But complexity also implies opportunity.

The Secretary-General, as the "chief administrative officer" is entitled to organize the leadership of the Secretariat, i.e. his team, in a manner which he deems adequate for the task. He decides on where and how to delegate and on the type of teamwork needed. In 1997 he established a structure of executive committees to strengthen the collective, team based work in the areas of peace and security, humanitarian affairs

---

[5]   Max Jacobson: The United Nations in the 1990s: A Second Chance?, Twentieth Century Fund, 1993, p. 157.

and development. In 1998 he appointed (first ever) Deputy Secretary-General and delegated to her important tasks in the area of management as well as a number of politically sensitive tasks for the coordination of the UN system in the situations such as Kosovo (1999), Iraq (2002-2004) and the Sudan (2004-2005).

The results of the strengthened teamwork and delegation represented important progress. The executive committees provided, as a minimum, a welcome forum for exchange of information and views and, in the case of the UN Development Group and the Executive Committee on Humanitarian Affairs, also a degree of operational coordination. Chaired by Under Secretaries-General the executive committees represented a real step in the right direction.

The appointment of the Deputy Secretary-General has proved to be an important step forward. In a hierarchical organization like the UN Secretariat it is necessary that certain forms of coordination be presided over by a person senior to the Under Secretaries-General (heads of departments), but not by the Secretary-General himself. He must concentrate on strategic guidance while the minutiae of coordination are delegated to his Deputy. This also saves him time that is badly needed for communication with Member States and with intergovernmental organs of the UN. It is important, however, that the Secretary-General stays in close touch with the process of coordination and that he intervenes whenever necessary. In matters of policy-making he has to retain leadership and control of the process. It is often difficult to discern the moment when issues of implementation of existing policies become, in fact, new policy issues. The Secretary-General must decide at which point his own intervention is necessary. There is a fine line between implementation and the making of a new policy decision. It is necessary to distinguish between the beneficial delegation and the need to exercise leadership and control and to combine the two in a coherent manner. Sound judgment of the Secretary General is indispensable.

In addition to other forms of team work the Secretary-General introduced (in 2005) a new tool, his "Policy Committee" which brings together his key advisers in discussions on the most serious political issues. The key to success of this mechanism is twofold: (a) continuity and (b) thorough preparation. The analytical basis of decisions must be thoroughly researched and complemented by clear and realistic options for action. The decisions taken must be revisited and refined, as appropriate. While these requirements can be seen as necessary in all decision- making they are vital to the work of the team, which has to prepare some of the most important political decisions the Secretary-General is expected to take.

In his report "Investing in the United Nations: for a stronger Organization worldwide", the Secretary-General proposed a further step: a redefinition of the role of the Deputy Secretary-General "so as to delegate to him or her formal authority and accountability for the management and overall direction of the functions of the Secretariat."[6] This proposal requires careful consideration. The role of the Secretary-General as the chief administrative officer is an essential, albeit very difficult part of his job. Delegation of tasks in this domain has to be carefully calibrated and

---

[6]   A/60/692, p.2, recommendation 5.

his supervisory role fully retained. Delegation should not be irreversible: there has to exist, at all time, the option of bringing any issue under direct authority of the Secretary-General. Otherwise, his stature in the organization would be weakened and could eventually diminish his ability to speak with authority in matters of political substance as well.

In the same vein the Secretary-General also has to retain full authority to organize the departments of the Secretariat in accordance with his own judgement and vision of priorities. While some of the key departments (for example, the Office of Legal Affairs- OLA) are well defined and need to be kept, some others can be reorganized or merged. The dynamic nature of developments affecting the work of the Department of Political Affairs (DPA), the Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) and the Office of the Coordinator of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) requires, as a minimum, very close cooperation and coordination among these departments. In particular, reports and proposals to the Secretary General in situations involving the tasks of DPA and DPKO often have to be prepared jointly. Occasionally a case is made for the creation of integrated mission task forces (IMTAs). However, the practical experience with the latter has been mixed so far.

Proposals to merge the DPA and the DPKO have been rejected in the past. Instead, in specific situations and in accordance with the need, the concept of the "lead department" – with the other departments working closely with it – has been used to ensure close cooperation among the departments. The results have generally been positive, albeit not ideal. The questions of a possible merger of the two departments will be left to the next Secretary-General. The issue, obviously, has to be approached with a clear sense of purpose in mind and preferably with a vision of the choice of persons in the leading positions. The recent proposal of the Secretary-General to reorganize the reporting of the 25 departments and other entities who currently report directly to the Secretary-General[7] should be, at this stage, understood only as an expression of the need to streamline reporting rather than as a call to an immediate (and therefore somewhat artificial) merger of departments.

Information management

There are several reasons why information management has to be high on the agenda of the management reform. The most technical among them is described in the Secretary-General's report "Investing in the United Nations: for a stronger Organization worldwide":

"Despite a number of improvements to the United Nations information and communication technology (ICT) infrastructure in recent years, the overall system remains fragmented, outdated and under funded compared to similar large and complex organizations. The lack of any integrated system to store, search and retrieve information generated at the United Nations holds back progress in many other areas."

---

[7]   Ibidem, recommendation 6.

This is what one could call the technical aspect of the problem to which a technical solution is offered - the creation of the post of Chief Information Technology Officer and upgrading of secretariat-wide ICT systems.[8]

There is very little doubt that the UN needs technical improvement in the area of communication technology. But there are two other aspects which have to be considered as well. The first relates to the practices of in-house reporting which needs to be improved and made more system – relevant. There is a large amount of reporting and other communication taking place within the UN system. This communication follows a variety of mandates, reporting lines and personal communication. Like in any other organization, e-mail communication within the UN has greatly expanded the amount of information and communication circulating in the system. The question remains whether all this communication and the wealth of information communicated is adequately organized and harnessed for the benefit of the Organization as a whole. This has less to do with the sophistication of the ICT and more with the way the UN is designed and the way it works. UN country teams consist of agencies with different mandates and different reporting systems. Peacekeeping missions have their own priorities and methods of reporting. Political field missions differ from the other types of field presences in their communications and in other respects. Human rights rapporteurs and field presences are different still. Often the analysis and assessment coming from different parts of the system vary. How should this system work?

The Secretary-General would be well advised to create an information management team which would consider rules and techniques of organizing existing information and making it available throughout the system in the most effective manner. Admittedly, this is a sensitive task given the need to respect the existing mandates determined by intergovernmental bodies and, above all, the sovereignty of Member States. With these considerations in mind the Organization should improve the information flows and do so not only by upgrading its ICT system, but also by developing an appropriate organization of work.

Finally, the issue of information management necessarily involves the question of intelligence. Not surprisingly, the UN has been, in particular during the Cold War years, a "source of intelligence", and has not been allowed to develop a serious intelligence capacity - either on its own or in cooperation with member states. Even today one wonders whether the political conditions allow a serious discussion on the need for the UN to develop an adequate intelligence capacity. But be that as it may, it is impossible to discus the UN management reform without touching on the question of intelligence.

In some areas of the UN work intelligence is very important. In matters of peacekeeping the lack of intelligence capacity could be critical – as seen in various operations in the Balkans and elsewhere. As all military operations, peacekeeping operations have to develop, in a situation-specific way, methods of collection and analysis of information relevant to the implementation of the pertinent mandate.

---

8   Ibidem, p. 3, reccomendations 8 and 9

At the level of UN as a whole there is a need to develop, in cooperation with Member States, appropriate capacities to deal effectively with such priority tasks as counterterrorism.

Intelligence has to be specific to the task at hand and devoted to specific mandates determined by the Security Council. Member states need to be encouraged to share the relevant information with the UN Secretariat. For its part, the Secretariat has to develop a better analytical capacity. That capacity too has to be related directly to a specifically mandated task within the relevant units of the Secretariat: in the case of counterterrorism within the Counterterrorism Executive Directorate (CTED) and in the case of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, within IAEA, OPCW[9] and the Department for Disarmament Affairs. A more serious support from Member States to the UN and a better analytical capacity within the UN are among the critically important conditions for an effective Organization with a serious deliberative purpose.

Personnel

Every organization depends on the people who work for it. However, the effect of their work does not depend only on their own quality but also on how the organization is financed and led and on other factors, including the system of information management.

Article 100 of the UN Charter has defined the essential conditions of the international character of the UN staff. From an historical perspective one can clearly see the movement towards that ideal. The period after the ending of the cold war has generated a cadre of UN officials, many among them recruited for the tasks in the field, who can genuinely claim to be "international officials responsible only to the organization."

Around 16,000, i.e. more than half of the UN personnel today is deployed in civilian tasks in the field. This is also where the number of the UN staff has grown the most in the past decade. In the headquarters too the growth in the number of personnel has been mostly related to the expansion of the operational tasks. This growth has created additional challenges to the system. Recruitment procedures designed in a different era for a different type of Secretariat are no longer adequate. The question of staff mobility, in particular rotation between the field and the headquarters has become much more serious. The question of career development is more complex than before, a fact particularly felt by the part of the personnel most affected by technological change.

The recruitment system clearly needs improvement and this is not simply a matter of technology. There are many people around the world, including in particular young and skilled people who long to work for the UN. Many among

---

9   OPCW is an independent organization, established by the Chemical Weapons Convention. Nevertheless its rules allow for the expert assistance of OPCW to be provided to the Security Council.

them are given this opportunity, but many more are not. Vacancy announcements are advertised on the UN website in a system known as "Galaxy," which allows many candidates around the world to apply. This gives an advantage to candidates with computers. More importantly, in the absence of any pre-screening of candidatures, the system is inundated with information and the Office on Human Resources Management has an impossible task of making the first selection. The lists produced in this process and transmitted to the substantive departments for further selection are long and often crowded with candidates with wrong qualifications. The system becomes clogged and the selection process too long. It is difficult to ensure adequate geographical representation through this process. There is a clear need for reform to make recruitment more efficient and fair. What exactly should such a reform entail is difficult to say. A thorough analysis of the current practice is necessary before specific changes are proposed.

On the other hand there are some areas in which improvement should not wait, for example the need to harmonize conditions of service and to improve remuneration for work in dangerous situations, as well as the need to streamline the contracts.

Rotation between the headquarters and the field should also be improved. Field service should become a more prominent factor in career development and should be rewarded. On the other hand, there is a need to respect specialization. Staff members who join as professionals with serious professional ambition in the disciplines such as law, economics or political analysis may not be at all time prepared for deployment in a field mission. This too has to be recognized as legitimate.

A different concern affecting the staff and their morale are occasional suggestions regarding relocation, off-shoring or even outsourcing of services. This matter has to be approached with great care. As an intergovernmental organization the UN is a "public sector system" not adjusted to sudden change. Prudence requires a great deal of discussion and participation of the staff members – at all stages of the process. However, staff members have to understand that given high cost at the headquarters and the difficulties with space for the UN in New York the idea of relocation of certain parts of the Secretariat should not be a taboo. Serious discussion involving the Secretary-General, the Staff Union, Member States and the Host Country is called for.

Outsourcing, on the other hand, raises fundamental issues. Technically, almost all the functions of the UN Secretariat can be outsourced. However, it is precisely the need for an international civil service that gave rise to the creation of the Secretariat in the first place. Therefore outsourcing should not only be supported by cost-benefit analyses but also by a clear political agreement of the Member States before any specific step is taken.

For the UN Secretariat to be genuinely international it has to be fully representative. The number of underrepresented countries has to be further reduced. It is important to provide those countries not only with national competitive exams but also with the possibilities for training soon after the selection which will allow their candidates to be prepared for their future tasks.

In conclusion

The proposed selection of issues related to better management of the UN Secretariat represents a sample which merits serious consideration. Its components can be taken up one by one but with a clear sense o f a general strategy. Mr. Kofi Annan, the current UN Secretary General has done his utmost to move the process forward. But the issues are such that require a sustained and long-term work. Mr. Ban Ki-moon, the incoming Secretary –general will have a solid basis to start from. As the above comments suggest, he will have to address some of the issues which have traditionally been among the most sensitive and difficult to tackle. He deserves support and confidence as he decides on how to approach the task.

Essays

UN REFORMS:
UN SECURITY COUNCIL AND
THE RIGHT OF INTERVENTION[*]

Srgjan KERIM

UN Secretary General Kofi Annan has recently expressed the broad and overall need for serious and deep reforms of the UN System. Especially attractive in this respect are his thoughts and attitudes related to the functioning of the Security Council (SC) in the area of protecting peace and security in the world.[1]

The Secretary General Annan evaluates and recommends, when talking about global security, that the SC should pass a resolution, which will contain the principles that will be the base for using military force, including undertaking preventive action as well.[2]

This recommendation of the UN Secretary General fully complies with the spirit and the wording of the proposals included in the study, i.e. the report of the International Commission on intervention and state sovereignty, published in 2001 with the title "Responsibility to Protect".[3]

Namely, in the third chapter of the report of the Secretary General entitled "Freedom to live in dignity", Annan asks the members of the World Organization to commit to the strengthening of the just state, human rights and democracy in concrete ways, i.e. by accepting the principles of the "responsibility to protect"[4], as a base for collective action against genocide, ethnic cleansing and crime against humanity – thus

---

[1] UN General Assembly A/59/2005, *In large freedom: towards development, security and human rights of all;* Report of SC, New York March 2005

[2] UN General Assembly ... ibidem ... E. Use of force, pg. 33

[3] *The Responsibility to protect*, ICISS, The International Development Research Centre, Ottawa 2001, pp. 69

[4] Ibidem ... pg. 74

---

[*] This text was published in Dr. Srgjan Kerim's book "Bridges to the Future" in Macedonian language (Skopje, 2005 , by "Matica Makedonska", ISBN 9989-48-603-4) in Serbian language (Belgrade, 2006 by "Narodna Kniga" ISBN 86-331-2782-2) and in Albanian language (Tirana, 2006 by "Ideart" ISBN 99943-43-43-00-9).

Srgjan Kerim, PhD, is the candidate of the Republic of Macedonia for President of the 62nd Session of the UN General Assembly. He filled the post of Ambassador of the Republic of Macedonia to the United Nations from 2001 to 2003 upon serving as Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Macedonia from 2000 to 2001.

admitting that the responsibility lies above all in each state separately, but also in the international community, i.e. in final instance at the UN SC, in cases when the national authorities are unable to protect their citizens or unwilling to do so.[5]

Not only because of the fact that these proposals of the Secretary General coincide with the second anniversary of the US and UK military intervention in Iraq, but also because this intervention instigated a lot of controversy in the UN over how ripe the situation is for change, it would be useful to analyze the conduct and reactions during the two-day debate (26/27 March, 2003) led in the SC with the participation of almost half of the UN member states (83 countries) regarding the military intervention in Iraq.

The debate made it clear that the SC fought with many difficulties in the defining of relations in its own ranks, i.e. the bases for its action. Two permanent members of the SC (China and Russia) stressed in the debate that this was a matter of an illegal action of the part of the US and the UK, while those two permanent SC members pointed out that the authorization of military intervention is given by the SC resolution 678 (1990), and 1441 (2002), by which the authorities in Iraq are being warned that force will be used unless they meet the conditions imposed by the SC in relation to the line taken in these and other corresponding SC resolutions.

It thus became obvious that among the permanent SC members there are unbridgeable differences in the interpretation of the role and function of the SC concerning the use of force in applying its collective will, presented through passing of different resolutions.

In this respect the question arises as to whether the SC is a collective body, the role of which is reduced to making assessments, that is giving a green light to the use of force when necessary, or it is acting as a body within the UN which will organize the collective use of force.

This dilemma is not just of a purely conceptual nature, but is even more relevant under the current conditions of an obvious imbalance between US military power on one side and the rest of the permanent SC members on the other.

In other words, this imbalance poses the real question for the SC. Its functioning is the attitude towards the military superpower of the US. Is it opportune for the SC to measure its own authority by attempting to "control", i.e. to restrict US power, or should it attempt to use it for collective goals, thus strengthening its own authority?

Trying to give a balanced, but at the same time clear answer to this dilemma in the context of the relations between the European Union and the US that is within the North Atlantic partnership, the Egon Bahr from Germany, who is one of the most prominent European experts for security issues, says: "The transatlantic partnership can develop and strengthen only on the basis of knowledge and acceptance of the reality by both sides. This means that the European side should acknowledge and accept without any inferiority complex the power of the US military hardware for

---

[5] UN General Assembly A/59/2005, ... Use of force ... pg. 33

military intervention, and in turn the US side should accept the benefits of the so called European software in preserving peace in the post-intervention period."[6]

Egon Bahr's logic corresponds even more to the relations in the SC. If there is an inclination to "discipline" the US and turn the SC into a forum which would counterbalance its power, or attempt to counteract it with the use of a veto or other means, in order to tame the only true superpower in the world, the SC would increasingly face blockages in decision-making.

Not only is this approach counterproductive, but it leads to erosion of SC's authority and legitimacy. After all, Chapter VII of the UN Charter has been envisioned and conceived as a combination of the use of force and legal authority.[7]

In this context it is necessary to point out the economic dimension of the problem. According to Lester Thurow, one of the leading world economists, if there is a lesson to be learned from the Iraq case, it can be presented in the following form.[8] The US cannot be controlled, but it can be engaged. The most certain way to accomplish this is the development of the global economy. If one views globalization in this respect, it becomes obvious that the biggest changes it will bring and initiate will happen precisely in the US. Nowhere else will the influence of globalization dislocate the production, labor and capital flow in greater scope than in the US. At the same time, one should bare in mind that US makes 32% of the gross world production, EU 25%, and Japan 16%.

So, the problem is not how to "tame" the superpower US, or to control the use of its undeniable military supremacy to undertake unilateral military interventions with the assistance of so-called voluntary coalitions like the one in Iraq's case. Simply put, it is necessary to modify the UN, or its norms and bodies to a new reality created by the fundamental changes in the area of human rights, the rule of law, globalization as an increasingly important phenomenon, and the emergence of international terrorism.

After the attack on the US on September 11, 2001 the issue of global terrorism became the highest priority on the agenda of the international community. The US has uncompromisingly imposed the doctrine of the right for "hot preemption" in order to prevent any terrorist activity that compromises their national security.

