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Study Group Regional Stability in South East Europe
Foreword

General Raimund Schittenhelm

The Republic of Austria joined the PfP Consortium of Defence Academies and Security Studies Institutes through its Ministry of Defence in 1999. Right from the beginning, the main Austrian interest centred on the issues of security policy and crisis management, with a special focus on the Western Balkans region. As a consequence, the Austrian National Defence Academy propelled the establishment of a Study Group on “Regional Stability in South East Europe” jointly with Croatia and Bulgaria at the Consortium’s second Annual Conference in Sofia in December 1999.

The Study Group, which started to convene first workshops from 2000 onward, rapidly established itself as a cutting edge platform for exchange of opinions and policies for regional and international actors engaged in South East Europe. Austria, which due to its geographical proximity and direct involvement in security political, economical and societal developments in South East Europe, is uniquely positioned to act as lead agent for discussion and policy shaping in Western Balkans issues.

Workshops have been held twice a year for the past ten years, one in Austria and the other one in the region, relying on a network of regional partner institutions (e.g. Tirana, Ohrid, Dubrovnik, Sofia, Istanbul, Cavtat, Budva, Belgrade, and Sarajevo): in April 2010, the 20th workshop of RSSEE was convened at Chateau Rothschild. These workshops have provided an opportunity for civil society actors from the region to introduce practical conflict resolution ideas to each other and international actors alike.

---

1 General Raimund Schittenhelm is Commandant of the Austrian National Defence Academy, Vienna, Austria, and Austrian representative in the Senior Advisory Council of the PfP Consortium of Defence Academies and Security Studies Institutes.
Moreover, the Study Group fills an important communication and information function with and within South East Europe. The efficiency and reach of that tool is enhanced through the regular publication of Study Group Information series by the Austrian Ministry of Defence and Sports and through the occasional papers germane to South East Europe published in Connections. The Austrian National Defence Academy has published 35 such proceedings in the ten years of the Study Group’s existence. Through the simple process of advocacy-cum-advisory, actors and interested parties from the region (and beyond) ensure an information loop that creates action.

In addition it has made the crucial leap of imagination and action by taking the conclusions of each workshop over the past ten years and digested them in the form of applicable advice. As can be expected, this advice found the loudest echo in the region, attracting the attention of local partners and institutions of official and on governmental background, and influencing major actors engaged in the field. This advice, through the conduit that the Consortium affords to its funding agents, is finding its way to NATO and European institutions and ultimately to the Office of the Secretary of Defence of the United States of America.

The RSSEE Study Group remains a cornerstone of Austrian security policy oriented towards Western Balkan stability. It can be said that the Study Group’s existence itself has had a beneficial impact in pacifying this troubled region. Especially in a policy-oriented group as the SG RSSEE, the expertise and opinion of people coming from outside of government institutions are of vital importance.

Austria is looking forward to a further collaboration with the PfP Consortium on a stable and continued financial and administrative level, with our South East European partners, and to the possibility of transmitting the lessons learned in this Study Group to other similar endeavours covering the Southern Caucasus, Central Asia, and even Africa.

is pleased to present, in combined form of an anthology, the policy rec-
mendations offered to national and international actors and institu-
tions the EAPC framework alike of the past seven workshops convened
between 2007 and 2010.
Advice and Advocacy: Ten Years of Regional Stability in South East Europe Study Group

Ernst M. Felberbauer, Predrag Jureković, and Frederic Labarre

Advocacy and Advice: Supporting Regional Stability

Advocates and advisers share a passion for the region they work in, but they are separated by the quality of their functions. Advocates are practitioners of reform and reconstruction working in the region, while advisers propose (but ideally do not proselytise) decision options. Dictionaries define *advisory* as an adjective reflecting the "power or duty to advise", whereas *advocacy*, which it follows immediately, defines "the act or action of supporting an idea, way of life, person, etc." Rarely is the English language so clear in its distinctions between two neighbouring concepts. Both advocates and advisers, however, are often criticised for appearing too much as the emitters of opinions, and not being receptive enough to the realities on the ground and the grievances or actual needs of the local population.