Contrary to the interpretation of Secretary General Annan, according to which article 51 of Chapter VII of the Charter justifies the US understanding that the SC "is not a jury, but a cop", article 39 of the same Chapter unmistakably points out that any military intervention is unacceptable without the assessment and agreement from the SC that peace and security are at stake.[9]

On the other hand, the question arises as to what is the point in protecting the status quo based on the Chapter VII of the Charter, when the number of precedents

---

[6] Egon Bahr, *Krieg und Frieden*, Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, 10/12/2003, pg. 8
[7] *The Charter of the UN: A Commentary*, edited by Bruno Simma, Oxford University Press, New York 2002
[8] Lester Thorow, *Fortune Favors the Bold*, Harper Collins Publisher, New York 2003, pp. 6-8.
[9] The Charter of UN, ibidem ... pp. 713-714.

embodied in the military intervention by voluntary coalitions outside the SC (Kosovo, Liberia, Sierra Leone, Cambodia, Uganda, Afghanistan, Chechnya and finally Iraq) is so big that it does not allow to "look back" any more, but rather we will have to "look forward".

The strengthening of multilateralism, or the role of the UN and the functioning of the SC in conditions when the right of intervention viewed within the "responsibility to protect" concept becomes necessary in international practice, becomes by destiny related to deeper reforms of the UN, and thus of the SC. This is why the reform of the SC should not be reduced only to insisting on representation and parity, which is justified, and a necessary condition, yet not a sufficient condition for its optimal functioning. Because of these reasons, it is necessary to incorporate two other principles: effectiveness and responsibility.

Without transformation on these grounds, i.e. fundamental reforms, the UN faces a danger of diminished relevancy in global decision-making. That's why it is important to pose the question whether such reforms can be effective if the charter remains untouchable for any changes. This especially concerns Chapter VII.

There is a reason to believe that certain unclear wording and contradictions in articles 39 and 51 of Chapter VII in the charter require for them to be at least revised and redefined in accordance to the tectonic movements and fundamental changes that have happened in international relations in the past sixty years.

Article 39 states: The SC shall determine if there are threats to peace ... and will decide what measures will be undertaken ... to establish peace and security.

While article 51 states: This Charter (meaning the UN Charter – note by S.K.) does not violate the inherent right to individual and collective self-defense in the case of an armed attack against any UN member state.

Even if we accept the thesis contained in Secretary General Annan's report that article 51 also "covers" cases of so-called immediate threat to world peace and security, it is difficult to stretch the interpretation to that extent as to cover cases of so-called latent threat to the peace and security. However, even if we extremely minimize the importance of things related to the interpretation of article 51 we could never counterbalance it with article 39, which leaves no room for unilateral decisions and measures, i.e. the establishment of voluntary coalitions which will act as a substitute of or on behalf of the SC.

These and some other open issues cannot be answered without the taking into consideration the basic postulate of the concept "responsibility to protect" as determined by the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty. The basic motive to define this concept comes from the lack of internationally accepted rules and principles on the bases of which one would determine the need for so-called humanitarian interventions (which in the 1990s were often on the international agenda).

The authors of the concept think that, above all, there is a need to redefine the term "humanitarian intervention", shifting the accent from "the right to intervene" to "responsibility to protect".[10]

The use of the concept "responsibility to protect" has several advantages:

I. It enables the problem to evolve also from the perspective of those who need protection, and not only from the perspective of those who believe that they have the right to legitimate intervention.

II. It stresses the primary responsibility of the state, which needs intervention (only when this state is incapable to perform its responsibility to protect does the international community takes over this responsibility).

III. The term is comprehensive and includes the right to react, the right to act preventively and the right to renew.

Namely, the right to react will mean addressing situations of essential human needs with corresponding measures, which might include coercive measures as sanctions and international processes, and in extreme cases military intervention.

The right to act preventively points to the roots causes, direct causes of internal conflict, as well as the so called man-made crisis, which put the population at risk.

The right to renew includes providing full assistance in rebuilding, especially after a military intervention, reconstruction and reconciliation, naming the causes of injustice this intervention is designed to stop or prevent.

So, in other words, the core of this term is shifting the classical concept of the essence of sovereignty towards control (division) of responsibility.

The concept of "responsibility to protect" is based on the same premises as the international human rights law. In this sense, the classical concept for equality of the sovereignty of states , has already been relativized with the international human rights law, the development of which in the last 50 years has helped take a decisive step from the culture of irresponsibility of the sovereign state (on issues of its exclusive jurisdiction) towards national and international responsibility. 11

The international practice and the reality of international relations stress the difference between stricto sensu interpretation of sovereignty and the realistic practicing of sovereignty. Today it is widely accepted, even by the staunchest supporters of the strict interpretation, that sovereignty has dual responsibility: internal and external.

---

[10] In the middle of the 1980s, the French diplomacy launched the principle called "devoire d'ingerence" (necessity to intervene), justifying it with the needs preconditioned with the unbearable situation in relation to human rights, as well as the danger of ethnic cleansings in Africa. The author of this principle was Bernard Kouchner, the first administrator of Kosovo. During the 90ties this principle was not only confirmed, but evolved in the "right to protect" with the same explanation expanded with the issue of humanitarian catastrophe and protection of peace and security of certain region.

[11] The Chapter of the UN, A Commentary, Edited by Bruno Simma, ... ibidem ... article 2/point 1, pg. XXXVII.

Although the principles of international human rights law cannot, still, be treated as a de facto norm, which is formulated into "responsibility to protect".

The use of the concept of "responsibility to protect" does not exclude military intervention as ultima ratio in the behavior of the international community in certain extreme cases. However it anticipates the existence of principles for its legitimacy.

In his study of ruling and the world order in the 21st century Francis Fukuyama, the author of the internationally renowned book The End of History and the Last Man, stresses the need for military interventions by the international community not only as a right, but primarily as a responsibility. He derives this thesis from the fact that sovereignty as a category is becoming increasingly problematic, illustrating this with examples of weak and unstable states as Somalia and Afghanistan.[12]

Serious human rights violations, humanitarian catastrophes with elements of ethnic cleansing, as well as international terrorism, are according to Fukuyama, a product of non-functioning nation states, thus putting into question the usefulness of their sovereignty, bearing in mind that they endanger peace and security beyond their borders.

Drawing on the stretched interpretation of article 51 of Chapter VII of the UN Charter, Fukuyama puts the US intervention in Iraq under the category of preventive action in order to prevent threats to peace and security, but he himself concludes that "anticipating such threats" cannot be an adequate principle in international relations.[13]

It is precisely because of this reason that it is unavoidable to set determinants for the term extreme cases when it comes to a possible use of military intervention within the concept of "responsibility to protect".

This involves the following six principles:

    I. "Just reason": the just reason must be highly placed for the military intervention to be really an exceptional measure, and not a rule. In that sense, military intervention is justified if there is evidence of mass killings or ethnic cleansing. It is not a proper measure and is not justified in cases of systematic racist political or racial or ethnical suppression.

    II. "Just intention": the justification of intention is legitimized with multilateral support for the intervention; with the degree of support for the intervention by the population of the specific state-recipient of the intervention; with the degree of support from other states in the region and wider.

    III. "Last resource": the military intervention will be legitimate and justified only if all options are used to prevent or to peacefully solve the problem. Military intervention is justified only if the responsibility for prevention was fully achieved.

---

[12] Francis Fukuyama, State Building, Profile Books, Cornell University Press, London 2004, pp. 124-131.
[13] Francis Fukuyama, ibidem ... pg. 146.

IV. "Proportionality": the scope, length and intensity of the military intervention must be a necessity, only to the extent necessary to reach the goal – to protect the endangered individuals. The effect on the political systems of the states in which the intervention is conducted must be limited only to the level necessary to reach the goal of intervention. The change of political systems and governing structures cannot be the sole or the priority reason for military intervention.

V. "Responsible assessment": there must be reasonable chances for success of the intervention, i.e. reasonable chances that it will put an end to the suffering of the endangered individuals. The intervention must not cause greater suffering.

VI. "True authority": the role of the UN Security Council is compulsory and irreplaceable in the approval of the military intervention.

The key issue is of course the instance that would determine whether the conditions for military intervention have been met, i.e. whether the abovementioned principles as preconditions for conducting a military intervention have been adhered to.

The SC should have a primary role, but the question is whether it should have the only role, i.e. final say, having in mind its structure of "double standards" as expressed by the status of the five member states with the right to veto. The role of the UN (SC) is without any alternative, primarily because of the principle of legitimacy in the international relations. The UN is the only global organization that should apply legitimacy.

In relation to the issue of true democratic legitimacy, Fukuyama is right to point in his already cited study that between the EU and the US there are deep differences not so much in relation to unilateralism and multilateralism in their behavior in the international community, but more in the interpretation of genuine democratic legitimacy in decision-making.[14] The US is of an opinion that it originally belongs to nation states, and is derived i.e. is delegated when needed to international organizations. On the contrary, the EU believes that democratic legitimacy is also expressed through the will of the international community (UN).

The legitimacy principle is essential and connects the execution of responsibilities of the body (authority) to the use of force. Only such use of force can have a legitimate interest and goal; the unilateral one lacks that interest and goal and is thus illegitimate. The denial of this role of the UN bears the risk of erosion of their general authority and undermines the principles of the world order based on international law.

So, the goal should not be to find an alternative to the SC, but rather to improve its efficiency.

In case the SC is unable to reach a decision, two international options are possible. The first one is for the UN General Assembly to review the issue on an urgent special session based on the procedure "united for peace" (used in the case of

---

[14] Francis Fukuyama, ... ibidem ... pg. 149.

Korea in 1950, Egypt in 1956 and Congo in 1960). The second solution is within the jurisdiction of regional and subregional organizations mentioned in Chapter VII of the UN Charter. Provided there is later on an authorization by the SC (the case of Kosovo).

However, the key issue is what happens if the SC does not succeed in its function to protect in such "extreme situations"?

In that case, the question is which of the two evils is the lesser one: to overthrow the principles of the international order, as defined in the UN Charter through neglect of the SC decision or to allow shocking suffering of innocent individuals, as in the case of the Democratic Republic of Congo, with 3.8 million killed and 2.3 million displaced people since 1997, in order to respect the role of the SC.15

Such blockades in the functioning, i.e. the process of decision making in the SC, leave room for unilateral actions, that is violation of the principles that help determine the legitimacy of the military intervention.

However, matters become even more complicated if the justification for such "unilateral or coalition intervention" outside the SC becomes obvious post festum, (the case of Kosovo), when NATO takes the role of "executor", but still receives additional endorsement by the SC, through the engagement of peace forces.

To get out of this vicious circle it will be necessary to take many steps in the direction determined by the proposal of the Secretary General Annan, within the radical reforms of UN, in order to pass a resolution of the SC which will determine the principles of "responsibility to protect" as a basis for authorization of necessary military interventions in order to prevent a threat to world peace and security.

The passing of such a resolution, along with change-related reforms, i.e. the broadening of the composition of the SC, would definitely symbolize positive change. However, there is the serious reserve as to the purposefulness of such moves, unless the limits present in Chapter VII of the UN Charter in relation to the functioning and the role of the SC in cases of threats to peace and security are reconsidered.16

When it comes to the question how opportune it is to undertake military interventions in certain extreme cases, the current controversies that burden the work of the SC, including the frustrations related to the undertaking of unilateral activities and actions outside the SC by certain member states will be possible to overcome if we incorporate the principles of "responsibility to protect" in this part of the UN Charter.

With each passing day, this is becoming more and more unavoidable.

---

[15] General Assembly, Report of the SC, ... ibidem ... D. System coherence, pg. 49

[16] General Assembly, Report of the SC, ... ibidem ... V. Strengthening the UN, ... pg. 43
Out of the two offered models for changes in the composition and structure of the SC we believe that "A" is more acceptable, including 6 new seats in the permanent composition of the SC, without the right to veto, and 3 new seats in the non-permanent composition with a two year mandate, so that the SC will consist of 24 instead of the current 15 states equally divided among Europe, Asia, Africa and the Americas.

THE OSCE
AND SOUTH EASTERN EUROPE

Marc PERRIN DE BRICHAMBAUT

Introduction

In 2005, the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) celebrated not only thirty years' of existence as a regional organization, but also thirty years of experience as an enduring framework for dialogue and peaceful coexistence. Initially conceived as a loose conference mechanism to provide a forum for East-West political dialogue, the OSCE has evolved into a solid framework with a permanent structure, an annual budget, a network of field operations as well as other operational capabilities, and an international and highly-skilled professional staff. Since its creation in 1975 as the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE), the OSCE has been a work in progress reflecting the changing needs of participating States as well as the transforming context of European and international affairs.

As much as the Cold War was the formative early experience of the CSCE, engagement in South-Eastern Europe has defined the modern history of the OSCE. The Organization's experience in this region, indeed, has shaped the OSCE as it stands today, driving much of the form and scale of OSCE field operations and affecting the structure of OSCE Institutions. The OSCE has been in this region every step of the way since the early 1990s, walking with the peoples and communities of the countries of South-Eastern Europe through tension and war and working tirelessly to build peace and confidence. The process has been difficult for all concerned. But the scale of change over the last fifteen years has been historic. The OSCE is proud to have played a role in accompanying, even stimulating, positive trends across the region. Much has been accomplished, and much remains to be done. The OSCE will remain deeply engaged as the countries and the peoples of South-Eastern progress towards their rightful destiny of peace, stability and integration.

OSCE field Operations in South-Eastern Europe have been working to address root causes of conflict, to eliminate sources of tension and to facilitate reconciliation, as much as supporting efforts in inter-community relationship building. The OSCE profile in South-Eastern Europe spans the full range of OSCE activities, from conflict prevention to crisis management and post-conflict rehabilitation. In this article, I will review the success stories of OSCE experience in the region before turning to discuss

Mr. Marc Perrin de Brichambaut is the OSCE Secretary General.

the challenges ahead. But before starting, it is worth stepping back to examine the nature of the OSCE at a more general level.

A Laboratory of Ideas

The creation of regional organizations and institutions based on and driven by common values, shared standards, and agreed commitments was once the ideal of a few far-sighted philosophers, scholars, enlightened statesmen, and peace activists. Viewed from this perspective, the founding of the OSCE demonstrates how ideas can become building blocs for change, and how such ideas can be transformed into new realities. On this basis, even to this day, the OSCE functions as a laboratory of ideas, and this role has grown in strength over the last decades. Nor is it surprising that the OSCE serves as a reference and a focal point for its participating States which resort to it to manage change in Europe as well as within their own respective societies.

Many features make the OSCE a unique regional organization in the European landscape. For one, the OSCE is an association of states and their societies, joined by Partner States for Co-operation in the Mediterranean and Asia. It is neither a military alliance nor an economic union, but an inclusive forum spanning the transatlantic and Eurasian geographic areas, and embracing the world's major religions and cultures.

Second, the OSCE's core rests on a far-reaching aquis of politically binding values and standards in areas concerning democracy, human rights and the protection of the rights of national minorities, as well as standards concerning military affairs, such as the principle of democratic oversight. The OSCE operates on the principle of equality that is enshrined by the rule of consensus in decision-making. Although the decisions of participating States are only politically rather than legally binding, this allows for greater flexibility in the Organization. While no legal obligations are placed on States through their OSCE commitments, a process of peer review among participating States has fostered an impressive record of implementation.

Moreover, the OSCE is an organization that has always been ahead of its time, especially when it comes to the articulation of new ideas and the development of a body of shared standards and agreed commitments. Already in the 1970s, the OSCE, then still the CSCE, embraced a radical concept of security, founded on the concept of "co-operative security," where the security of one state is inherently linked to that of all other states. To implement this vision, the OSCE pioneered confidence and security-building measures that have served as inspiration to regional organizations worldwide. The OSCE has also been at the forefront of widening our thinking on security in another way. Indeed, by adopting the notion of comprehensive security, the Organization transcended early on the traditional wisdom of viewing security merely through a political-military prism. Instead, it added an economic/environmental as well as a human dimension. All of these three dimensions carry equal weight, and are embedded in all activities of the Organization's institutions and field operations. The two pillars of the OSCE concept of security -- cooperative and comprehensive security -- were revolutionary thirty years ago, and they remain so today, even if they have become commonly accepted by other organizations and actors in the global system.

The OSCE has played a key role in European security by articulating new ideas and turning them into political action. This is well-documented in relation to what, indeed, might be called the OSCE aquis. The OSCE role is also evident with respect to the Organization's pioneering and extensive efforts in early warning and conflict prevention, as well as crisis management, conflict resolution, and post-conflict rehabilitation. While its forerunner, the CSCE, had always a preventive function in that it brought two antagonistic systems into a forum for political dialogue and confidence-building, it was not until the first half of the 1990s that the Organization's capabilities in attending to conflict and post-conflict situations were developed. This occurred at a time when few other international organizations were fully prepared and ready to implement long-term conflict prevention and conflict resolution measures or had the operational capacity to do so.

In order to be effective in this task, the participating States created a number of new structures and mechanisms, many of which have since been extensively tested. At present, the OSCE is able to draw on a variety of instruments in emerging crisis situations. These include, most importantly, the Chairman-in-Office and his Personal/Special Representatives and Envoys; the Secretary General and the Secretariat's Conflict Prevention Centre; the Institutions, including the High Commissioner on National Minorities and the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights; the Field Operations; and the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly. In crisis situations where the OSCE has played a role, a combination of tools available to the Organization is applied in accordance to the specific circumstances of a particular situation. Through the adoption of comprehensive principles and commitments, the participating States have created a solid basis for the Organization's to become deeply involved in conflict-related activities.

The OSCE has developed robust operational experience. The Organization's nineteen field operations -- deployed in seventeen countries, absorbing about two-thirds of the OSCE's budget — are an important vehicle for assisting participating States in capacity- and institution-building. But, more than this, their conflict prevention and resolution capacities have been vital to host countries.

Success Stories

The OSCE has a long and distinguished history of assisting the governments and societies in South-Eastern Europe. This support began as early as 1992, and it has ranged since across a broad spectrum of activities. These have included early warning preventive diplomacy and crisis management, and stretched also to post-conflict rehabilitation, the rebuilding of inter-community relations, as well as longer-term reform processes, such as institution- and capacity building, for democratic consolidation. OSCE involvement in South-Eastern Europe illustrates the depth of OSCE activities in the field and the scale of the Organizations' vision of security.

The violent conflicts in South Eastern Europe provided the stimulus for the establishment of an extensive network of OSCE Field Operations in the region. As of mid-2006, the OSCE had seven operations altogether, with the Mission to Montenegro

launched in the summer. The disintegration of the former Yugoslavia unleashed not only unprecedented violence in the region at the end of the twentieth century. It also gave rise to complex problems associated with post-conflict environments, the formation and consolidation of new states as well as the accommodation of an intricate web of multi-ethnic societies. Thanks to the efforts of many actors, including the OSCE, the immediate post-conflict reconstruction efforts have now given way to long-term engagement in transition processes and democratic consolidation in the States in this region.

The OSCE role in South-Eastern Europe has been wide-ranging, requiring the allocation of extensive resources and the deployment of personnel in its field operations. More than 70% of the OSCE's Field Operation budget is spent on the field activities in the region. South- Eastern Europe also hosts the largest concentration of international and national OSCE staff members, nearly 2,000, with the Mission in Kosovo having the highest number of staff of all OSCE field operations.

Across the region, OSCE Missions share similar priorities to strengthen states, consolidate democratic institutions and values, and to foster regional co-operation. The OSCE's objectives remain to further consolidate states and societies in order to accelerate their firm integration into wider European developments. Here, the OSCE works in partnership with local authorities and communities as well as with other actors from the international community.

The activities of the Field Operations in the region are multi-dimensional, covering, indeed, the political-military, economic/environmental, and the human dimensions. While they vary according to the needs identified by host countries, the missions are similar in that they all address an exhaustive list of issues. The list is long, ranging from legislative and electoral support, police development and education, particularly with regards to creating a multi-ethnic police force and implementing community policing standards, assisting governments in fighting organized crime and corruption, strengthening local government, supporting citizen participation and civil society development, monitoring criminal reform, and assisting with educational reforms. The basic objectives of all of these activities have been to strengthen the institutions of States and their governance and to assist the emergence of healthy societies. The idea is simple: healthy societies make for well-governed states, which, in turn, ensure positive regional development.

Indeed, in addition to this focus on building strong institutions, good governance, and the rule of law, the OSCE supports regional cooperative processes that deal with the long-term consequences of war: the return of refugees and proceedings on war crimes. These issues are also critical for the re-establishment of constructive inter-community relations. Four OSCE Missions—Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Montenegro and Serbia— have established, with the assistance of the OSCE's Conflict Prevention Centre, mechanisms to enhance cross-border co-operation in these areas. Such regional cooperative processes, the so-called "4x3 Initiative" on refugee return and the "Palic Process" on inter-state cooperation in war crimes proceedings, will continue in 2007 and require consultations with the EU and the United Nations (UN) .

OSCE activities to improve inter-community relations in the region take place at two levels: First, through the creation and institutionalization of effective confidence-building measures – for example, in police development and training, media training, the protection of minority rights or education and tolerance building; Second, through long-term reform programmes designed to benefit communities. In most of its field operations in South-Eastern Europe, the OSCE has been engaged in the creation of a multi-ethnic police force and in training police officers in community-based policing to encourage communities to work with local police and to build trust between different ethnic communities and security forces. Moreover, many of the activities that facilitate inter-community relationships take place in the realm of media training and media development as well as civil society development and educational and tolerance-raising activities.

The OSCE's efforts to promote tolerance and non-discrimination in multi-ethnic societies mirror the Organization's efforts to promote inter-cultural dialogue and inter-faith co-operation. Certainly, in today's world, deepening intercultural and interfaith dialogue and co-operation are important for building long-term and broad security. Ignorance, discrimination, and intolerance of different groups and cultures have become key factors of tension within the OSCE borders and beyond. Given the region's importance as a crossroad of different cultures, religions, and national and ethnic groups, OSCE assistance to youth, education, and the media are in themselves crucial confidence-building and security- enhancing measures.

Looking specifically at the Republic of Macedonia[1], it goes without saying that the country and its people were particularly fortunate in having prevented large-scale armed confrontations. This was largely thanks to the efforts of its political leadership. An important role was also played in the preventive efforts initiated by the international community. As the host country to one of the earliest and longest-serving OSCE Field Operations, the Spillover Monitor Mission to Skopje has been a showcase for demonstrating the OSCE's successful involvement in all phases of a conflict cycle—from conflict prevention in the early years of independence, to crisis management during the violent events of early 2001 to peace implementation and post-conflict rehabilitation.

Moreover, the Republic of Macedonia has itself taken a leading role in conflict prevention and conflict management, through its political power-sharing arrangements among all ethnic groups, through decentralization of power throughout the country, and through the implementation of broad minority rights. As such, it serves in many ways as an example for how a country can successfully manage the complex fabric of inter-ethnic relations. With the implementation of key provisions of the Ohrid Framework Agreement, the country has taken major steps away from worrying episodes of its past. This was also confirmed by the positive opinion from the European Commission regarding the country's application for EU membership.

---

[1]   In the original text the author is using the provisional reference for addressing the Republic of Macedonia as a member of OSCE.

The OSCE does not act on its own in the region, but in partnership with other regional and international organizations. Intense and wide-ranging inter-action is also part of the OSCE success story in South-Eastern Europe. The OSCE, indeed, works in close co-operation not only with the EU and NATO, but also with the UN, the Council of Europe, and other regional actors such as the Stability Pact and the South East European Cooperation Process (SEECP). For one, OSCE cooperation with the UN in Kosovo, where the OSCE Mission serves as the third pillar of the UN Interim Administration, is an institutional arrangement that is unprecedented in the history of the OSCE as well as in the region. The OSCE also works closely together with the EU, NATO, and the UN in assuring the smooth transition to a post-status Kosovo following the termination of UNMIK. The case is not isolated. In Bosnia and Herzegovina and in the Republic of Macedonia, OSCE Missions, while autonomous, act as part of an integrated international presence.

In addition, OSCE institutions and missions in the region are in many cases key partners for the implementation of joint projects with the EU for example, and especially the European Commission. The "Ohrid Process on Border Management and Security in South-Eastern Europe" is another excellent example of successful co-operation between the OSCE, the EU, NATO, and the Stability Pact for South-Eastern Europe. What is more, the OSCE and NATO have worked in the past closely on disarmament issues, such as the elimination of small arms and on security sector reform. Moreover, governments in the region work in co-operation with OSCE Missions to fulfil the criteria related to future EU membership; these processes have reinforced OSCE-EU interactions.

Thus, in many respects, the OSCE as we see it today was forged in South-Eastern Europe, in response to the conflicts of the 1990s and to the difficulties of complex transition processes. While often the result of urgent need and changing circumstances, OSCE activities have been led for over a decade by the principles of co-operative and comprehensive security. As a result, the OSCE profile across the region is both wide and deep, covering all three OSCE dimensions, focusing on societies, States and the region itself. Much has been achieved, and with some success. Of course, the key ingredients have been, first, the willingness of the governments of the States in the region to undertake the necessary reforms to build new futures from difficult pasts, and, second, the resilience and vibrancy of societies to act together. The OSCE has been most successful when these two ingredients have acted together.

Challenges Ahead

The story, of course, is not over.

Many challenges lie ahead, both for South-Eastern Europe, and for the OSCE in the region. For South-Eastern Europe, the basic challenge is to continue on the path of successful transition. This is a prerequisite for the creation of healthy states and societies, and for the fulfillment of South-Eastern Europe's Euro-Atlantic aspirations. Several more difficult turns on this path remain to be negotiated across the region. For one, consolidating co-operation between countries in South-Eastern Europe, whether

in border management, in fighting organized crime, or in the refugee return process, is vital to the long-term stability of the region and Europe.

In addition, it is crucial for the region to come to terms with its past and face the responsibilities that derive from the wars of the 1990s. For Serbia, for example, full cooperation with the International Criminal Tribunal on the Former Yugoslavia (ICTY) is crucial and remains the prerequisite for the country to sign the Stabilization and Association Agreement (SAA) with the EU. Recent statements by Chief Prosecutor Carla Del Ponte, as well as her visit to Belgrade, underline the urgent need to arrest and transfer all ICTY indictees, including Ratko Mladic. Non-compliance will further burden Serbia's relationship with the EU given the ICTY's insistence that SAA talks with the EU continue to be suspended until there is full cooperation.

Determining the future of Kosovo remains by far the most pressing challenge since it has uncertain implications for the region and beyond. While the precise timetable in the final determination of the Kosovo status remains unclear, the OSCE must ready itself now to provide major assistance in any transitional period which will see the divestment of UNMIK powers. With the OSCE and the EU as the primary actors in a post-status Kosovo, concerted efforts must continue on defining areas of responsibility where the two organizations have comparative advantage and can bring unique value-added. Moreover, maintaining uncertainties in the final determination of the status might have negative repercussions for Kosovo and the region, since it could lead to a heightening of tensions and increased violent incidents, all of which would impact on the security of Kosovo's neighbours. In addition, from another perspective, despite the clearly unique nature of this situation, the decision taken on the status of Kosovo may be seen by some as a precedent for other regions in the OSCE area, such as the unresolved conflicts in the former Soviet Union.

The OSCE itself also faces a number of institutional challenges. One of these concerns the present trend of downsizing and phasing out of field operations. Croatia may be the first country to experience this. Should this trend be confirmed, it may set an important precedent in the region and further afield. It would also require from the host country a greater assumption of responsibility and commitment to ensure local ownership of institution and capacity-building processes and to remain on the path of what promise to be prolonged and complex reforms. In addition, the OSCE's capacity to pursue regional initiatives, as it currently does with regard to refugee return or judicial co-operation, as well as new regional cooperative projects, would become more difficult to undertake without the physical presence of field operations.

Looking Forward

The developments that the OSCE faces in South-Eastern Europe are magnified by the wider challenges that the Organization faces as a whole when it comes to improving its effectiveness and to finding an appropriate role in future European security. At present, the OSCE (as, indeed, are the EU and NATO) is adjusting its role and place in the European security landscape. It is true that the OSCE is not the only European security organization. It is also true that the OSCE did not develop

into the pre-eminent pan-European security organization as some had envisaged in the 1990s. More importantly, the Organization faces the challenge of adapting to changing international circumstances and to new threats and risks facing participating States. Partly as a result, the 2005 Ministerial Council set forth an agenda for the reform of the Organization. The challenge now is to make this process meaningful.

Reform and adaptation are never easy. However, I believe that the Organization has the resilience and vibrancy that are necessary to undertake this path with success. In conclusion, I wish to highlight three points about the Organization. Some of these may seem obvious, but the essential is important and is also too often forgotten. These essential features of the OSCE ensure for it a key role in Europe's security landscape. Nowhere is this role more evident than in South-Eastern Europe.

First, the Organization is the most inclusive organization and, indeed, the world's largest security organization. Compared to other organizations, the OSCE can be seen to embody an inclusive definition of Europe. This is a key resource, and one that matters also for finding long-term sustainable solutions to enduring problems in South-Eastern Europe. All countries of the region are represented in the OSCE, along with their major international partners. Second, over the last thirty years, the OSCE has become a unique laboratory of ideas and principles in Europe, having itself been born from the idea that states and their societies can cooperate when it comes to their intrinsic need for security and peace. Finally, the OSCE has a proven record of providing value added to the security of its participating States. In South-Eastern Europe, this record has been demonstrated at the operational level, where the OSCE has developed unique experiences, such as acting to assist States in implementing their commitments in the struggle against terrorism to anti-trafficking cooperation.

Of course, building peace after war requires the effort of all; everyone counts, from young pupils to local police officers, from town government to civil society activists. The lessons of the last fifteen years in South-Eastern Europe can be summed up in one sentence: we all, from the international community to local communities, must act together to embed peace, craft stronger institutions and healthier societies. Much has been achieved, but a lot of hard work remains before us.

The transitions underway in South-Eastern Europe are complex and dynamic. Their success depends on active support from all political actors inside and outside these countries. This path involves institution-building and state consolidation, but more besides. Successful transition requires crafting a democratic culture, one based on inclusion and reconciliation. Such a culture must be adhered to by all members of society to take root. Strengthening the institutions and culture of democracy in South-Eastern Europe will help to build healthy societies and states, which, in turn, are vital ingredients of regional and broader European security. The OSCE has been active in South-Eastern Europe in the difficult times; the Organization remains as firmly committed as ever to supporting the region's States and societies to move towards a better future.

MACEDONIA AND NATO: EVOLVING PARTNERSHIP

Nikola DIMITROV

"Why did you choose us?"
"We like you, we think you like us, and then you talked it into our heads for so long that we could not do otherwise."[1]

It is more or less conventional wisdom among foreign policy-makers that "...alliances break up when the common danger lessens or disappears...."[2] Under the neorealist balance of power theory, victorious alliances will most likely fall apart over the division of the gotten booty or on the grounds of their security needs to balance their relative capabilities against one another once the major threat is defeated. For an illustration of the former one can look into the Second Balkan War where the former allies went to war against one another to divide the booty. An example of the later may arguably be the break-up of the World War II alliance.

Hence, it comes as no surprise that in the wake of the West's Cold War victory and the demise of the Warsaw Pact and the Soviet Union, many observers and scholars anticipated that NATO would cease to exist as well. After all, the existential threat to Western Europe against which the Alliance was established had disappeared. NATO

---

[1] Dialogue on the margins of the NATO Madrid Summit in 1997 when Poland, the Czech Republic and Hungary were invited to join the Alliance between Czech deputy foreign minister Vondra and a group of American senators. Frank Schimmelfennig. NATO's Enlargement to the East: An Analysis of Collective Decision-making. EAPC-NATO Individual Fellowship Report 1998-2000.3

[2] Wolfers, Arnold. 1968. Alliances. In International encyclopedia of the social sciences, edited by D. Sills, 268-271. New York: Macmillan.

Mr. Nikola Dimitrov was assigned National Coordinator of the Republic of Macedonia for NATO Integration on 16 March 2006 and Special Envoy of the Republic of Macedonia in the talks between the Republic of Macedonia and the Hellenic Republic for bridging their differences over Macedonia's name, under the UN auspices, on 13 March 2003.

He was designated Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Republic of Macedonia to the United States of America (28 November 2001 – 16 March 2006), to which position he was appointed upon serving as National Security Advisor to the President of the Republic of Macedonia from 1 October 2000 to 28 November 2001.

On 15 March 2000, he was elected Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Macedonia and filled the post through 30 September 2000.

was to be a victim of its own success[3]. "NATO is a disappearing thing. It is a question of how long it is going to remain a significant institution even though its name may linger on."[4]

These predictions came true only to the extent that NATO of the Cold War is gone. In fact, as Secretary General Scheffer said at the Munich Security Conference this year, "more than ever, NATO is in demand and NATO is delivering." The Alliance today is more than a static collective defense alliance. NATO outlasted the threat it was designed to counter by way of transforming itself, its geography and the historical area of its activities. "If you think about 1994, NATO was an alliance of 16 countries that had done a lot of exercises but had never conducted a military operation. It had no partners. If you look at the NATO of 2005, you see an organization that was running, eight military operations simultaneously, which had 26 members, and partnership relationships with another 20 countries in Eurasia, 7 in the Mediterranean, and a growing number in the Persian Gulf."[5] The central goal of the Cold War NATO was the defense of Western Europe. However, the core provision of the North Atlantic Treaty (Article 5), which provides for collective defense in the event of an armed attack against a member state, was invoked for the first time in 2001, in the wake of 9/11 – the attack against the United States.[6]

These developments can hardly be explained solely under the assumption that states generally act egoistically and instrumentally. Those who predicted the demise of NATO in the wake of the Cold War underestimated the importance of values as stated in the Preamble of the North Atlantic Treaty: the Parties "are determined to safeguard the freedom, common heritage and civilization of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law." If one makes a cost-benefit calculation exclusively in terms of security or military incentives for NATO it will be difficult to understand the process of the post Cold War enlargement. "… NATO is therefore best understood not as simply a military alliance but as the military organization of an international community of values and norms."[7]

This article is an attempt to analyze the development of relations between the Republic of Macedonia and NATO within the context of the wider evolution or transformation of the Alliance in the past 15 years. Through its cooperation with NATO and its involvement in the Balkans, Macedonia itself played a part in the evolution of the Alliance. Relations between NATO and Macedonia started with

---

[3] For a great challenge to the neorealist balance of power theory see James W. Davis. Victims of Success? Post Victory Alliance Politics. NATO Research Fellowship Final Report

[4] Kenneth Waltz, quoted in Hellmann, Gunther and Reinhard Wolf. 1993. Neorealism, neoliberal institutionalism and the future of NATO. Security Studies.17

[5] Kurt Volker, Deputy Assistant Secretary for European and Eurasian Affairs. NATO: Where Is It Headed? Speech at the Naval Postgraduate School. March 28, 2006

[6] If the alliance was originally intended to keep America in, as it was famously observed by NATO's first Secretary General Lord Ismay, the first invocation of Article 5 "kept" Europe in - it was the Europeans who were offering Washington their support.

[7] Frank Schimmelfennig. Ibid.

cooperation and a partnership, at one time they were in a two way street of direct security assistance, which resulted in participation of Macedonian soldiers in the ISAF operation in Afghanistan. These are relations, which undoubtedly lead towards membership of the Republic of Macedonia in the Alliance.

During the dissolution of the former Yugoslavia[8], the Republic of Macedonia became an independent state on the basis of a successful referendum held on September 8th 1991. Just two months later, at the NATO summit in Rome, the alliance revised its Strategic concept. Starting from the historical changes in Europe, in the chapter on security challenges, attention is directed towards instability that can emerge from "…ethnic rivalry and territorial disputes" in NATO's immediate neighborhood in Europe. Having in mind the developments on the territory of the former Yugoslavia, it can be said that the only former republic that peacefully gained its independence shared the concerns of the Alliance[9].