In 1998, the PfP Consortium of Defence Academies and Security Studies Institutes applied the innovative concept that academic and governmental representatives of hitherto hostile blocks and countries could sit together around the same table and discuss - in the spirit of the Partnership for Peace - solutions for conflict resolution. In many cases - Serbia and Russia spring to mind immediately - it was one of the few politi-
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3 Ernst M. Felberbauer is Head of Research Management at the Austrian National Defence Academy, Predrag Jureković is Senior Researcher at the Institute for Peace Support and Conflict Management at the Austrian National Defence Academy and co-chair of the RSSEE Study Group and Frederic Labarre is regular contributor to the work of the Study Group.

cally-acceptable fora of integration to join. Some countries have had the benefit of their own privileged fora with NATO, but they are eminently political. The PfP Consortium also has a political vision, but it is sublimated through its academic and scientific character, which means that in the event of a crisis, such as the one that opposed NATO with Russia over Kosovo, the subtlety of this agenda does not lead to a collapse of cooperation.

Although the idea of enlarging the North Atlantic Treaty Organization was already occupying the diplomatic and defence staffs of most Eastern and Central European countries between 1995 and 1998, for many of them the PfP Consortium represented the only forum where they could sit side by side with their future Alliance colleagues and counterparts alike. The educative value of the concept is therefore evident. Issue by issue, region by region, the PfP Consortium succeeded in developing a spirit of understanding between groups and individuals which until recently had been adversaries. This predated every concrete invitation for membership and had the courage to tackle many controversial issues with varying degrees of success. It has been noted, for example, that rarely could Azeris and Armenians, Serbs and Croats, or Kosovo Albanians and Serbs find themselves together debating the case of Nagorno-Karabakh, of the Krajina, or of Mitrovica in a Chatham House rule-protected apolitical forum.

It is this idea that propelled the Austrian Ministry of Defence to co-sponsor a study group on South East European security in 1999, and start convening first workshops from 2000 onward. The impact of this decision - if only indirectly - can be measured in the integrative success of many Western Balkan countries. In 2004, Slovenia became both EU and NATO member. And, some would say against all reasonable odds, Albania and Croatia formally joined the Alliance in 2009, and the rest are firmly setting their sights first on NATO and then EU membership. Two core functions of the study group have been so far to serve as a platform for building confidence and as a “neutral” platform to facilitate the exchange of different views in politically sensitive circumstances. Thus, the format enabled contacts between Edita Tahiri, the advisor of the then president of Kosovo, Ibrahim Rugova, and representatives of
Serbian think tanks shortly after the end of the Kosovo war. In the spring of 2008, shortly after the independence of Kosovo had been unilaterally declared by its parliament a study group meeting on the Kosovo development brought together today’s Serb State Secretary in the Kosovo Ministry, Oliver Ivanović, with analysts from a Kosovo-Albanian think tank. There are strong expectations that a Study Group on the Southern Caucasus could again achieve comparable results for that conflict region through the transmission of lessons learned from the Western Balkans.

In the spring of 2000, Austria convened its first "Crisis Management in South East Europe" Study Group meeting. The rapidly improving security situation in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Kosovo warranted a name change to "Regional Stability in South East Europe" in 2003. The format, however, never changed. Workshops have been held twice a year for the past ten years, one in Austria and the other one in the region (Tirana, Ohrid, Dubrovnik, Sofia, Istanbul, Cavtat, Budva, Belgrade, and Sarajevo). The workshops have provided an opportunity for civil society actors from the region to introduce practical conflict resolution ideas to each other and international actors alike. It is extremely important to note that the Study Group has never been an ivory tower where its members were divorced from the realities on the ground. Proof of this is the timeliness with which the discussion topics were chosen year by year. If new security issue of importance surfaced, the Study Group would move quickly and pave the way to address it. To demonstrate how nimble the Study Group is, it successfully managed to collect advice and opinion on the subject of the Presevo Valley crisis as it was developing in May 2001, and integrated it in the subject of its Reichenau conference on ethnic heterogeneity. Therefore, the network rapidly became a receptor of information and regional grievances, not an emitter of so-called "solutions" for the locals to apply.
Regional Stability: a Process of Conflict Management and Resolution

Regional stability – as defined by this Study Group – means to strive for cooperative political, economic, cultural and military relations in areas which passed through wars, where the political and interethnic relations are still partly conflicting or which are afflicted with security problems due to differing geo-strategic interests of regional or global actors. The Study Group Regional Stability in South East Europe has contributed at an academic level with its activities to enhance regional cooperation and to focus the important issues for regional stability.