Based on its security interests and on its commitment to full acceptance of the values of the Euro-Atlantic community – human and minority rights, democracy, rule of law, market economy and peaceful resolution of disputes – Macedonia developed a national consensus on its aspiration for NATO membership expressed in the decision of the Parliament adopted on November 23, 1993.

Although from today's vantage point it seems that the road NATO took towards its enlargement was the only correct and historically possible road it could take, at the time it was the topic of heated academic and political discussions.[10] In January 1994 NATO promoted the Partnership for Peace, which according to some, was an attempt at a temporary compromise between the supporters of swift enlargement and their opponents.[11] In November 1995 the Republic of Macedonia became a member of the Partnership for Peace and opened a new chapter in its partnership with the Alliance.[12] That same year NATO defined the criteria and goals of enlargement through the Study on NATO enlargement.

Doubts about security benefits, the cost of enlargement and implications for the Russian Federation were overcome primarily by the discourse of common values.

---

[8] In spite of obvious contradictions, the reference "former Yugoslavia" unfortunately still exists only in the temporary reference which is used when the Republic of Macedonia is being addresses by certain states and international organizations, including NATO.

[9] Within the context of the Balkans, besides acquiring its independence peacefully the Republic of Macedonia is also an atypical example because it's multi-ethnic democracy.

[10] For the most influential opponents to enlargement see Rühe, Volker 1993: Shaping Euro-Atlantic Policies: A Grand Strategy for a New Era, in: Survival 35:2, 129-137. and Lake, Anthony 1993: From Containment to Enlargement. Current Foreign Policy Debates in Perspective, in: Vital Speeches of the Day 60:1, 13-19. For dilemmas from today's perspective see Richard Holbrooke and Ronald D. Asmus. Next Step for NATO. *International Herald Tribune*. March 14, 2006; A19. Also see Dan Reiter. Why NATO Enlargement Does Not Spread Democracy. *International Security* 25.4 (2001) 41-67

[11] Strobe Talbott: *The Russia Hand*, The Random House Trade Paperback Edition, 2003. 98-8

[12] For a more encompassing study of the contents of the partnership see Islam Jusufi. Partnership for Peace and the Republic of Macedonia. NATO Fellowship Report 2000.

At the margins of the Summit in Madrid in 1997, invitations for membership were issued to countries with traditional anti-communist movements, classified as leaders of democracy in the region by Freedom House – Poland, the Czech Republic and Hungary.[13] Adapting to the tectonic geo-political changes in Europe, strengthening new democracies and filling the security vacuum in Central and Eastern Europe is the second key success of the Alliance.[14]

Experience from the first round of enlargement after the Cold War lead to the promotion of the Membership Action Plan at the 1999 Summit in Washington, as an instrument to be used in preparing for membership adapted to the specifics of each candidate separately. Macedonia, together with the other 8 countries from the partnership, who are also candidates for membership[15], immediately acceded to this mechanism. At the same time the Alliance revised its Strategic concept, binding its members not only to mutual defense, but also towards preserving peace and stability in the wider Euro-Atlantic region, which includes crisis management and peacekeeping operations.

However, initial participation of NATO in operations outside its territory were more the result of needs and requests, rather than of a general theoretical consensus about NATO's new role. Wars, chaos and the deep-rooted instability in the former Yugoslavia thrust forward the dilemma about peacekeeping operations and crisis management operations outside of the traditional zone of the Alliance and its concept of collective defense. To the claims that the Alliance must shift its accent from defending the territory of its member states to defending common interests outside its territory, it was replied in the following illustrative manner: "Having a baby to save the marriage is neither good family practice nor a sound basis for military strategy".[16]

NATO undertook its first monitoring and peacekeeping operations within the context of the war in Bosnia and Herzegovina under the mandate of the UN Security Council, and after Dayton, it continued with the deployment of implementation forces (IFOR) and later stabilization forces (SFOR).

For the first time in its history NATO went to war in 1999 after the failure of diplomatic efforts, which were supported by the threat of use of force by NATO in an attempt to prevent ethnic cleansing and a humanitarian catastrophe in Kosovo. This was a war outside the borders of the Alliance. It was not because of collective defense and it did not have a mandate from the Security Council. The intervention, in fact just like its enlargement, besides interest in stability in NATO's neighborhood, can

---

[13] See Karatnycky, Adrian/Motyl, Alexander/Shor, Boris (Eds.) 1997: Nations in Transit 1997. Civil Society, Democracy and Markets in East Central Europe and the Newly Independent States, New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.

[14] Kurt Volker. Ibid.

[15] Albania, Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Romania, the Slovakia and Slovenia (Croatia joined later in 2001) in the joint statement from Vilnius, pointed out that the vision of a whole and united Europe will be realized only when all of them are integrated into NATO.

[16] John Hillen, "Getting NATO Back to Basics," Heritage Foundation *Backgrounder* No. 1067, February 7, 1996, p. 2.

once again be explained through the prism of common values – provoked by ethnic cleansing as a crude violation.

NATO's military involvement in the neighborhood of the Republic of Macedonia marked a new phase in a strengthened partnership in their mutual relations.[17]. As the host country to NATO troops, by placing its territory at the disposal of the Alliance and by opening its borders to the enormous refugee wave from Kosovo, Macedonia made a concrete contribution to NATO's mission.

This policy, which is not without problematic repercussions[18], is the result of two mutually compatible national interests. On one hand Macedonia was interested in putting an end to the violence, in returning the refugees and in stabilizing its northern border. On the other hand, in compliance with its commitment to NATO membership, Macedonia was interested in directly contributing to the goals of the Alliance. At the same time, the presence of NATO troops was used to increase inter-cooperation with Macedonian troops. From the deployment of KFOR troops that followed the intervention, to date the Republic of Macedonia is playing a significant role in logistical support of this peace-keeping mission.

It is obvious that KFOR faced an exceptional challenge in its efforts to stabilize Kosovo. Regardless of the perspective, all serious analyses of the 2001 crisis in the Republic of Macedonia can not avoid noting the direct or indirect "spill-over" of instability from Kosovo. The imperative in stabilizing the region, the partnership with Macedonia, but also the need to confirm that the NATO mission in Kosovo and its own political decisions were correct, were the reasons why the Alliance was deeply involved in resolving the Macedonian crisis. That is why the success in avoiding another inter-ethnic conflict on the Balkan through a political dialogue on inter-ethnic issues, was first of all a success of Macedonia but it was also a success of NATO. This success was realized under the patronage of the late President of the Republic of Macedonia Mr. Boris Trajkovski who's Plan, on August 13th 2001, resulted in the signing of the Framework Agreement, which marked out the road for the further development of the Macedonian multi-ethnic democracy. Confirming the unitary character of the country and discarding all forms of violence in realizing political goals, the Agreement introduces constitutional changes aimed at wider use of the languages of the minorities, decentralization and a balanced representation in the public administration. President Trajkovski's leadership, the deep involvement and coordination between NATO, the EU and the USA, as well as the maturity of the Macedonian citizens, were the main factors, which contributed to this mutual success.

---

[17] See the Preamble to the Basic Agreement between the Republic of Macedonia and NATO for the operation of NATO missions to Macedonia, which entered into force on December 24, 1998.

[18] The entire number of refugees housed in refugee camps, state owned buildings and private homes of the citizens of the Republic of Macedonia was 360,000 which was 18% of the entire population of the country. Besides the enormous economic, humanitarian and logistical challenges, this number was also a security challenge, additionally complicated if we have in mind the mixed ethnic structure of the population.

At the request of the Republic of Macedonia, for the first time in its history NATO had its high civilian representative directly involved in managing the crisis in coordination with national authorities. Among other things, a ceasefire was established under his mediation as a precondition for a political dialogue. On the basis of this experience, the Alliance dispatched high political representatives to Afghanistan within the context of ISAF and in Pakistan during the 2005 operation for humanitarian assistance.[19]

After the signing of the Framework Agreement, during the period in which stability was consolidated, NATO realized three successive operations in Macedonia. However, even during this period in which Macedonia was a consumer of security assistance, the country retained primary responsibility for its stability. For comparison, NATO and its partners deployed 60,000 soldiers in Bosnia and Herzegovina and 50,000 soldiers in Kosovo, as mandated by the UN Security Council. Nine years later the operation in Bosnia and Herzegovina was taken over by the EU. After 7 years in Kosovo NATO has a handful of work to do. On the other hand in Macedonia, the first NATO operation "Essential Harvest", approved at the request of the Republic of Macedonia, as well as the following two operations, lasted one month during which 3,500 soldiers collected and destroyed the arms of the NLA. In continuation, operation "Amber Fox", which provided security for the EU and OSCE monitors supervising the implementation of the Framework Agreement was carried out by 700 NATO soldiers. A similar role was played by the last NATO operation "Allied Harmony" but with a strengthened advisory role aimed at enabling the Republic of Macedonia to take over full responsibility for its own stability.

The crisis and management of the crisis did not indicate any fragility on Macedonia's part on the contrary it demonstrated the national capacity of the Macedonian multi-ethnic democracy to absorb challenges in exceptionally complex conditions and surroundings. If dialogue, minority rights and democracy are part of the values of the Euro-Atlantic community, then the Republic of Macedonia clearly proved that it is part of that community of values. Furthermore, Macedonia's success in 2001 is also the success of NATO, its policy and involvement on the Balkans. A year later, at the Prague Summit, seven countries were invited to membership among which were also Bulgaria and Romania, countries that are in Macedonia's neighborhood. To a certain extent Macedonia was left out because of the events in 2001, which are related to the Kosovo crisis.

The exceptional cooperation between NATO and the EU in Macedonia, as well as the personal involvement of the Secretary General of the Alliance George Robertson and the EU High Representative Javier Solana, represented a significant step forwards in building a strategic partnership between the two organizations. The NATO and EU declaration on European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP) from December 2002, preceded the agreement "Berlin +" from March 17, 2003, as the basis for cooperation between the two organizations in crisis management, enabling the Union access to the

---

[19] James Pardew and Christopher Bennett. NATO's evolving operations. *NATO Review Spring 2006.* 3

collective resources and capacities of NATO for operations lead by the EU. The EU's first historic military operation for crisis management was the operation "Concordia" in the Republic of Macedonia (March – December 2003), taking over from NATO as it finished its operation "Allied Harmony".

It is interesting to note that, to a certain extent, the Republic of Macedonia contributed to this development. President Boris Trajkovski, in spite of diplomatic pressure[20,] firmly stood behind his position that Macedonia would not accept on its territory an operation lead by the EU or by a coalition of several European countries without a previous agreement, more precisely complementarity between the EU and NATO. Macedonia was not interested in being forced to choose, which would have confronted the interests of one or the other organization.[21]

In the mean time, monitoring what is needed and various developments, NATO continues its transformation. The terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, resulted for the first time in its history, in the activation of article 5.[22] Even though initially the USA essentially independently dealt with the Taliban regime and al-Qaeda, today the Alliance leads the ISAF operation in Afghanistan, quite far away from the borders of the Euro-Atlantic organization. The fact that the attack on the USA was not carried out by a country but by a terrorist organization will hasten the continuity in the transformation of NATO and the development of capacities to deal with the global threats of the 21st century. The "in house" dispute over Iraq between the USA and some of its European allies lead by France and Germany is acquiring reconciliatory tones, even though it did leave certain negative consequences.[23] In practice NATO is becoming the primary organization for joint operations by Europe and North America in defense of common values and security, regardless of territorial boundaries.

Macedonia is an active participant in these processes. The independent generation and maintenance of its internal stability, through the implementation of the Framework Agreement and the strengthening of the Macedonian model of multi-ethnic democracy, as well as fundamental reforms in the defense field, has enabled the Republic of Macedonia to assume a new role – to become a generator of stability even outside its borders. Demonstrating its readiness to share part of the burden and responsibility in defending common values, within the frame of its capacities, Macedonia took over some of the functions in the NATO headquarters in Skopje for support of the KFOR

---

[20] Meeting between President Trajkovski and the President of France Mr. Chirac at the margins of the Francophonie Summit in Beirut in October 2002.

[21] There is no coincidence in the fact that the decision to terminate the operation "Allied Harmony" was made by the North Atlantic Council on the same day when the agreement "Berlin +" was reached between the EU and NATO – March 17th, 2003.

[22] See Sebestyén L. v. Gorka. Invocation of Article 5: five years on. NATO Review. Summer 2006

[23] For an interesting prediction that this argument in Europe will endanger the adoption of the European Constitution, see Laurent Cohen-Tanugi. The outlook for CFSP after Iraq. New Defence Agenda. 2004. The warming up of relations is not just rhetoric of the leaders. The closeness in perceptions, in the USA and Europe, about contemporary risks can be seen in the not so different strategies on national security, as well as in public polls. See Transatlantic Trends. 2006.

operation in Kosovo, it deployed soldiers within the frame of ISAF in Afghanistan, in the mission Iraqi Freedom in Iraq and in the ALTHEA operation of the European forces in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

While the Alliance, at its summit in Riga 2006, is first of all focusing on its own transformation, Macedonia, just like its partners from the US – Adriatic Charter[24], Albania and Croatia, is intensively working on completing preparations for membership. Preparations that will lead to an invitation for membership in the next round of NATO enlargement.

This will be a historic opportunity for further expansion and strengthening of security and stability in the region which in fact provoked the first NATO peace-keeping operation and the first in its history military intervention of the Alliance. The formula for the permanent stabilization of the Balkan is double sided. On one hand, it is necessary to close all open issues, like the final status of Kosovo. On the other hand, to offer membership to those countries which are ready to carry the burden and which identify themselves, in word and deeds, with the Euro-Atlantic values. Expansion will enable the further development of their democracies and market economies and will inspire their neighbors to follow on the same path.

This close and real perspective for a new NATO enlargement on the Balkans represents an enormous opportunity and an enormous responsibility for completing the incomplete security and civilization vision for a united and free Europe in peace. A vision, which was confirmed by the citizens of the Republic of Macedonia when in 1993, though it's democratically elected representatives it decided that it would become a part of the Euro-Atlantic community of values.

---

[24] The three and the USA, inspired by the Baltic Charter, established this instrument of cooperation in May 2003 directed at completing the vision for a free and united Europe in peace and for their inclusion in the Euro-Atlantic family.

EU POST-WESTPHALIA DILEMMA: NATION OR MEMBER-STATE?

Blerim REKA

1. Sovereignty or membership?

Nation or member-state? Ethnic or European identity? Sovereign or supranational institutions? State borders or EU frontiers?

Those dilemmas faced Europe in the end of the 20th century and in the beginning of the 21st century, particularly in the context of the recent debate on the constitutionalization of EU. They also reflect the European paradox: the long attempted desire to build a pan- European project in the same geopolitical area where the model of nation-state and national constitution was born. Four centuries later, Europeans are trying to introduce something that could be called post-Westphalian or post-national political model. They are creating something that includes these concepts: post-nation-state, post-national sovereignty, post-national citizenship, and post-national constitution.

The first test of this supranational philosophy: two rejections of the constitutional treaty of EU in 2005 by the citizens of two founding member-states raised the suspicion on possibilities to federalize Europe. "European Constitution", although did not introduce a classic federal model, it created some kind of external federation, which is more than a federal association of member-states.[1] Others propose re-actualization of Churchill's idea of United European States.[2,3] But, either the model of EU as a sui generis entity, as a single constitutional union, or the model of UES, seemed pre-ambitious, at least for the moment. They are even in direct collision, because the first

---

[1] More about it: Jean Claude Gaurton: "Droit Europeen '' (Dalloz, 2004) ; Piere le Mine: » Droit de l'Unionin Europeene et politiques communes »(Dalloz, 2005)

[2] Like as it was proposed the Prime Minister of Belgium Guy Verhofstadt, in his new book: "Les Etats- Unis d Europe", (Brussels, 2006)

[3] Announced in his famous speech at University of Zurich, in 1946

Prof. Dr. Blerim Reka is Ambassador, Head of the Permanent Mission of Republic of Macedonia at EU, Brussels, and former Vice- Rector for Research of the South East European University, Tetovo. He is Professor of EU law and International Law, and the author of 13 books from these fields. The views presented in this paper are personal of the author- in his intellectual capacity of the author, and do not present any official position.

approach aims to create a unique entity with own international-legal subjectivity; and in the second one is more oriented in some kind of a large European federation.

The fears of Europeans from a new "super-state" or "supra-nation-state"[4] and creation of one centralized Europe are stronger than the altruistic vision for a new Europe "sans frontieres". Even such fears are faced in the period of globalization where the old fashion of nation-state has started to be replaced by a new fashion, the member-state. However, in between two of these main tendencies, in the late of 90s, in some EU member countries the third-medium, the moderate one was promoted: region-state.[5]

The theories of post-Westphalia sovereignty, or those of interdependent sovereignty,[6] are new views for explaining our complex global world and global governance.[7] Of course, the model of sovereign state is not yet disappeared and Morgenthau's realism[8], and state-centric approach, should still remain as a basic theory explaining international relations because just sovereign states are qualified to became member-states. However, it is also a paradox: these sovereign states, after becoming member-states, agree on the relativism their sovereignty. Does it mean that this process introduces the new phenomena of internationally de-sovereignization of the nation-states? This term might be too aggressive, but as Barosso fittingly wrote: "globalization, has reduced the ability of the nation-state alone to provide solutions."[9]

There are circumstances in which classic Westphalia state building process, at least in Western Balkans, is not finished yet and where post-conflict societies are still internationally governed.[10] In some cases, like Kosovo, there are proposals for the creation of a new hybrid state-building model: "independency without full-sovereignty"[11] which is more or less keeping with the previous model of a "conditional

---

[4] Roger Scruton: "Belgian citizenship in not rooted in a shared national loyalty", (in: "The Flemish Republic", No.15, July-August-September, 2006, p.2)

[5] These new tendencies proclaims secession from the nation-state of certain region, who would like to be independent state, for economic or political reasons. Like political programs of some political parties for creation of: "Republic of Padania", or "Republic of Venetia", in Italy; or "Flemish Republic" in Belgium. The last one has proclaimed by Vlaams Belang Party, which by its quarterly newsletter: "The Flemish Republic", as it was stated in his fron page: "explaining why Flanders is seceding from Belgium"; More about federal political system of Belgium see: Jacques Brassinne: "La Belgique federale", CRISP, Bruxelles, 1994).

[6] More abut that: Abraham Chayes and Antonia Hadler- Chayes: "The new sovereignty", (Harvard, 1998)

[7] On global governance see: Blerim Reka: "UNMIK as an international governance with post-war Kosova; NATO' s intervention, UN administration and Kosovar aspirations", (Logos A, Skopje, 2003); Richard Caplan: "International governance of war torn societies", (Oxford University Press, 2005).

[8] Hans J. Morgenthau and Keneth W. Thompson: "Politics among nations: the struggle for power and peace", New York, sixth edition, 1985)

[9] Jose Manuel Barroso, President of the European Commission, in his speech: "Seeing trough the hallucinations: Britain and Europe in the 21st century", (Hugo Yong Lecture, London, 16 October 2006, p.4)

[10] On global trends of the process of state building in the XXI century, see: Francis Fukuyama: "State building, governance and world order in XXI century", (Ithaca, New York, 2004).

[11] International Commission on the Balkans: "The Balkans in Europe' s Future", 2005, p.21.

independency".[12] It seemed that this status, more a quasi-solution than a lasting solution, would not ideally solve the problem. Rather it would prolong it, leaving on analysts to discus whether this is the last unfinished self-determination case in the Western Balkans. Despite this un-finished state-building process, in the mean time, the global political and economic tendencies show us that the world is in the process of post-state member-ization. Even powerful nation-states are asking to be member-states of various international organizations. Membership in the WTO (in universal terms); and membership in the EU (in regional terms) are two examples. But, membership in such organizations is open only for nation-states. Slovenia could not join the EU before becoming an independent and sovereign state. Kosovo is not in SAA process, because it has not yet achieved independence. EU, WB, or IMF is clubs of only nation-states. To be member-state in such international organizations, first it should be a nation-state. Only then the nation-state can become a member-state. The question is: why such wars, human causalities, and material destruction, in the process of state building during the 19th and 20th centuries up to the most recent wars of self-determination, here in the former Yugoslavia, when immediately after becoming a sovereign state, the process of its state relativization begins? Does it mean that a nation-state is a ticket to join or just a national identity for entrance in the process of attaining member-state status?

2. Supranational consensuses frame memberships?

Those aims of sovereign states to become member-states are rising even in the situations that membership in such international organizations presume fulfilling very hard preconditions which, in the mean time, weaken national sovereignty.

Universally, middle- income countries with junta regime background, certain Latin America countries for example, should fulfill preconditions set by "Washington Consensus",[13] which sets the world economic and political standards for nation-states.

Regionally, aspiring European countries should head to reach acquis set by "Brussels consensus", which sets the far-reaching political and economic criteria as well as the capacity of the nation-states to assume the obligations of membership. Those two consensuses comprise the basic framework that makes the transition from national to member-state. Even more, we could speak by three main consensuses: "Washington Consensus-1" (for security, NATO, 1949), "Washington Consensus-2" (for economic policy, IMF & WB), and "Brussels Consensus" (for political and economic criteria and acquis, EU). More or less, the entire process of the member-ization of nation-states was realized by those consensuses by which these international organizations do not evaluate just nation-state building, but also constituency building of future member-states[14].

---

[12] It was proposed in 2000, by International Independent Commission for Kosovo, (IICK Report, 2000), and latter by International Crisis Group in 2003.

[13] More about it: "The stultifying Brussels Consensus", ("The Economist", October 7th, 2006, p.40); See also: "International Relations", Martin Griffits and Terry O' Callagan, (Rutledge, London and New York, 2003, p.33)

[14] International Commission on the Balkans: "The Balkans in Europe's Future, (2005, p.32.).

After 1st January 2007, when Bulgaria and Romania, will became new members, EU will be faced by new dilemma: how to reach new "Brussels consensus" on future enlargement, which could be called: "Brussels consensus-2". This is not an easy task, not just for the EU, nor for aspiring countries. Any further delay, or in the worst case, suspension of further enlargement, would create a negative attitude of nation-states toward Brussels, and will end its principal and original mission: integration of these countries within the peaceful, democratic and developed west, to keep the East stable, secure, and in the process of growth.

Actually, not just the EU, its member-states, and its citizens are facing the enlargement fatigue. Also the donor community, felt "donor fatigue".[15] Consequentially, after these proposals for a pause in future enlargement, the EU commissioner for Enlargement Olli Rehn, thinks that now is crucial to reach a new consensus for enlargement.[16]

Could any nation-states, even member- or pre-member-states, rebel against those three main consensuses?

Universally speaking, as far as we know, the answer is no, not yet, except for a few countries that consider that those consensuses are introducing "neo- imperialism".[17]

Regionally, in some cases there were some indications of non-interest states to be part of those consensuses. In Austria, for example, after the Haider's election victory in 2000, there was a collision between democratic legitimacy (derived by national election), and EU interventionism to avoid creation of the government based on those election results because of a "violation of the basic European values". It created the feelings of centralized EU, and six years latter, some Austrian political views,[18] propose that Austria should "withdraw from centralized EU", and create together with Switzerland and Sweden a block of European neutral states.

The draft of the still not ratified constitutional treaty, allows for such a possibility of "voluntary withdrawal" as well as the suspension of the EU membership.[19] That's why some authors proposed a new category of membership: "associated member"[20] , by which a member-state would not be a full member of EU, but join the European Free Trade Areas (EFTA) and EEA, using their institutional mechanism, but not participating in the further development of EU law and losing the privileges of direct representation in the EU instruments.[21]

---

[15] Bodo Hombach: "The Stability Pact- lessons for the future", (in: "SEE and the road towards European Integration", Wien ,2005, p.46.).

[16] Oli Rehn, speech at promotion of his book: "Europe Next Frontiers", (Munich, 2006) at EPC, Brussels, 10 October 2006.

[17] Like: Cuba, in Latin America; North Korea, in Asia, or Libya, in Africa.

[18] The leader of Freedom Party Hajnz Christian Strahe, said it in his interview to Austrian daily: "Ostrich", 25.09.2006, quoted by TV A1, on the news of 26.09.2006

[19] Draft Constitutional Treaty, (Articles: 58 and 59, of Title IX, (2003); Article I-60 of the draft of the constitutional treaty, (2004)

[20] Andrew Duff: "Plan B: How to rescue the Europa' s Constitution"?, (Notre Europe, studies and research, No.52, Brussels 18 October 2006, p.26)

[21] Ibid

Other individual cases show us a kind of disobedience of some nation-states towards the EU. Turkey, in the beginning of October 2006, canceled the scheduled visit of an EP delegation, because of Cyprian MEP.[22] After the rumors that the EU will suspend negotiations with Turkey, Turkey responded with Euro-Asian neighbors creating a "Turkic Commonwealth", including Turkey, former Islamic soviet republics, and the Republic of Northern Cyprus.[23]

3. Treaty or Constitution based EU?

Based on "Brussels consensus", membership in the EU is still desired, but far reaching station for nation-states. The 55 years of this sui generis entity show us that the EU was faced with at least three main phases: creation, institution building, and enlargement. This process of European integration is a key to understand Europe after WWII. It explains, in a most evident manner, the issue of war and peace, traditional European enemy, but also the vision, that in the name of the peace, stability and prosperity; a new Europe should be built, founded on principles of reconciliation and free integration.[24] That's way we have to recall the famous sentence of Monet: "Faire l' Europe, c' est faire la paix". But, if building a peace in post-conflict Europe was the main strategic aim in fifties, then there are more world problems facing the EU like climate change, demographic change, international terrorism, global pandemic, and energy security in the first decade of the 21st century.[25]

The process of European integration has not started today. The Europeans during the centuries have permanently proposed the closest cultural, economic, and even political relationship between them, without success.[26] Territorial disputes between nation-states spoiled great visions of: Dubois, Kant, Hugo, and other European spiritual fathers of European unification. Unless they become member-states by free will, then there was no real institutional European integration. Roman, Napoleonic, Hitler's and Stalin's "unifications" of Europe were all imposed by war, occupation, and violence. After 1950, voluntary and consensual institutional integration of nation-states that decided to become member-states of a new European entity in nascendi was born.

In this dynamic process of change and permanent advancement, this historical project has developed along two tracks: internal institution building and external enlargement (new member-states). The whole development of the EU has been a parallel process, a horizontal and vertical one.

---

[22] "Europe", No.9280, 06.10.2006, p.6

[23] The conference for friendships and cooperation, was held in Antalya, September 18-20, 2006, and gathered representatives of: Turkey, Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, and the Turk Republic of Northern Cyprus, and by delegates representing the Turcic territories from: Russia, Ukraine and Moldova. (see more about it in: CEPS, "European neighborhood Watch, Issue September, 2006, p.15).

[24] Blerim Reka- Arta Ibrahimi: "European Studies", (South East European University", Tetova, 2004)

[25] See more about it : Jose Manuel Barroso : « Seeing trough the hallucinations: Britain and Europe in the XXI century", (Hugo Yong Lecture, London, 16 October 2006, SPEECH/06/602, p. 3).

[26] Blerim Reka: "EU Law", (KIEAI, Prishtina, 2000)

First of all, the main development process of the EU is owed to its historical transformation from economic communities toward creation of one political union.

The first stage, economic integration, of the European integration has been successfully finished. The second one, the one that aimed to inaugurate political integration, even more now based on its Constitution, still has not been realized. In fact, the main battle within the EU of today is between two main tendencies, as Barroso named them: "market fundamentalist" and "state-ist fundamentalists".[27]

In 2004, a new page in the political development of the EU has been opened with a tendency for its constitutionalization. With the draft of a constitutional treaty, a new phenomenon appeared. This phenomenon is legal and political one: one non-state entity composed of nation-states convened under one constitution. New concepts were introduced: supranational constitution, or European meta-constitution.[28] Actually, this is in line with the concept of Hix's "Constitutionalization of the EU"[29] and what Schwarze qualified as "the birth of European Constitutional Order".[30] The aims of this constitutional union were to become more legitimate, more cohesive, more institutionally efficient, more internationally visible and externally unique, and within one single legal framework, while still being composed of member-states.[31]

But, the main EU dilemma still remains unresolved: will the EU continue to function based on founding treaties or under a single Constitution? That is why some authors looked at this process as utopist and have named it "EUtopia".[32] This pessimistic moniker is based on the constitutional crisis phase of the development of the EU since 2005 and the failure of two national referenda, in France and in Holland.[33] Seven member-states still have not ratified the constitutional treaty and more than two years since the launching of this draft, predominant opinions are that "this draft is dead" and a discussion on the innovation of the existing text or even drafting a new "mini-constitution" needs to take place.[34]

---

[27] Barroso, 2006, p.3

[28] Blerim Reka: "Lectures on European Supranational Constitutionalism", in Master Program for comparatives studies on Public Administration of EU, (South East European University, Tetovo, 2005-2006.

[29] Simon Hix, The Political System of the European Union, New York 1999; after the case „les verts" (PE 1986 RKE 1339, case 294/83), this Court for the first time acknowledged the fact that the Treaties of the EU have constitutional character.

[30] Jurgen Schwarze, The birth of a European Constitutional Order, Baden - Baden 2001, pg. 5.

[31] See more about it: Andrew Duff: "The struggle for Europe' s Constitution", (London, 2005)

[32] Kalypso Nicolaidis & Robert Howse: "Narrative as power", (2002) 40/4 Journal of common market studies, pp:767-792.

[33] Although still the level of citizen's support in EU member countries are high for constitutional treaty; 61%, according to polls, to which is referred: "Bulletin Quotidian Europe", No.9289, 19 October 2006, p.6)

[34] This idea was presented during several events and public presentation in 2006, by Interior Minister of France Nicolas Sarkozy, during his election campaign for President of France

Others, in order to rescue the existing draft, offered a so-called "plan B"[35] for renegotiation and changing some parts and provisions of the existing constitutional draft[36] in order to make a shorter version of the text.[37] This plan includes not just substantial innovations in five areas, one of which is enlargement,[38] but also the innovation in the procedure of adopting the constitutional treaty, proposing "constitutional co-decision",[39] by which the text under renegotiation, should be sent from intergovernmental conference to European Parliament and back with the option of conciliation and thus increase interactivity and finally reach democratic agreement.

Not all opinions are as skeptical. German Chancellor Merkel rejected the idea to restart talks on the existing text of the draft of constitutional treaty.[40] This is a legitimate attitude because two thirds of member-states that already ratified the existing draft would also likely reject the process of renegotiation for new draft.

According to Merkel, a constitutional treaty will be the priority of the Germany EU presidency, starting in January 2007 and a "European Constitution should be adopted before the next elections for EP, in 2009".[41] Similar to this position is the position of the President of European Parliament, Borell, who pleaded for "survival of the constitution"[42] by continuing the process of ratification by member-states who still have not ratified the existing draft.[43]

In between these two pro et contra antipodes, there are at least four possible scenarios: keeping the text as it stands with one or more possible additions, save the main elements in a smaller treaty, re-opening negotiations on certain points, and abandoning it completely while waiting for more favorable times to re-negotiate.[44]

---

[35] Andry Duff, MEP, in his speech in conference organized by "Notre Europe", in Brussels, 18 October 2006, where he presented his : "Plan B: how to rescue the European Constitution", (Notre Europe; Studies and research No.52, 2006); (www. notre - europe. eu)

[36] In particular: Part III of constitutional treaty

[37] According to this Plan: B of Duff, there is need "to be revised at least five areas, in order to respond to the citizens concerns: economic governance, environment, social dimension, enlargement and financial perspective" ,(Bulletin Quotidiene Europe, No.9289, p.6).

[38] He proposed that Copenhagen Criteria's of 1993 should be part of the constitutional treaty, as constitutional criteria's and introduce new category of membership: associated membership"; (Duff, 2006, pp:24-25)

[39] Ibid

[40] "European Voice", 28 September- 4 October, 2006, p.4.

[41] Her speech at the meeting of German Government, Berlin, 12 October 2006; For the recent discussion about the constitutional treaty see: Paull Magnette: "Peut- on sauver la Constitution?; Jean- Victor Louis: "Les enjeux de la Part III de Traite Constitutionel"; Christian Lequessve: "Rejet de la Constitution et Europe elarge", (in: "Eyes on Europe", Spring 2006, Issue 4, pp:4-8); John Williams: "People' s Constitution", (2006); Debate in EPC: "Can the Constitution be saved?", Brussels, 13 September 2006; or, so-called "Plan B: how to rescue the European Constitution", by Andrew Duff, MEP, in the debate organize by EP and Notre Europe, Brussels, 18 September, 2006.

[42] See his address to the College of Europe in Bruges, on 16 October 2006, quoted by: "Bulletin Quotidian Europe", No.9287, 17.10.2006, p.8.

[43] UK, Belgium, Ireland, Denmark, Finland, Czech Republic and Poland; Bulgaria and Romania, by ratification of the Accession Treaty ratified also the constitutional treaty.

[44] Bulletin Quotidian Europe, No.9287, Tuesday 17 October 2006, p.8; and No.9289, pp:3, 4 and 6

As we said, two main directions of unique institutional European integration remain: (1) permanent building and improvement of institutions and (2) permanent expansion of its borders. But, now when the EU faces this crisis, the next dilemma is: deeper or wider integration?

Analyzing more than a half of a century of institutional development of the EU, one can conclude that the main decision-making institutions were institutions of intergovernmental character: European Council and the Council of Ministers. But, this system could work with six, twelve, or fifteen, but not 25 or 27 member-states. At the beginning of a new century, the demand for supranational institutions is growing, primarily because the criticism of "democracy deficiency", or the lack of legitimacy of its institutions. Therefore, with the Nice Agenda, the EU has focused on three main issues: change in the voting mechanism in the Council, increasing the areas for majority voting principle, and reform of the European Commission.

The Treaty of Nice has incorporated these strategic commitments to reform the EU to adapt to the reality of a 27 member-state union. After 1st January 2007, what is next? Do Bulgaria and Romania memberships end Nice's institutional period of EU? Yes, because of new enlargements, legally with the limits of Nice Treaty, and without its further revision are impossible. With the existing treaty, which will reach its expansion limit by 1st January 2007, and without a ratified constitutional treaty "decision making in the Council will remain too difficult, European Commission will remain to big, and European Parliament to weak."[45]

So, the whole process of enlargement of the European Union may be best presented by Folsom's metaphor on magnetic power: "European Union is like magnet: the bigger, the stronger".[46] This metaphor for the EU was confirmed in the last decade. By introducing the Single European Market and especially after the inauguration of single European currency, the EU has become increasingly attractive for non-member-states. The "magnetic force" of the EU can best be seen in the development of a process of its enlargement in five waves between 1973 and 2007. But, what after 1st January of 2007? Does this attractive magnetic power of the EU towards interested countries for its membership remain or will it stop at least ad interim? Based on a realistic perception, there is not real chance for new ICG discussing a new treaty, or ratifying a constitutional treaty until the end of 2008, when France will assume the EU presidency, six months before the next election for EP in 2009.

All of these problems show us that EU enlargement is not only geographical, but also political, economic and legal rapprochement of the rest of Europe to the "elite club". It is a long-term process of the unification of their economic, legal, and political standards with the standards and goals of the EU. That is why the EU is called a "normative power", "norm community"[47], i.e. e. "cooperative arrangement of democratic and peaceful states", which, through its influence, demands from

---

[45] Duff, 2006, p.8

[46] Ralph H. Folsom: "European Union Law", (St. Paul, 1999, p.330)

[47] Martha Finnemore& Kathryn Sikkink: "International norm dynamics and political change", (1998) 52/4 International organization, pp:887-914

the accession countries to accept and implement EU norms. But, it is not just a technocratic process, it is a much-disputed process. It has its democratic legitimacy on account of the enlargement decision in the community institutions (European Commission) and the representative institutions (European Parliament) together with the institutions of intergovernmental character (European Council and the Council of Ministers).