Inasmuch the topics and projects of the Study Group since its beginning have been connected with the main trends in the process of stabilisation and peace-building in the following some milestones of this complex endeavour shall be cited.

Since the war in Bosnia and Herzegovina was terminated by the Dayton accord in 1995 and even more evident after the ending of the NATO operation “Allied Force” in Kosovo in June 1999, the so-called Western Balkans became one of the main target regions for international support in terms of military, political and economic peace-building measures.

The international support as such has run trough a substantial change in the last 15 years: The first missions – as it was the case with the NATO-led “Implementation Force” (IFOR) in Bosnia and Herzegovina – above all aimed at preventing the outbreak of new hostilities between the parties of conflict. Democratic changes inside the two regional core actors Croatia and Serbia in the Post-Tudjman and Post-Mišojević era since 2000 have enabled the international side to support a positive transformation of the formerly violent conflicts. This reaches beyond the prevention of new wars.

The more ambitious goal focused in the last years has been to make partners of former enemies. Of crucial importance for approaching this goal is the perspective offered by the NATO and EU to the Western
Balkan countries to join these two organizations and the common interests and democratic standards that are the result of the integration processes. Albania’s and Croatia’s accession to NATO in April 2009 has been an encouraging signal for the whole region that substantial reforms and a cooperative policy can lead to positive changes, although the way to achieve this goal sometimes seems to be very stony. The analysis of the obstacles for a cooperative policy in the region and proposing ways how to deal with them by the Study Group “Regional Stability in South East Europe” is seen as one of its most important tasks.

The fact that supporting positive peace in a post-war region is a very complex and demanding goal has been demonstrated in the last 15 years by the international peace-building activities in the Western Balkans which, compared to other post-war regions in the world, is a rather small area. Regarding this we should remind us of some figures: Since 1995 the UN, NATO and EU in total have deployed nine military Peace Support Operations (PSOs) with different mandates according to the necessities in different stages of the peace-building process.

In Bosnia and Herzegovina for instance IFOR with its main task of implementing the military aspects of Dayton 1997 was replaced by the NATO-led follow up mission “Stabilisation Force” (SFOR) which had the mandate to back up the international civilian presence in implementing the political and human rights part of the peace agreement. The SFOR again was followed by the “EUFOR-ALTHEA” mission in 2004, which is still deployed in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Although “EUFOR-ALTHEA” is still provided with an executive mandate according to Chapter VII of the UN Charta, its future presence is planned to be primarily used for supporting the local security forces in the field of Security Sector Reform. For this purpose the EU military mission will cooperate closely with the NATO-mission, considering the political goal to increase Bosnia and Herzegovina’s functionality as a state and to provide assistance to this country in approaching the Euro-Atlantic institutions.

In the FYR of Macedonia the “United Nations Preventive Deployment Force” (UNPREDEP), which was deployed in the second half of the
1990ies, tried to prevent a spill over of the Kosovo conflict. Unfortunately this generally successful mission was terminated too early because of a diplomatic conflict between FYROM and China. When 2001 a civil war-like situation could be calmed down by diplomatic efforts of the international side, also in this country new Peace Support Operations were launched. NATO’s operation “Essential Harvest” for collecting the weapons of KLA-fighters in FYROM was followed by the NATO-led missions “Amber Fox” and “Allied Harmony”, the latter by the EU-led operation “Concordia” to support the peace-building process in FYROM. This EU military mission in FYROM was completed in December 2003. As a result of the partly still tense interethnic situation in its operational area the “Kosovo Security Force” (KFOR), deployed in 1999, has remained a Peace Support Operation highly focused on security protection.

Beside the military operations several police and civilian peace support missions launched by the EU contribute to the improvement of the overall security situation and provide support for the Security Sector Reform in the Western Balkan region. The most comprehensive civilian ESDP mission at present in the region as well as on the global level is EULEX-Kosovo, with approximately 1,900 international personnel that aim to back up Kosovo’s police, customs and justice system. The main political frame for the regional process of peace building is provided by the EU and its “Stabilisation and Association Process” for the Western Balkan countries. It defines the road map and provides substantial assistance in regard to future EU membership.

The EU as such has become deeply involved in state-building processes in the region, as it is in particular demonstrated by the important function of the High Representative/EU Special Representative in Bosnia and Herzegovina, which was established to push forward the peace process with strong legislative and executive powers. This post that beside the recognized positive effects on the peace- and state-building process has been partly criticized by the affected groups in Bosnia and Herzegovina due to its questioned compatibility with democratisation goals indicates that international peace support in case of the Western
Balkans has departed substantially from traditional concepts of peacekeeping and peace-making.

EU’s and NATO’s efforts to prepare the Western Balkan countries for a future membership without doubt has positively influenced regional co-operation, which is certainly a precondition to transform a negative peace in a situation of positive peace. During the last ten years in the wake of Euro-Atlantic integration processes a lot of new institutions were founded to enhance regional co-operation. In this context in particular the former “Stability Pact for South East Europe” has to be mentioned, which was followed by the 2008 established Sarajevo-based “Regional Cooperation Council” (RCC). The RCC supports and assists regional projects in the field of economic and social development, energy and infrastructure, justice and home affairs, security cooperation, in building human capital and is engaged in parliamentary co-operation.

It is important to mention that the RCC like the regional political platform “South East European Cooperation Process” are guided by the principle of regional ownership. The membership of all Western Balkan countries in the “Central European Free Trade Agreement” (CEFTA) gives the opportunity to enhance substantially the economic relations. Last but not least also the activities of this study group in the frame of PfP Consortium can be regarded as an important forum for regional co-operation. Considering the fact that analysts and policy advisers from the whole region meet twice within a year in order to arrive at common recommendations regarding the challenges in the stabilisation process.

Generally viewed, successes in the post-war-period are obvious. An indicator for this is the interest shown in the Caucasus region and in parts of Africa for the “Balkan model” in regard to conflict resolution. However, this may not lead to the wrongful assessment that all problems are solved and that international support for this region is no longer required. On the contrary, the process of conflict transformation currently is in a sensitive phase, as demonstrated for instance by the difficult state-building process in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the still bad relationship between Belgrade and Priština/Prishtina and the fragile interethnic rela-
tions in FYROM. The continuation of integration policies is crucial for dealing positively with these challenges.

The Future of Regional Engagement and Stability in the Western Balkans

In support of these endeavours, the RSSEE Study Group has embraced the advocacy of some 350 experts and practitioners during the last ten years. Government officials, police and military officers, NGO representatives, think tank analysts, academics and journalists have been provided a judgment-free, non-political forum where they have shared in the spirit of collegiality the need for a free press, the importance of improved rule of law, multi-ethnic bureaucracy, improved civil-military relations, argued for tolerance in refugee returns or stressed the need for market liberalization, among many other topics. In addition it has made the crucial leap of imagination and action by taking the conclusions of each workshop over the past ten years and digested them in the form of applicable advice. As can be expected, this advice found the loudest echo in the region, attracting the attention of local partners and institutions of official and non-governmental background, and influencing major actors engaged in the field. This advice, through the conduit that the PfP Consortium affords to its funding agents, is finding its way to NATO and European institutions and ultimately to the Office of the Secretary of Defence of the United States of America.

Moreover, the Study Group fills an important communication and information function with and within South East Europe. The efficiency and reach of that tool is enhanced through the regular publication of Study Group Information series by the Austrian Ministry of Defence and Sports and through the occasional papers germane to South East Europe published in Connections. The Austrian National Defence Academy has published 35 such proceedings in the ten years of the Study Group’s existence. A rapid internet search on any of its contributors will reveal how broadly they are used in the region. Through this simple process of advocacy-cum-advisory, actors and interested parties from the region (and beyond) ensure an information loop that creates action.
The year 2010 is the occasion for many anniversaries for the Austrian Ministry of Defence and Sports. First and foremost it marks fifty-years of participation in peace missions, extending from Katanga (today's Democratic Republic of the Congo) in 1960, up to the latest mission in Chad, under UN and EU mandates. Second, it marks the coincidence of a twin anniversary: that of Austria's membership in the EU and accession to the Partnership for Peace programme, and last, but not the least, it marks ten years of active participation in the PfP Consortium and the RSSEE Study Group.