The process of enlargement, by accession based on individual merit was applied to 21 out of 27 member-states. According to the individual merit system, each European country, which fulfills the membership criteria, can become a full-fledged member-state.[48] This broad treaty formula then became operational by concretizing it with several criteria, instruments, and following procedures. Begun by three criteria from Copenhagen (1993) political, economic, and legal which is followed by the Madrid criteria (1995) of administrative capacity, different integration instruments were provided. For the membership of the countries from Western Europe, it was a classic accession model; for SEE countries, it was modified accession model based on: "European Agreement. While for the Western Balkans, it is conditional accession model based on the new "3-C" enlargement strategy and on the SAA Process. It seemed that the latest instruments were most demanding and harder than any previously manifested.[49]

These strong demands for aspiring countries confirmed that EU has transformed itself in a kind of "post-modern state",[50] which, with its normative influence towards the candidate countries, functions as a "silent disciplinary force".[51]

Should aspiring countries from Western Balkans fulfill those EU norms and criteria as a formal precondition for becoming a member-state or because these norms and criteria are for their own benefit, as well as for the benefit of society? Why should they have to reach these benchmarks for democracy, rule of law, human rights, minority rights, and competitive market economy, if not for the sustainable economic and political development of its country? The achievements in this integration process should be their ownership and not impositions from Brussels.

According to the enlargement experience of the EU towards Western Balkan countries, for these countries, beyond just the basic criteria or "basic norms",[52] additional criteria53 have been decided, such as implementation of the Dayton Peace

---

[48] As was regulated by Article 49 of Treaty

[49] This was confirmed by European Commissioner for Enlargement Oli Rehn, who lately said that "the system of conditionality applied to Romania and Bulgaria has been more rigorous than in past" , (Oli Rehn speech before EU committee of German Bundestag, Berlin, 18 October 2006, (SPEECH/06/607), p.2

[50] EU as a post-modern state; Further reading: Annika Bjorkdahl:"Norm-maker and norm-taker: exploring the normative influence of the EU in Macedonia", (European Foreign Affairs Review, 10/2005, pp: 257-278

[51] Ibid

[52] Three Copenhagen Criteria s of 1993: political, economic and acquis; and one new additional of Madrid of 1995- administrative capacity; (see more: Negotiations on the accession of the Republic of Croatia to the European Union", Zagreb, 2006, p. 12)

[53] Council conclusions of April 1997, and of June 1999, EU laid down special political criteria for the countries of SAA process like: full cooperation with ICTY, progress in refugee return, reform of judiciary, full freedom of

Agreement (Bosnia and Herzegovina), cooperation with ICTY (Serbia), fulfillment of the "standards for Kosovo" (Kosova), and Implementation of the Ohrid Framework Agreement (Macedonia).[54] Because of such hard additional political and security conditions, some analysts predict that membership should not be expected until 2020, at the earliest.[55]

4. Old Europe or unified Europe?

The question is whether after the accession of Bulgaria and Romania to the EU, the enlargement will stop, not just because of its internal institutional settlement, but also for its further expansion. Does it mean that by this enlargement they will draw the final EU borders, by which the EU would finalize the process of recovering of old Europe, but will step back from its ideal of creation a unified Europe?

Following interim failure of Constitutional Treaty in France's and Holland's referenda in 2005[56] and general public opinion on enlargement fatigue, the need for deep institutional reform of the EU is clear and discussions of the suspension of further enlargement are taking place. Through this, the EU will draw up its strategic borders on the northeast with Russia, in southeastern Europe with a border on the Western Balkans, and on southeast with Turkey. As German Chancellor Merkel said, "Europe must have its borders."[57]

Compared with this nation-state attitude, the position of European Commission is a bit different, at least of the commissioner for enlargement. According to Olli Rehn, instead of borders, Europe should look for frontiers. For him, "borders are restrictive, limit our minds, constrain actions and reduce our influence. Frontiers free our minds, stimulate action, and increase our influence."[58]

But, not all in Brussels think like him. EC President Barroso thinks that the future enlargement process should occur after a pause, pending new institutional settlement of EU. It seems that in this restrictive opinion, the famous and still un-clarified notion of "EU absorption capacity" has been propagated.[59]

---

media, regional cooperation and good neighbourly relations", (see more in: "Negotiations on the Accession of the Republic of Croatia to the European Union", Zagreb, 2006, p.13).

[54] Blerim Reka: "International administrations and state building: from Bosnia to Iraq, 1995-2005", South East European University Review, Vol.1, No.1, 2005, p.43.

[55] "Economist", April 2006; Based on this analysis, EU in 2020 would have 33 member-states.

[56] See more: Gaetane Ricard- Nihoul: "The French "no" vote on May 29, 2005: understand act", Notre Europe, Octoberr ,2005); Henri Monceau: "The European Constitution and deliberation; the example of deliberative focus groups ahead of the French Referendum of 29 May 2005", (Notre Europe, November, 2005); Henri Oberdorff: "Ratification and revision of the constitutional treaty", (Notre Europe, May, 2005);

[57] According to:"Buletin Quotidiene Europe", No. 9284, 12 October, 2006, p.2.

[58] Olli Rehn: " Europe's next frontiers", (Munich, 2006)

[59] At the same time, the Commissioner for Enlargement, Oli Rehn, in its statement in front of the European Parliament, (April, 2006) stressed the fact that instead of permanent reference to the absorption capacity, we shouldn't forget about the functional capacity of the EU, to serve better to its citizens.

The question could be raised differently. Is the EU capable of absorbing new member-states? How much can the EU continue with its enlargement process without damaging or changing its substance, budget, and its institutional structure?

The Copenhagen criteria of 1993 stressed that the EU capacity to absorb new members, although not a criteria, is an "important consideration" in the interest of both the EU and the candidate countries.[60] Even recent analysis proposes that these Copenhagen criteria should be constitutionalized and be part of constitutional treaty.[61]

This notion, absorption capacity, emerged again and became a topical term into the European debate in 2005 after the two failed referenda. The draft conclusion circulated during the Austrian presidency[62] drew criticism from some member-states for putting too much emphasis on the EU's so-called absorption capacity as criteria. They insisted on a more positive assessment of past and future enlargements especially as absorption capacity was presented as an additional and unqualified obstacle on the road to membership. As a result, the final version of Austrian presidency's conclusions[63] acknowledges that enlargement is "helping the EU to become a more competitive and dynamic economy and be better prepared to meet the challenges of a global and changing world."[64] The text states that the European Council in December 2006 will "have a debate on all aspects of further enlargements including the EU's capacity to absorb new members and further ways of improving the quality of the enlargement process on the basis of the positive experiences accumulated so far".

Still the precise contents of the notion remain unclear, as does the distinction between a criterion and a consideration for membership. For this reason, the European Council, in June 2006, has mandated the Commission to provide a special report on all the relevant aspects concerning the EU absorption capacity for the December 2006 EU summit which should also cover the issue of present and future perception of enlargement by citizens.

Waiting for this EU official clarification, some independent research institutions presented their own analyses, explaining not so much the definition of absorption capacity, but at least components of its meaning, such as the "capacity of goods and service markets, capacity of the labor market to absorb new member-states, capacity of the EU finances to absorb new members states, capacity of EU institutions to

---

[60] European Council, Copenhagen, SN 180/1/93, 21-22 June, p. 14; See more about it: Michael Emerson, Senem Aydin, Julia De Clerk-Sachsse and Gergana Noutcheva: "Just what is absorption capacity of the EU"?, (CEPS Policy Brief, No.113, September 2006, p. 1)

[61] Andrew Duff: "Plan: B, how to rescue the European Constitution"?, (Notre Europe, Studies and research, No.52, Brussels, 18 October 2006

[62] Few days before the Salzburg summit, 11 March, 2006

[63] European Council, Presidency Conclusions, 15-16 June 2006, p.18.

[64] See more about it: EPC: "On the slow road to recovery, destination unknown", (S34/06, 17 June 2006); "Enlargement Newsletter", (20 June 2006); "EU observer", (23.06.2006; 26.06.2006); "Toward a European Commonwealth", (Intl. Herald Tribune", 24-25.06.2006, p.6); "New Europe", June 25- July 1, 2006, pp: 5-13.

function with new member-states, capacity of society to absorb new member-states, and capacity of EU to assure its strategic security".[65]

What are the positions of EU institutions regarding this consideration?

European Parliament's position is that the EU should keep its promises to candidate countries and possible candidate countries, but take the EU absorption capacity fully into account.[66]

The president of European Commission Barosso said that no further enlargement would take place until finalization of institutional reform of EU.[67] But, in the context of accession of WB countries, Commissioner Rehn has repeatedly called on the Member-states to keep earlier promises to the region for full membership. WB accession is not at all an absorption obstacle or a problem. For Rehn, absorption capacity is in fact "ability" to take in new member-states.

As for the Council's position, the EU foreign policy chief, Javier Solana, has reiterated that the EU commitments to the WB countries made at the 2003 Thessalonica summit are still valid. This position was reaffirmed by the Finnish Presidency of the EU at the end of September 2006 when Finnish Prime Minister Matti Vanhenen had not agreed with proposed interim freezing of future enlargement pending institutional reform of the EU proposed by EC president Barroso.[68]

What do the citizens of EU member-states think about new enlargements?

Based on the figures given by Euro barometer polls, there is a rising tide of opposition to enlargement in older member-states,[69] in particular from "old Europe" member states.[70] In ten of the EU15, more than 50% of the population is against further enlargement. Compared with the opinions of spring 2005, where 50% was pro enlargement within EU- 25 member-states.[71]

Skeptical public opinion in member-states towards new enlargement is not just because of their enlargement fatigue. It is also because of the experience in the first two years of development in eight of the ten new member countries from 2004's expansion. Eight post-communist member countries, although showing economic

---

[65] Michael Emerson, Senem Aydin, Julia De Clerck-Sachsse and Gergana Noutcheva: "Just what is this 'absorption capacity' of the European Union"/, (CEPS Policy Brief, No.113, September 2006, pp:11-21)

[66] EP Resolution, March 2006

[67] The Speech of President of European Commission Barroso at 10th Bertelsmann Forum, Berlin, 22 September 2006

[68] "Bulletin Quotidian Europe", No.9276, 30 September 2006, p.4

[69] EU-barometer poll of April 2006.

[70] Ibid; In spring 2006, the support for enlargement in the EU-15 averages was 44% and in the new member-states was 69%. The average for old Europe was against enlargement, and in some key member-states like France even 69%, Germany 64%, or in Austria, where 71% oppose the enlargement.

[71] The picture is even more disturbing with regard to attitudes towards specific candidates. Not one country, not even Bulgaria or Romania, has majority support in the EU15. some 71% oppose Turkey's membership, 68% Albania's, 64% Serbia's, 62% Ukraine's 61% Bosnia's and Macedonia's, 59% Romania's, 55% Bulgaria's and 53% Croatia's. See more about it in: CEPS Neighborhood Watch, Issue 18, July 2006, p.17

growth,[72] were not politically successful. Most of them face unstable and weak coalition government and still un-established good governance.[73]

In this restrictive climate for new enlargement, there are some views that new conditions should be set. For example, the opportunity to exercise the clause "suspension of the negotiations of political reasons" has been mentioned.[74]

This short history of the enlargement of the EU shows us that the birth of a nation-state is a fact. Becoming member-state is the process, and a long one indeed.

A few recent developments confirm this point. Not just the stagnation of the ratification of the constitutional treaty, but also waiting for seven years on implementation of "passarelle", clause of Amsterdam Treaty, (Tampere process: 1999-2006), which should lift a national veto on justice legislation,[75] illustrated how long and difficult the process of transferring the sovereign power from a national to a supranational institution from the existing member-state is. Even more, the new members of the EU face post-accession difficulties. Accession to the EU does not mean automatically guaranteed rights and benefits. It was especially clear after the fifth wave of the enlargement. The ten new member-states from 2004's enlargement are still neither a part of a SIS II, (Schengen Information System),[76] nor have all of them become a part of the EURO-zone, nor have their workers benefited significantly from access to the labor markets of previous EU:15.[77] The two new members, Bulgaria and Romania, are two cases that might be named conditional membership, based on a more strong conditionality imposed to them than in the previous accession.[78] The Romanian minister for European integration denied the accusation that they are "second-hand members",[79] full members because of the strong EU monitoring system and deprivation of rights and access to EU funds.[80]

---

[72] Up to 12% in Estonia

[73] "Economist|, October 14th, 2006, pp:13, 30-34; For economic trends of these countries see more in: EUROSTAT: "Trade between EO-25 and neighboring countries by mode of transport", by Evangelos Pangas, 1/2006; Some figures are given also in: "TAIEX 2005 Activity Report: Building Europe together", (EC, 2005).

[74] The Nederland's Dutch minister for foreign affairs , Bot in beginning of 2006, proposed for the countries of the Western Balkans to impose a condition that the opening of the negotiating process should happen only after the obligations provided in the SAA are fully complied with.

[75] "In Europe we don' t trust", ("Economist", September, 30, 2006, p.38)

[76] "European Voice", 28 September- 4th October, 2006, p.1

[77] Ibid, pp:8, 16-17

[78] Based on mechanism for cooperation and verification of the progress, these two countries need to fulfill certain and very precise benchmarks and than to report twice per year on this progress. If they would not fulfill those benchmarks and not made progress, than could be applied safe guard measures; see the Speech of Oli Rehn, Member of the European Commission responsible for Enlargement at EU Committee of the German Bundestag, Berlin 18 October 2006, pp: 1- 4, (SPEECH/06/607)

[79] The statement of the Minister of EU Integration of Romania Anca Daniela Boaqiu, made in Brussels, 6 September, 2006, (according to "Buletin Quotidien Europe", No.9260, p.3)

[80] "European Monitoring Report on the State of preparedness for EU Membership of Bulgaria and Romania," ("4 Conclusion"), of 26 September 2006; quoted by CEPS: "European Neighborhood Watch", Brussels 19 Issue, p.13

A national, independent, and sovereign state could exist, but it could not be automatically a member-state. This is more obvious in the pre-accession period than in post-accession one. The recent warning from Brussels and other EU capitals that, after Bulgaria and Romania, there will not be any new enlargement until finalizing institutional reform of the EU creates a perception that the EU replaced its well-known inclusive policy, with a closed-door policy. The enlargement fatigue was for sure one of the key factors for introducing this new restrictive policy of the EU toward future enlargement. The approach by which this new policy would be justified is absorption capacity, which although formally is not a new criterion for enlargement, could be a new serious consideration, which should be taken into account for the future process.[81]

5. Post-Nice and Pre-constitution period of EU?

As we said, the EU is still a treaty-based entity. This phase of the development of EU could be named as a transitional phase: post-Nice and pre-constitution period, 2001-2009. It seems that it could be one of the most complicated phases of the development of EU. As it was started in Nice at the end of 2000, during the French Presidency of EU, it could be finished at the end of 2008, during the next French Presidency. Does it mean that the new, third EU treaty, after Paris (1951) and Nice (2000), also the first EU Constitution would be adopted under French auspices?

Getting the solution between these two strategic approaches would be decisive for the future of the EU. In this period of reflection, EU launched "three D- strategy", democracy, dialogue, and debate,[82] to try to establish a pan-European debate and open channel of communication with the citizens of EU member-states.

In the recent intellectual and political European debate, the main arguments were discussed within various discourses.

I will try to conceptualize them within the following seven categories of problems:

A. The status of EU
  - Centralized or decentralized EU
  - Federal or Con-federal Europe
  - Free-association of European countries
  - Free-trade European zone
  - European political entity

---

[81] Even there is no unique position between two main decision- making player of the EU: Inter-government Council, which as it was stressed very clear by Fins Presidency is not for suspending the process of enlargement; and Supranational Commission, which was presented by his President Barrosso, for interim suspension of the further enlargement until finalization of institutional reform at EU.

[82] On updated developments on the implementation of this strategy see the interview with Margot Walstrom, Vice- president of European Commission, given to Simon O' Connor in: "E-Sharp", (September- October, 2006, pp:17-19)

B. The Constitution of EU
- Possible ratification of the existing draft of Constitutional Treaty
- Replace it with a "mini-treaty"
- Re-negotiating the existing draft or starting negotiation for a new draft
- Revising some parts of existing draft and replacing them with new provisions
- Keeping existing Nice Treaty
- Convoke a new IGC on adoption a new institutional treaty

C. The Governance of EU
- Keeping existing governance of EU in spite of criticism of "democratic deficit", or
- Introduce an innovative[83] approach of EU governance which should take into account the following principles: legitimacy, accountability, transparency, public awareness and financial discipline spending moneys of European tax-payers
- Introduce some kind of "presidential style" leadership[84]

D. The Geopolitics of EU
- Final borders or expanded border of EU?
- Privileged partnership[85]
- Strategic partnership[86]
- Neighbor policy[87]
- Economic Partnership[88]

---

[83] By this I mean a set of principles and measures which should be taken at EU in order to introduce better and good governance. The author of this paper had participated in a project: "Innovation in governance", realized by Kennedy School for Governance and ASH Institute of Harvard University, 8-14 December, 2005.

[84] Presidential style is introduced by the draft of the constitutional treaty by provision of the President of EU Council. Also presidential style was proposed as well as for European Commission. Recently it was proposed by the President of European Commission Barrosso. He propose that the president of EC should have more presidential style leading the commission as a way to avoid its paralyze. ("Barosso: Commission needs presidential- style leadership", by Dana Spinant, ("European Voice", 26 October- 1 November, 2006, p.2.

[85] With Turkey, as recently was proposed by some key member-states of EU?

[86] With Russia, after 2007, which was planed, but after the EU concerns on violation of human rights and the freedom of speech and media freedom inRusiia and its relationship with Georgia, this option is in doubt.

[87] Council of Ministers, in the meeting in Luxemburg: 16-17 October 2007, adopted the Regulation for establishment a new instrument supporting EU policy for partnership and neiborghood with: Algeria, Armenia, Azerbegan, Byelorussia, Egypt, Gruzia, Israel, Jordan, Liban, Libya, Moldavia, Morocco, Palestinian Authority, Russia, Syria, Tunis and Ukraine, by which would be provided 11, 1 billion EURO. The Regulation will be in force from 1st January 2007.

[88] Like EPA, (Economic Partnership Agreement), which EU is negotiated with six ACP regions, of Africa, Caribbean and Pacific states; It was a item on GEAR meeting in Luxemburg 16-17 October, 2006; More about it: "Bulletin Quotidian Europe, (No.9286, 14, October, 2006, p.4.).

E. The Enlargement of EU
- Continuation or suspension of further enlargement?
- Keeping classic accession model, as it was during: 1951-1995
- Using modified accession model, as it was during the "big bang" of 2004
- Applying conditional accession model, as it was for Bulgaria and Romania until 2007
- Thinking about waiting accession model, as it is now for Croatia, or so-called alternative to accession, for Turkey
- Staying on the position of so-called pending accession without a date for the beginning of negotiations, as it is a case for Macedonia
- Offering a potential accession model, for Albania
- Proclaimed vocation to accession, for Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, Kosovo
- Freeze the accession possibilities, i.e. start of SAA process for Serbia

F. The Capacity of EU
- Absorption capacity
- Financial capacity
- Functional capacity
- Integration capacity of the EU

G. The Integration in EU
- Homogenous or heterogeneous integration?
- Equal or different integration?
- Full or associated integration?

As I assume, with these seven conceptual problems each containing sub-problems, the EU will face itself in the future, at least until the end, and beginning of the next decade of the 21st century. Without serious answers to these seven thematic questions, I see no possible prospect for the future of the EU. These above mentioned questions should be seriously taken into considerations, not just for academic and intellectual debate.

6. Wider or Wilder Europe?

All of the confusion of the future of the EU, in particular of its final size and geopolitical map, encourages fear among Europeans from old Europe. Within the next dilemma, does a wider Europe mean a wilder Europe?[89] This dilemma

---

[89] See about it: Edward Lucas, in European Voice", 28.09-04.10.2006, p.12

is complementary to a previous one.[90] Does unification of Europe mean simply unification of old Europe with 27 EU member-states or does it mean broader unification throughout the rest of the continent?

In particular those fears are related to the future waive of the EU enlargement in the Western Balkans. One century after the 1914 assassination of an Austro-Hungarian sovereign in Sarajevo, the Balkans is now in the position to finally rejoin Europe. After five centuries under ottoman rule, this attack against one of the key European figure, further delayed the Europeanization of the Balkans, continued the process of making the Balkans wilder, and prevented exploiting a valuable geographic position for broader commercial gains with Europe. The fear of a wilder Europe is not only the fear of today's Europeans. It is the same fear that Europeans expressed towards the Balkans one century ago. This century showed the un-successful path of modernization of the southeastern Europe. The rest was the tragic delaying of the process of Europeanization of Balkans. The following transitional processes could describe it:

- Post- Ottoman transition: after 1912
- Out-European transition: after 1914- 1918
- Un-finalized nation-statehood process in Balkans: after 1918
- Anti-Nazism resistance: 1939-1945, which was replaced by communist ruling:1945-1990,
- Post-Communist transition: after 1990
- Pre- European transition: since 2001, and
- Possible full Europeanization of the Balkans: after 2014?

The Balkans appeared on the European diplomatic agenda relatively late. Instead of the so-called "eastern issue", opened by the Austro-Hungarian Minister of Foreign Affairs Gula Andrassy, the German diplomacy of Otto Von Bayern then Otto von Bismarck promoted the Balkan issue on the Berlin Congress (1878). But, even if it was and still remains one of the most critical geo-political issues, the Balkan issue was never seriously understood and followed by consistent diplomatic strategy.[91] It can be best presented by the famous comparison of Bismarck: "The Balkans are worth less than the bones of one dead German soldier." Since then and until the beginning of the XXI century, the Balkans, for Western diplomacy, remained a permanent source of destabilization for Europe.

The history of the Balkans in the last century can confirm the same: Balkan Wars, WWI and WWII, the Cold war, up to self- determination wars in former SFRY. Some authors named the process "unfinished modernization", concluding that it was

---

[90] Chapter four of this paper: "Old Europe, or Unified Europe?, pp:12-19

[91] Blerim Reka: "Thesis before appointment as Ambassador and Head of the Permanent Mission of RM at EU, Brussels", presented at Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Republic of Macedonia, Skopje, 12 May 2006

- 137 -

a history of "150 years of unsuccessful attempts to make over the Balkans, from its ottoman and communist past."[92]

During this history, three names have been used: the Balkans (until the end of WWII), South Eastern Europe (since the end of WWII until the end of 20th century), and the Western Balkans (since 1998).[93] Etymologically, there is a further dilemma: why the Western Balkans? Does, in the case of Balkans, 'western' have geographical or pejorative meaning, describing the wild Balkans? Does, it should content both of them: to explain the geographical position of this part of Europe, but also to describe its wild nature, associating old wild American Western 150 years ago?

7. Europeanization of the Balkans or
the Balkanization of Europe?

In the end of 20th century and in the beginning of 21st, the EU was faced with a dilemma: how to Europeanize the Balkans while not Balkanizing Europe?[94] According to Solana, during recent years it was, as he wrote, "a progressive Europeanization of the Western Balkans".[95] But, "Europeanization" is not only institutional import,[96] not only adoption of new norms and their implementation on behalf of the countries attempting to get EU membership. It is a broader notion presuming also the changing of mentality. That is the reason why, at the beginning of the 21st century, the EU came out with a new strategy for the region and with a brand new name. The new long-term vision for the EU was Stabilization and Association for the Western Balkans, complemented by Stability Pact for SEE.[97] But what is the Western Balkans and what do they represent?

Besides the fact that it is one geographical area, Western Balkans present a conglomerate of different statuses, regimes, and political systems, from independent and sovereign states, to quasi-sovereign states, up to internationally administered societies. From a country with candidate pre-accession status (Croatia), with candidate status waiting for negotiation (Macedonia), toward a country which have signed

---

[92] Further reading: Alina Mungiu-Pippidi: "Deconstructing Balkans particularism: the ambiguous social capital of southeastern Europe", (Southeast European and Black Sea Studies, Vol.5, No.1, January 2005, pp.49-68

[93] The reference "Western Balkans", was first introduced at the EU Vienna Summit, in 1998. According to Solana: "Western Balkans is EU jargon which consists of countries which used to form SFRY,(with exception of Slovenia) plus Albania". See about it Javier Solana: "Stability Pact and long term conflict prevention in Europe", in: "SEE on the road towards European Integration", Wien, 2005, p. 93.\; See also: Dr. Dobrinka Taskovska: EU- Western Balkans relations careful, confused, encouraging", (Macedonian Affairs, Vol.V. No.1/ 2004, p.21)

[94] Even EU officials usse the term "Balkanization" as way of fragmentation of its institutions. This was said by the President of European Commission Barosso; see more in: "Barroso: Commission needs presidential-style leadership", by Dana Spinant, in: "European Voice", 26 October- 1 November, 2006, p.2.

[95] "South East Europe in the European integration", Wien, 2005, p.97

[96] "Europezation as modernization process and institutional imports"; Ibid.

[97] See more: "South Eastern Europe on the road towards European Integration", Wien, 2005; Since 2008, SP for SEE will be transformed in: Council for Regional Cooperation, a regional forum with its own ownership and ledership.

SAA (Albania), possible candidates for opening negotiations for SAA, (Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Montenegro), frozen status of SAA, (Serbia), and Kosovo, which is included in the special "SAA mechanism STM"[98] until finalizing political status.

Apart from these differences, Western Balkan countries have at least four common development points:

1. Developing functional democracy
2. Recent post-conflict history
3. Economically hardships[99]
4. Political problems include weak governance, lack of rule of law, and corruption

Thus the EU, after slow and feeble policy towards wars in the former Yugoslavia and towards building a sustainable peace in the region, came out with a strategy for the Western Balkans that meant: democratic transformation of these post-conflict societies, through association with the EU to stabilize them from within, and then to introduce them to regional cooperation. That is why the whole process has been named stabilization and association as a legal framework for realization of the integration of this part of Europe into the EU.

After the inauguration of this new EU strategy for Western Balkans, the EU, in series of Summits in: Fierre (June 2000), Zagreb (November 2000), and Thessalonica (June 2003), announced the European perspective on these countries, but also the principle of individual merit for each of the countries on its road to the EU. Besides the fact that Austrian and Finnish EU Presidencies confirmed this approach, during 2006, some analyses imply that it is possible that any process of enlargement could be delayed, even for 10 to 15 years[100] as a result of a limited absorption capacity of the EU.[101]

If we summarize the last six years of implementation of this EU strategy for the Western Balkans, it seems that it was only promised European perspective, rather than real one. As one author wrote, it was a period of more "humanitarian aid and integrative

---

[98] Since March 2003 European Commission established a special mechanism for Kosovo within the process of SA, so-called STM for Kosovo, by which the Government of Kosovo and EC, periodically will review the progress in various fields. During last three years were 9 rounds of meetings. Since November 2005, European Commission started with annual progress report on Kosovo. (See about it: Communication from Commission: 2005 Enlargement Strategy Paper, Brussels, 9 November 2005, COM (2005) 561, pp.26-29)

[99] These country have around 24-29 million population, depends on fact if Croatia is still considered a Western Balkans country of not; the lowest GDP of some EU member-states, like Greece and Portugal; (see abut it: World Bank & Freedom House Report, 2000)

[100] ESI newsletter, No. 2/2006, "Salzburg- missed opportunity", p.1-2; See also CEPS Brief Paper, no. 113, September 2006, where five years would need for accession of Croatia; 10-15 years for Western Balkans countries, and 20 years for former Soviet countries., (p.11); Similar to these independent analysis was also The Report of European Parliament (16 March 2006), by request to prolong next accessions for 10- 15 years.

[101] Ibid; See also: Guillaume Durand and Antonio Missiroli: "Absorption Capacity: Old Wine in new Bottles?", (EPC Policy Brief, September 2006, pp:1-4).

exclusion" of the EU towards these group countries.[102] From the Balkan side, it was a perception that the EU likes to keep the region as much as possible on the periphery from Brussels and direct them more to accomplish regional sub-integration. Indeed, the regional approach of this new strategy for the Western Balkans remains one of the main elements of the whole SA process, because as it was concluded in the first yearly report for the SA process (2002), the admission is possible if future members regionally cooperate with their neighbors, as is done by the EU member-states.[103] But, since April 2006, instead of proposed SEEFTA,[104] a Central European Free Trade Agreement project has been reopened, (free trade area for the Central Europe), which during the second half of the 20th century enabled current EU member-states from Central and Eastern Europe to successfully prepare themselves for EU integration. Now, this model should be used for the Western Balkan countries since CEFTA has proved itself as a success in pre-accession procedure for the CEE countries. But, now CEFTA has changed and enlarged, by 10 (- 2 member-states).[105] They, within the framework of the Stability Pact for SEE until the end of 2006, would have to finish the negotiations for a new agreement with which all bilateral trade agreements between the CEFTA members states will be supplemented by one multilateral regional agreement.[106] According to the Bucharest Joint Declaration, "CEFTA should be modernized and improved by various measures which would establish a kind of regional sub- integration, or the corridor to the next EU integration.[107] This project also provides suitable framework to manage the agreement and review its efficient implementation[108] and the discussion goes that it should include supranational institutions such as: Secretariat, Tribunal, and Mediator.

Although this regional approach remains essential for those countries in their road towards EU, it is not the only direction from Brussels. In accordance with the Thessalonica Agenda, the new Western Balkans Strategy began its implementation

---

[102] Dr. Dobrinka Taskovska: "European Union- Western Balkans Relations, careful, confused, encouraging", (Macedonian Affairs, Vol.V, No.1, 2004, p.21).

[103] That is the reason why the EU, in the beginning of 2006 proposed establishment of SEEFTA (Southeastern Europe Free Trade Agreement). The author of this paper, since1998, has proposed similar project of regional sub-integration: BAFTA (Balkan Area of Free Trade Agreements)

[104] Similar Project was proposed in 1998, by author of this paper, named: BAFTA. See about it: Blerim Reka: "BAFTA, a anew model for sub-regional integration", (Balkan Forum,Paris, 28 November 1998; Published in: "Euro-Atlantic Review", Vol.1, No.1/2002, p.82-86);

[105] Albania, Bosnia, Croatia, Macedonia, Moldova, Montenegro, Romania, Serbia, Kosovo/UNMIK, and Bulgaria and Romania, which would left CEFTA after 1st January 2007.

[106] It will replace 31 bilateral agreements for free trade.

[107] Like "Building on the bilateral trade concessions provided for in the existing bilateral free trade agreements between the Parties, and seeking where possible to extend them; Including harmonized provisions on modern trade policy issues such as competition rules and state aid, government procurement and protection of intellectual property, trade in services and regulatory convergence in the relevant trade-related issues, in full conformity with the rules and procedures of the WTO; Including clear and effective procedures for dispute settlement and a mechanism to improve compliance by all parties both to the agreement and to WTO rules, including for those parties not yet members of the WTO; Facilitating the gradual establishment of the EU-Western Balkan countries zone of diagonal cumulating of origin, (as envisaged in the EC Communication of 27 January 2006).

[108] Ibid, pp. 1-2; See more about it: "Preamble of JD of Bucharest Conference".

by the European Partnerships,[109] by which the countries would better prepare for the membership. Based on this strategic document, the EU Council adopted number of annual documents on the principles, priorities, and conditions contained in the European Partnership" for each Western Balkan country.[110] But, the main legal framework for their full membership remains under SAA. The financial framework for realization of the SAA process so far was provided by the CARDS program (2000-2006) and from 2007 new financial pre-accession instrument- IPA should be provided.[111]

So far, only two countries from the Western Balkans succeeded to go beyond the Balkan average: the Republic of Macedonia, which has concluded the first SA Agreement and is currently a candidate country, and Croatia, which is the first of this group of candidate countries to open accession negotiations. The first one, the road from candidate country to pre-accession should pass by implementation of the European partnership, and the second one with the "Partnership for pre-accession".

One of the latest dilemmas, is whether the partnership approach could freeze temporarily the accession to the EU or replace it by offering privileged partnership? Or, does the EU have a new enlargement strategy that will offer something like a pre-membership status? Delors called this confederation between old member-states of EU and others, by which other will have high level of political and economic relations with EU but not full membership.[112] It might also fall under the term that Duff proposed, "associate membership".[113]

Why is everybody today moving past this announced interim suspension of further enlargement of EU when even former President of European Parliament, Pete Cox, said the same only a few years ago, that after memberships of Bulgaria and Romania in 2007,[114] there will be a pause in the acceptance of new members because the EU must consolidate itself and recover from the enlargement shock.[115] Brussels

---

[109] This document was based on the EC Regulation(EC)No 533, of 22 March 2004, on the establishment of European Partnerships in the framework of the SAA process, (O .JL 86,24.03.2004)

[110] Further reading: "Council Decision 2004/648/EC, of 13 September 2004, on the principles, priorities and conditions contained in the European Partnerships with Croatia", (O. J.L 297, 22.09.2004); "Council Decision 2004/520/EC, 14.06.2004 on…European Partnerships with Serbia and Montenegro including Kosovo as defined by the UN SC Resolution 1244 of 10 June 1999", (O.J. L 227, 26.06.2004); "Council Decision 2004/519/EC of 14 June 2004 on…European Partnerships with Albania", (O.J. L 223 24.06.2004); "Council Decision on…the European Partnerships with former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia", (O.J. L 222, 23.06.2004); "Council Decision 2004/515/EC, 14.06.2004 on…the European Partnerships with Bosnia and Herzegovina", (O.J. L 221 22.06.2004).

[111] Although Croatia achieved for six months to get the accreditation for DIS, it seemed that Macedonia, would not be ready until 1st of January of 2008, to start with the implementation of IPA.

[112] Jacques Delors book: "Memoires", 2004 quoted by Buletin Quotidiene Europeene, No.9257, 5 September, 2006, p.3

[113] Andrew Duff: "Plan:B, how to rescue the European Constitution", ("Notre Europe", Studies and Research No.52, 18 October 2006)

[114] Cox that time for 2007 membership added also Croatia

[115] Quoted by Dr. Dobrila Taskovska: ""EU- Western Balkans Relations, Careful, Confused, Encouraging", (Macedonian Affairs, Vol.V, No.1/ 2004, p.25)

denied those speculations and reconfirmed its commitments toward continuing the enlargement process, but in a more conditional fashion.

Officially, since the end of 2005, the EU introduced its "new enlargement strategy", composed by "three C" principles and, since the end of 2006, added an additional one: absorption capacity, which would be the general direction of the whole future process of enlargement.[116] Because the problem of absorption capacity was previously elaborated, let me explain the "three C" principles for future enlargement.

1. Consolidation: continuation of EU to its promised commitment of further enlargement;
2. Conditionality: applying fair and rigorous conditionality for admission through strict advancement of the countries;
3. Communication: or communicating enlargement as a policy of better communication with the public opinion and the citizens.

This new enlargement strategy seemed to be harder to achieve for the countries of the Western Balkans compared to the countries of Central and Mediterranean Europe who became and will become members of the EU during in 2004 and 2007. Only successful conclusion of negotiations of one chapter of acquis opens a door to start the next one.[117]

But before opening each chapter, certain and concrete benchmarks must be set. At the same time, the number of chapters has been increased from 31 to 35. Based on these rigorous conditions and strict procedure, membership remains prospectively at a distance of many years.[118]

The experience with the previous EU enlargement processes shows similar difficulties. For example, in the cases of Greece and Spain, there were also objections to their integration, but they have become members of the EU nonetheless.[119] Similar objections are directed towards the countries of the Western Balkans. Although Brussels' formal message for those countries is that they have European perspective, this slogan remains more as a global vision or just as a chance for membership, rather than any inclusive and binding commitment from the EU.

Although "the Western Balkans European identity is beyond dispute",[120] the Balkans, as it was said, have come a long way in searching for their own, unique European identity. The Balkan nations were ruled by totalitarian ideologies that

---

[116] "Consolidation, conditionality, communication-the strategy of the enlargement policy", (IP/05/1392), Brussels, 9th November 2005.

[117] The case of Croatia was very successful: since 2o October 2005, until 19 October 2006, this country achieved to finish for one year the screening process.