The RSSEE Study Group is the cornerstone of Austrian security policy oriented towards Western Balkan stability. It can be said that the Study Group's existence itself has had a beneficial impact in pacifying this troubled region. We are looking forward to another ten years of collaboration with the PfP Consortium, with our South East European partners, and to the possibility of transmitting the lessons learned in this Study Group to other similar endeavours covering the Southern Caucasus, Central Asia, and even Africa.
15 Years of Peace-Building Activities in the Western Balkans – Lessons Learnt and Current Challenges

Predrag Jureković

General Outline

In the past 15 years, the complexity of the peace processes in the Western Balkans has shown that achieving stability in terms of preserving a non-fighting situation cannot be automatically equated with peace-building. The latter demands long-term and comprehensive political, security-political, judicial and economic efforts on the side of the affected post-war societies and international intervention forces.

However, in the Balkan “laboratory”, lots of new concepts and instruments have been developed and tested in regard to international interventions in crisis and post-war situations. Among them are the building - respectively the re-building - of states and their institutions, civil-military cooperation, the concept of Security Sector Reform, new forms of military peace-keeping like the Liaison and Observation Teams, the cooperation between EU and NATO in peace support operations, the concept of restoring multiethnic societies in post-war areas as well as integration as a tool for fostering reconciliation and restoring regional co-operation.

This generally comprehensive approach has guaranteed the absence of war on the one hand. On the other hand, the serious problems Bosnia-Herzegovina, Kosovo and, to a smaller degree, Macedonia still face while trying to install functional state institutions and to establish a

---

peaceful multiethnic society point to shortcomings of international strategies and instruments as well as to unrealistic expectations.

In respect to the analytical framework of international interventions in post-war societies it can be stated that stocktaking which is done permanently and substantially is still rare. An important lesson which can be drawn from the Western Balkan experience is that complicated processes of conflict transformation need a continuous analytical observation by stock-taking task forces.

These task forces, which could be established in the delegating countries, should imply the analytical capacity of researchers in the affected post-war societies. Their task would mainly be to overhaul the strategic approach of the international intervention forces in the peace-building process as well as the appropriate usage of personnel and financial resources.

**Lessons Learnt from and Recommendations with regard to State- and Institution-Building**

**The Challenge of Setting Priorities**

A crucial question in the context of state- and institution-building is whether international intervention forces in the first phase of their engagement should be focused more on supporting the process of democratisation or on implementing the rule of law. It is difficult to draw a general lesson due to the fact that the specific situation of the individual cases has to be taken into consideration (e.g. the respective level of democratisation before the war occurred, the respective level of corruption in the post-war elites etc.).

However, guaranteeing minimum standards in regard to rule of law needs to be seen as a precondition for establishing democratic and well functioning state institutions in a post-war society.
In Bosnia-Herzegovina and Kosovo – the main regional target countries for international interventions in the post-war period – serious mistakes were made in the field of rule of law. In both areas, the international intervention forces, in particular in the first period after the war, have been more engaged in organizing elections than in fighting criminal structures which continued to dominate the political scene. This shortcoming has seriously impeded the establishment of functional institutions according to Euro-Atlantic standards.

The latest development in Kosovo with the EU rule of law mission “EULEX” signalling a higher readiness to act against corrupt politicians shows how difficult it still is to establish rule of law.

**Foreign Intervention and Local Ownership**

Most international actors engaged in peace-building would agree that in post-war territories, supportive measures should not lead to long-term protectorates which evoke an “occupation syndrome” in the affected societies. Nevertheless, the experience gained from Bosnia-Herzegovina and Kosovo which have almost passed through 15 and respectively 11 years of externally guided peace- and state-building indicates how difficult it is to find a balance between international support and regional responsibility.

Having in mind that in the first period after the war energetic measures from the international intervention forces are necessary to establish basic standards in the field of rule of law and for fighting criminal elites, it seems reasonable to use protectorate powers primarily at the beginning of the international intervention. When basic standards in the field of rule of law are guaranteed and the political institutions show capable to fulfil their tasks the political responsibility should be stepwise transferred to the local authorities.

Neither in Bosnia-Herzegovina nor in Kosovo the interaction between the international intervention forces and the local authorities has developed as described above. As far as Bosnia and Herzegovina is concerned, the period 1995-1997 was characterized by maximum tolerance
of the international side vis-à-vis the war elites. They were enabled to realise their war goals by political means.

From 1997, when the High Representative was provided with de facto protectorate powers, the peace process developed in a better direction. The setbacks in the peace process since 2006, in turn, have derived from shortcomings in the Dayton peace accord, which does not take into account state functionality. Thus, Bosnia and Herzegovina still has a High Representative, who is backed up by the international stakeholders in the Peace Implementation Council in using his executive powers to a far smaller degree than it was the case before 2006.

Two lessons can be drawn from the Bosnian experience: Firstly, political shortcomings which are accepted in the peace plan in order to end the war can seriously impede priority goals in the peace-building process and should therefore, if possible, be avoided. Secondly, a precondition for continuing using protectorate powers is stout backing up by the main international stakeholders.

The import of “western standards” into a post-war society can be only successful if the international intervention forces practice a positive culture of intervention. This includes exemplifying good governance and avoiding adapting to corruptive behaviour. If international intervention forces become “a part of the problem” their presence in the post-war area has to be put into question (f. ex.: international forces involved in organised crime as clients or middlemen).

Post-war societies, as to be found in the Western Balkans, are burdened with (partly) corrupt and nationalistic political elites. The more important it is for international intervention forces to identify constructive and credible partners in the civil society sector in order to give the necessary reforms an endorsement outside the political sector. This does not mean a random financial support for the “NGO industry”, but a selective approach that is guided by a clear strategy.
Consistent Political Strategy and Division of Labour

Without a reasonable and consistent strategy of the international stakeholders as well as an efficient division of labour between the intervention forces the foreign influence on state-building will not produce the desired results and can be even counterproductive.

In Bosnia and Herzegovina, the cooperation between the High Representative as the highest political authority and the military missions (SFOR and later EUFOR) has proved to be an efficient model, especially in the phase when the HR was backed by the international stakeholders. As distinguished from the Bosnian situation, the present “division of labour” between the intervention forces UNMIK, OSCE, EULEX and ICO in Kosovo looks rather chaotic. This deplorable circumstance is caused by the disagreement of the international stakeholders regarding the status question.

Incentives

As demonstrated by the example of the Western Balkans, political and economic incentives can play an eminent role in peace-building processes. The integration into the EU and NATO will not be enough to reconcile the Western Balkan peoples, but they are important triggers for regional co-operation through providing the same standards and goals for all. In order to preserve integration tools as important catalysts in the peace processes, all the Western Balkan countries should be included in the integration processes – at present this is not the case with Kosovo.

The Cyprus case demonstrates that long-lasting ethnic and political conflicts will not be automatically resolved through EU membership. This is also valid for the former parties of conflict in the Western Balkans. They will have to normalise their relations before their accession to EU. A strict EU conditionality in regard to good neighbourhood relations would contribute to this goal.
Lessons Learnt from and Recommendations with regard to Establishing a Peaceful Security Environment

NATO and later EU military forces generally have been successful in providing and maintaining a secure environment which is an absolute precondition for any peace-building effort. However, the lack of sufficient numbers of international police, in particular at the beginning of the international peace missions in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Kosovo, overstrained the military forces which are not trained primarily to enforce the rule of law. This created a security gap in some phases of the deployment.

The respective lesson drawn from this experience is that in the best case the deployment of a military mission should go hand with the deployment of a substantial police mission which is focused on the enforcement of the rule of law. For critical situations like the defence of massive use of violence by civilians (see the Kosovo crisis in 2004) the so-called Gendarmerie forces as the link between police and military should be brought into action.

International interventions for the purpose of peace-building need to include preventive action if clear signals for a new crisis arise. Macedonia is regarded as a successful example for preventing the escalation of violence. The military observer mission of the United Nations Preventive Deployment Force (UNPREDEP 1995-99) in the border area contributed substantially to a minor spill-over of the Kosovo conflict to Macedonia. The lesson drawn is that a successful preventive mission should not be terminated prematurely – in particular if indicators for a violent crisis are increasing.

Once the clashes between Macedonian security forces and Albanian guerrilla fighters were near escalation in spring 2001, a fast political intervention on a high level by NATO and EU, which provided the Ohrid agreement, prevented the outbreak of a war. The lesson which can be drawn is that preventive action should be based on high level involvement and a balanced political proposal.
NATO’s and the EU’s integration processes have certainly fostered the regional cooperation in the security sector. Here the support of the new NATO members Albania and Croatia for Bosnia and Herzegovina’s application to NATO’s Membership Action Plan can be mentioned as well as the increased police cooperation in the region stimulated in particular by the previous EU programme CARDS (Community Assistance for Reconstruction, Development and Stabilisation).

Furthermore, the Western Balkan countries while having become aspirants for NATO membership have transformed from security receivers to security contributors.