[118] See: EU-25 Watch No.2, January 2006

[119] In 1977 Fransoa Miteran, that time opposition leader in France in his interview to „Nouvel Observateur", was against membership of Greece and Spain, because as he said: "they are not in position to join communities, and their accession is not our, neither their interest„. (quoted by: ESI: "Beyond Enlargement Fatigue? Part 1 The Dutch debate on Turkish accession", 24 April 2006)

[120] Duran and Missoreli, EPC Brussels, Brief Report, September, 2006, p.4

fostered the creation of certain mentalities. Centuries under Roman and Byzantine empires, five centuries of Ottoman ruling, a nationalist state between two world wars, and almost a half century of communist ruling, have created responses in individuals and societies that is almost like that of colonized peoples: waiting approach, lack of initiative, fear, general distrust, wild nature, and traditional rivalry and suspicion to the neighbor.

Since the beginning of 20th century, the Balkans were at least twice in out-European mental sphere: the first in the very first post-ottoman period, when they did not reach the west European train and the second in the post-communist transition which is prolonged until today, at least compared with other ex-communist countries, which are now EU member-states. In the beginning of 21st century, the Balkans has a new and maybe final chance to catch the train that will once and for all connect it to the west.

Instead of conclusions, the final dilemma remains still unsettled. How can we prevent Balkanization of Europe and achieve the Europeanization of the Balkans? How can the EU export peace, democracy, and sustainable economy in the Western Balkans in order to eradicate instability, failed state, corruptive governance and "casino capitalism"?

The Balkans remain a geographical part of Europe, but not yet politically and economically as they should be. Actually the Western Balkan countries are on an isolated island in the heart of Europe, with a formally introduced EU message for "European perspective", but in the same time with great concern and fears for its possible integration. Let it outside of EU, as a ghetto along the periphery, for another decade and it could be dangerous scenario due to the increased strength of organized crime and radical political movements.

By delaying the process of becoming part of civilized and developed Europe, it is the risk of Columbianization of the Western Balkans.

The comparative examples from the 1980's, Greece, Spain and Portugal, with un-democratic junta-regimes, and un-competitive economies, should be taken into account as a successful preventive approach of the EU for the countries of the Western Balkans. The above-mentioned three integrative cases show us how membership could influence the growth of the economy, strengthen democracy, the rule of law, and increase security. This is what EU could do for the Western Balkans.

From the other side, for this process to be successful, the Balkans should change its Byzantine-Ottoman mentality, and move more rapidly from the East towards the West.

But, not just, geographically, before and above all by changing mentality.

R e v i e w s

Pajo AVIROVIK: LE MANIFESTE POUR
UNE EUROPE NOUVELE
(Guy VERHOFSTADT: "Les Etats-unis D'Europe")

Ivica BOCEVSKI: FOG OF ENLARGEMENT
(Olli REHN: "Europe's Next Frontier")

Vasko NAUMOVSKI: ENGENEERING THE FOREIGN
POLICY OF A NEW INDEPENDENT STATE
(Dimitar MIRCEV: "The Macedonian Foreign Policy 1991-2006")

"LE MANIFESTE POUR UNE EUROPE NOUVELE"

Guy VERHOFSTADT: Les Etats-Unis d'Europe,
éditions Luc Pire, Bruxelles, 2006, 67 p.

Avoir le courage de parler franchement et d'une manière claire, est une vertu incontestable. D'autant plus lorsqu'il s'agit d'un homme politique au sommet du pouvoir et lorsque le sujet traité est l'avenir de l'Europe - ce qui est, en quelque sorte, la patate brûlante du débat politique d'aujourd'hui.Oui, Guy Verhofstadt, le Premier Ministre belge, parle de l'Europe, unie est forte, l'Europe que donne un enthousiasme renouvelé aux jeunes, en suivant les visions des pères fondateurs et justifie les efforts engagés jusqu'à présent pour l'unification du Vieux Continent. Il en parle avec courage, clarté, conviction et détermination. En commençant par le titre - ''Les Etats – Unis d'Europe'' - l'auteur se veut le porte drapeau d'une mise en oeuvre politique du rêve poétique hugolien. Ce n'est pas par hasard que ce manifeste politique commence notamment par les citations de trois grands hommes qui ont marqué les esprits, en évoquant la notion des Etats – Unis d'Europe : Victor Hugo, Winston Churchill et Jean Monnet. En rappelant les idées des penseurs d'une Europe unie, Guy Verhofstadt s'indigne de l'immobilisme et lance, en même temps, un appel à une action déterminée vers une intégration européenne plus étroite et plus approfondie. La solution de la crise actuelle au sein de l'UE est ''plus d'Europe'', et non pas ''moins d'Europe''. C'est exactement ce que veut la majorité des Européens, précise Verhofstadt. Ses conclusions, soutenues par les données de plusieurs analyses sur le sujet, démontre que ce n'est pas l'élargissement qui a provoqué une telle vague de mécontentement et d'euroscepticisme. En évoquant les dires de François Mitterrand, selon lesquelles ''le peuple aux referendums ne répond jamais aux questions posées'', Verhofstadt constate que les raisons du refus du projet de la Constitution européenne par les électeurs en France et en Pays Bas sont, au premier lieu,liées à la politique interne. Les origines du ''non'' peuvent être résumées sous les traits de deux sentiments dominants : l'angoisse et la peur. Angoisse par rapport à la mondialisation et la délocalisation, et le doute envers la capacité de l'Europe à y apporter des solutions adéquates. Mais il y a – et M. Verhofstadt le constate, sans ménager, un ras-le-bol populaire de ce que l'on perçoit comme bureaucratie bruxelloise. Il faut, donc, repenser l'Europe et la mettre à la hauteur des expectations des citoyens européens.

Ceci n'est pas facile à faire, mais ce n'est pas facile de le dire, non plus. A l'heure du gèle du projet européen, suite aux referendums français et néerlandais, Guy

Verhofstadt a refusé de se cacher derrière les phrases conventionnelles qui représentent, peut être, une bonne volonté, mais se transforment, en même temps, en substitution de l'action politique.

Etant sincère et prenant le risque d'élaborer son credo d'Européen, l'homme politique belge n'épargne pas la classe politique en Europe qui a évité de présenter ouvertement sa vision de l'Europe. Pire, on a l'habitude d'accuser l'Europe de toutes les défaillances politiques au niveau national. ''Ceci est inadmissible'', se révolte Verhofstadt, d'autant plus qu'une autre approche serait aussi bien incompréhensible : une Europe ,,qui se mêle de tous les domaines de la vie, y compris aux traditions et aux habitudes qui sont profondément ancrées, auxquelles les gens tiennent beaucoup, et qui représentent pour eux des points de repères,,. Il s'agit d'une peur de perte d'identité, et ce malaise s'affiche parfaitement avec l'angoisse de la mondialisation, de la perte de l'emploi, de la mise en cause du model social et du crime organisé, souvent liés à l'ouverture des frontières ou à l'élargissement vers l'Est. Tous ça rend l'Europe à l'heure actuelle, ,,inconnue et mal aimée,, surtout auprès des jeunes, les générations qui n'ont pas connu la Guerre et qui ne se sentent pas obligées de remercier l'Europe pour la paix et la prospérité qu'elles viventau quotidien.

Le manifeste de Guy Verhofstadt est un diagnostique précis qui établit également la thérapie à suivre. ''Il reste nécessaire de transformer l'Union européenne en un projet politique intégral et cohérent, à même de relever les défis nombreux et inédits qui s'annoncent. Il faut d'abord, choisir : L'Europe, sera t-elle une zone de libre-échange ou se transformera t-elle en une structure fédérale, capable de défendre l'intérêt de l'Union dans son ensemble ? La réponse à cette question est indispensable pour l'avenir du projet européen. Pour Verhofstadt il n'y a pas de doute: ''L'avenir de l'Europe se trouve dans la construction d'une Europe politique fondée sur un socle communautaire ou fédéral,,. Il faut donc pédaler sans cesse pour que le vélo reste debout, mais c'est aussi important de ne pas ralentir son mouvement. Au contraire, constate Verhofstadt, ''si l'Europe désire à l'avenir jouer un rôle sur la scène mondiale, il lui faudra s'intégrer davantage''.

Cette intégration très approfondie, jusqu'à la création des Etats Unies de l'Europe, se confrontera à de nombreux obstacles, dont M. Verhofstadt est tout à fait conscient. ''Ce serait comme attendre un train qui n'arrivera jamais'' - constate t-il avec lucidité, soulignant que la formation d'un noyau politique,, qui servira d'avant garde de cette nouvelle approche, sera peut être inévitable. Cela peut amener à la création de deux cercles concentriques en Europe : ''Les Etats-Unis de l'Europe'', dont la création pourrait se faire par les pays de la zone euro, ainsi qu'une ''Confédération d'Etats'' que Verhofstadt appelle ''Organisation des Etats européens''. Bien évidement, cette proposition ressemble beaucoup à ''une Europe à deux vitesses'', sauf que ceci ne serait qu'une phase temporaire. ''L'objectif final est que tous les Etats membres adhèrent à la nouvelle Europe''.

En tout état de causes, les changements sont nécessaires. En commençant par ''l'Eurpospeak'', ce langage incompréhensible, qui creuse le fossé entre le rêve européen du citoyen et la réalité. ''Pourquoi Javier Solana, a-t-il le titre de Haut représentant de

la politique étrangère et de la sécurité commune, alors qu'il est le Ministre européen des Affaires étrangères ?"

Bref, le manifeste proeuropéen de Guy Verhofstadt pose beaucoup de questions, mais il y répond également, avec vigueur et vision. La nouvelle Europe, selon Verhofstadt, doit avoir cinq missions en commun :Politique sociale et économique, coopération technologique, politique de la justice et de la sécurité, diplomatie et armée européenne. Cela permettra à l'Europe de prendre la place qu'elle réclame dans un monde globalisé, mais aussi de répondre aux demandes de ses citoyens.

Ainsi constituée, l'Europe nouvelle sera en mesure de régler l'une des questions cruciales de son avenir : l'élargissement. ,,De plus, la création d'une union politique permettra de poursuivre l'élargissement de l'Union sans grands problèmes. Cet élargissement est d'ailleurs nécessaire pour étendre la zone de paix, de stabilité et de prospérité à l'ensemble du Continent européen.

Guy Verhovstadt, qui au début de sa carrière politique à été connu comme, ''Baby Thatcher" à cause de son age et de ses idées économiques, a écrit un ouvrage court, mais audacieux, qui lui vaudra un jour le titre de ''l'un des pères fondateurs de l'Europe nouvelle".

Pajo AVIROVIK

R E V I E W S

Pajo AVIROVIK: LE MANIFESTE POUR
UNE EUROPE NOUVELE
(Guy VERHOFSTADT: "Les Etats-unis D'Europe")

Ivica BOCEVSKI: FOG OF ENLARGEMENT
(Olli REHN: "Europe's Next Frontier")

Vasko NAUMOVSKI: ENGENEERING THE FOREIGN
POLICY OF A NEW INDEPENDENT STATE
(Dimitar MIRCEV: "The Macedonian Foreign Policy 1991-2006")

"FOG OF ENLARGEMENT"
Book review

Olli REHN: "Europe's Next Frontier"
Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, Baden Baden, 2006

The expression "fog of war" describes the ambiguity of the anticipation of the outcomes of the military operations. In the eve of the forthcoming engagement the adrenaline levels and the perceptions (both rational and irrational) are sky-rocketing. The "fog of Enlargement" in the European Union is best captured by the quote from the Luxemburg's Prime Minister Jean-Claude Juncker in the newest book of the Enlargement Commissioner Olli Rehn - "Before, the rockets from the East were pointed at us – that was scary. Today, the hopes of the people from Central and Eastern Europe are pointed at us – and surprisingly that is even scarier than rockets". The "European Ostpolitik" designed after the fall of the Iron Curtain and Berlin Wall culminated on May 1, 2004 with the "big bang" enlargement although the queue is still full with the new aspirants for the European family. However, it is still very foggy in the European landscape for the actors of the processes to evaluate the results of the enlargement.

Following the tradition of the "practicing" European intellectuals Olli Rehn, the present Enlargement Commissioner and a distinguished political science scholar, decided to challenge the prevailing mood in the European Union. In his book "Europe's Next frontier" Ollie Rehn makes the case for the future enlargement of the European Union and for reinventing and reviving the European vision set by the founding fathers of Europe.

His blueprint for reinvigorating the European agenda is consisted of three pillars. The first is the case for the rebuilding the confidence in the European economy. The improvement of the competitiveness and innovation are embedded in the core of this project, however the crucial reforms target the flexibility and the security of the labor marker ("flexicurity" to use the "sexy" Nordic term), as well as continuous investments in education and training. The second item on his agenda is the political revival of Europe. Namely, fragility and weakness take place when arrogance and closeness prevail, especially when the intellectual flow of ideas becomes rigid and defensive. Therefore, Commissioner Rehn tries to "clear the fog" by challenging the dominant paradigms of the European Brahmins. Namely, he rejects the false dichotomies which are hotly debated in the European political and academic circles - the "economic versus political integration", as well as "widening versus deepening" agenda. His views are

that both concepts explain phenomena, which are going on parallely, and they don't cancel each other but rather reinforce each other mutually.

The third frontier, as he puts it, is the extension of the European zone of peace, liberty, prosperity and better projecting the EU' soft power ("speak of soft power and carry clear conditions"), especially through gradual, rigorous and carefully managed accession process. Being a "realist" in the evaluation of the current European political climate, Olli Rehn takes the incremental approach for the future stages of the European integration, but his vision is loud and clear – the frontiers of the European Union are shaped by the common democratic values and not by the geographic or other strict interpretation. This is why the concept of "frontier" is prevalent in his book rather than the concept of the "borders". Speaking of the countries, which belong in his portfolio –Turkey and the Western Balkans –, his arguments are very clear that these countries belong to the European family although the full membership is subject of their commitment for the reform process. As he puts it for the countries of the Central and Eastern Europe which have already joined Europe "the costs of non-enlargement" would have been "authoritarian and ethnic conflicts" and the projected "costs of non-enlargement" for the Western Balkans is the specter of a "new ghetto inside Europe" and "a Turkey that will turn its back of Europe and reject democratic values".

Maybe this explains why his concluding chapter begins with the works of the famous political economist Karl Polyani who warned that "the fate of the nations was linked to their role in an institutional transformation". After the First World War the Western democracies failed to integrate the nations of Central and Eastern Europe in the community of democratic nations. This is one of the sources of the 20th century totalitarianisms and the same institutional failure in the other nations on the present periphery of the European Union hinges on the pace of the European integration project.

In theoretical terms his book adds to the democratic functionalist theory in the international affairs section of the political sciences, although this can be read as a toolkit and practicum of applied policies for the future stages of the Enlargement process, as well as the processes of reinventing the European Union. One other major contribution of Ollie Rehn is the insightful resources used in his book to "clear the fog" of the present European debate which badly needs a reality-check.

Regrettably for Macedonia and the other countries from the Western Balkans and Turkey, the Enlargement agenda wouldn't be influenced by the excellent scholarship of a Finnish academic turned Commissioner. This process will be driven and crafted by the political cycles of the national elections agenda in the core countries of "old Europe" and the present perspectives aren't very optimistic.

Ivica BOCEVSKI

"ENGENEERING THE FOREIGN POLICY OF A NEW INDEPENDENT STATE"

Book review

Dimitar MIRCEV: "The Macedonian Foreign Policy 1991-2006"
Az-Buki, Skopje, 2006

The issues related to the foreign policy of Macedonia since the independence in 1991 are among the topics which are not in the focus of the writings of many academics in this country. The increased interest in this area comes up with the dynamism in the path towards the membership in the EU and NATO, as well as with the inclusion of these problems in the curricula in the Macedonian universities.

Undoubtedly, one of the leading researchers and analysts in this field is Dr. Dimitar Mircev, professor at two universities, politically and socially active intellectual, former Ambassador (1993-1997) of Macedonia to Slovenia and the Holy See, and president of the European Movement of Macedonia.

Intended for the students of political science and international politics, the book is also a useful resource for all other academics having Macedonia's foreign policy and the Balkan issues in their focal points, as well as wider scientific audience. Offering numerous facts and in-depth information on the events that occurred in the past fifteen years, Dr. Mircev takes the readers on a journey through the recent history of the region and the political developments in Macedonia regarding its international engagements in the years following the break-up of the Yugoslav federation.

The structure of the book enables easy following of the establishment and evolution of the main topic of interest – the Macedonian foreign policy. Starting with an introduction to foreign policy and its studying, the author gives a strong basis for the following chapter, including explanations of the characteristics of the foreign policy in a country like Macedonia, its geopolitical possibilities and brief description of the main political events in the near past. The introductory part also includes "views and reminiscences" of the Macedonian foreign ministers, where the reader can get first-hand data and details from the ministers about certain events and documents important during their mandates.

The second part is consisted of essays and studies published in countries where the author has lectured, on topics related to the fall of Yugoslavia, the construction of the foreign policy of Macedonia, the challenges of this policy, and the European perspectives of the Balkans. Also, important part are the Appendices, placed at the end

of the book, especialy the "Chronology of Events Significant for Macedonian Foreign Policy", where more than fifty events are listed. The appendix included tables with statistical information about the population, religion and ethnicity in the Balkans, human development, GDP per capita and their relations to the EU and NATO complete the scope of the book.

Gathering all these information, articles published in different periods and events, as well as text written by different authors, requires specific ability to put them in a common compound, which is obviously possessed by Dr. Mircev. His broad analytical and objective views of various aspects in the foreign policy are based on his academic and diplomatic experience, which contributes to the high value of his work presented in the book.

A highly important topic like the foreign policy of Macedonia researched by a highly-ranked author deserve better aesthetical appearance and higher quality of the edition. Also, the period includes numerous events which can be covered by photos and extracts from particular documents. This can be corrected in the following editions.

Dr. Mircev's book represents a significant contribution in a field of high importance for the state, and of course, for future creation of the Macedonian foreign policy in all directions, including its top priority – the Euro-Atlantic integration process. Future extended editions of this and similar books using scientific approach will be extremely valuable for paving the path for a stronger, comprehensive and more dynamic role of Macedonia on the global scene.

Vasko NAUMOVSKI