**Lessons Learnt from and Recommendations with regard to Fostering Transitional Justice and Reconciliation**

Reconciliation is a long-term process which goes beyond the political context while also touching in depth the social relations between average citizens. Strong political signals from the politicians are a precondition for reconciliation. Although since 2000, Western Balkan politicians have sent more and more reconciling signals in the wake of their Euro-Atlantic aspirations, reconciliation is partly still impeded by hidden political agendas (see f. ex. the policy of Republika Srpska in Bosnia and Herzegovina).

A regional process of reconciliation is difficult to be started while borders are still put into question. Hence, international intervention forces should either contribute to clear status and border arrangements, or – if this is not possible for the time being – reduce the space for regional politicians to continue manipulating with territorial and national issues.

International tribunals for prosecuting war criminals like the ICTY are important to transform the war perception of collective guilt into concrete legal responsibility of individual criminals. On the other hand, the previous experience with ICTY has shown that a legal body that at first should deal with legal tasks can not reconcile former parties of conflict.
However, the judgments of ICTY could be better used to initiate discourses on justice and reconciliation in the affected societies and between them. The Euro-Atlantic community could contribute to this process by supporting relevant outreach activities of civil society groups in the region.

**Recommendations with regard to Current Developments**

**Bosnia and Herzegovina**

After four years of political stagnation, this country needs an awakening after the next parliamentary elections which will take place in October 2010. An absolute necessity in order to increase the state functionality will be to decide and implement substantial changes in regard to the Dayton constitution. The support of the Euro-Atlantic partners will be necessary to push forward this important process, since in particular the Serb side tends to avoid the constitutional changes.

Amongst others it will be necessary to touch the issue of “entity voting” otherwise this mechanism can be further misused by destructive politicians to block the Euro-Atlantic integration of Bosnia and Herzegovina for the purpose of “defending national interests”.

In particular the EU should use its influence on Croatia and Serbia for guaranteeing a constructive policy of these countries vis-à-vis the inevitable reforms in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

**Kosovo**

Kosovo-Albanian-Serb relations will soon enter into a new sensitive phase due to the upcoming ruling of the ICJ. It will be important that the members of the Kosovo Steering Group stick to their previous position that the status issue will not be re-opened. Instead, the EU and the US should support a political dialogue between Prishtina/Priština and Belgrade which – in the context of European integration – should lead to a
modus vivendi according to the German-German relationship in the 1980ies.

The international presence in Kosovo is criticized by the Kosovo authorities for providing an uncoordinated performance. Different status positions of the EU-22 and EU-5 weaken the EULEX mission. The EU should strive for a common policy regarding its support for Kosovo otherwise the EU presence will lose its credibility among Kosovo Albanians.

Furthermore, it will be necessary for the EU and US to better coordinate their joint efforts in Kosovo, in particular as initiatives of the Kosovo government are concerned to “reintegrate” the Serb dominated north. Another field in which more harmonization of the policies of the Euro-Atlantic partners is needed will be a stronger support to EULEX in fighting corrupt politicians – one of the basic problems in Kosovo’s transition process.

The Euro-Atlantic partners should change their strategic attitude: instead of following only short-term stability goals, long-term strategic thinking should be established. This includes in particular the need of communicating primarily with a small group of corrupt politicians the EU and US to increase support for grass roots level involvement in Kosovo.

Kosovo needs less international police and more international judges to start the prosecution of corrupt politicians. EULEX should be reorganized in compliance with this priority.

Without a clear vision for an economic recovery of Kosovo, this country with more than 50% unemployed and mostly young people will remain a fragile and explosive society.

**FYR of Macedonia**

The continuing Greek blocking of Macedonia’s integration into the EU and NATO due to the unresolved name issue could become a serious risk for internal stability in Macedonia. Both NATO and EU accession
would be important steps to strengthen the state identity among Albanians in Macedonia. Holding Macedonia in a state of a limbo as far as Euro-Atlantic integration is concerned increases ethnic tensions between ethnic Macedonians and the Albanian population.

The EU-26 and the US need to continue with their efforts to convince Greece to accept a compromise in the name issue, in order to decrease the risk of new ethnic clashes in Macedonia.
Desecuritization through Integration: A State Functionality Perspective

Adela Halo

The Conceptual Framework

The impetus for this workshop springs out of the application of securitization/desecuritization theory to the state of affairs in the Western Balkans. Securitization and desecuritization are two relatively recent terms in security studies, mainly associated with the Copenhagen school of thought in this area. Securitization refers to the process by which issues between two or more units, typically states leave the sphere of normal bargaining and escalate to the realm of emergency. Desecuritization, on the other hand, refers to the opposite process, by which relations between two units break from the typical dynamics of a security dilemma and normalize by entering a political and bargaining mode.

The fall of communism and the wars following the dissolution of Yugoslavia saw the securitization of relations between and within states in the Balkans in the political, economic, military, and social sectors. This has indeed been the nature of relations between states as well as between significant social groups within states in the Balkans for many years, where “the other” has been perceived as a threat to one’s own well-being or survival. Securitized relations can be clearly seen to be in effect at peak moments of security dilemmas between two units, where every single accumulation of power by one unit is perceived as an equal decline in the power of the other—in other words, a zero-sum game.
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The breakdown of order and stability in the region presented a threat to the stability of its immediate neighbours. Therefore, much international activity since has been concerned with stabilizing relations between and within states and communities in the region. The main desecuritizing actors in the Balkans after the initial U.S.-led military and peacekeeping operations have been the EU and NATO. Their approach (more pronounced in the case of the EU) has been that of holding out the conditional prospect of the benefits of the peace, stability, and prosperity that are to be gained through EU membership by committing the countries to reform their systems of governance and economy in line with democratic principles.

The project of EU integration is precisely a method of sustainable desecuritization. In order to prevent the re-emergence of the securitization dynamic between states that had led to the devastations of the First and Second World Wars, states progressively combined together in joint management and decision-making mechanisms in key sectors, such as coal and steel. The progressive expansion of areas of cooperation has now created an institutional architecture and a political culture that guarantees against the eruption of violence in the EU.

A similar logic drives the EU’s approach to the Western Balkans. Integration of the region in the EU will anchor the countries within a virtuous circle of democratic stability and development. The path towards EU membership passes through two key steps. The first is state-building towards the democratic model of governance that guarantees a system of checks and balances between the state’s different branches. The second is a process of regional reconciliation and cooperation through the establishment of dialogue and mechanisms that channel the resolution of disputes along regional institutional lines and consensus-building, and that serve to bring to each country a level of prosperity that they would not be able to achieve individually.

The process of state-building essentially demands the enhancement of state functionality, understood as the capacity of the state to provide basic political public goods for citizens such as free and fair elections, order and security, the rule of law, access to justice, etc. This part of the
EU’s conditional approach resembles the stance taken toward the Central and Eastern European states after the fall of communism. The demands on countries of the Western Balkans, however, are higher given the region’s particular condition as both post-communism and post-war. While in the case of the CEE countries, integration equalled democratization, in the case of the Western Balkans it involves desecuritization as well, or what is commonly referred to as stabilization. So, in the case of the Western Balkans, apart from requirements in terms of democratic governance and market economy, there are also key requirements in the areas of neighbourly relations and regional cooperation, inter- and intra-state reconciliation, cooperation with the ICTY, return of refugees, respect for ethnic and minority rights, etc.

The combination of enhancing state functionality and regional cooperation aims at establishing reliable mechanisms at a state and regional level that will hinder the perpetuation of securitization dynamics and the typical curtailment of democratic procedures, rights and standards by states to employ extraordinary measures to address securitized issues.

The workshop sought to untangle the interplay of recent security and integration processes with state functionality at the core of the analysis. Thus, analysis focused on the relationship between recent developments (Kosovo independence, NATO enlargement, EU-Western Balkans relations, regional and domestic integration, and the world economic and financial crisis) and the degree of state functionality of the respective state. The recommendations that resulted address the roles of the EU, NATO, and regional states in desecuritization/stabilization.

**The Regional State of Affairs**

The security landscape of the Western Balkans has been significantly altered by the emergence of the new state of Kosovo and the process of NATO enlargement, as well as developments related to the larger project of EU integration that is now underway in countries in the region.

*Kosovo:* The independence of Kosovo has fortunately not spurred the violence that was feared. All states of the region (except Serbia and
Bosnia and Herzegovina) have recognised Kosovo, and diplomatic relations have been established. However, Kosovo’s participation in regional activities is often strained if not boycotted by Serbia, which remains determined to oppose Kosovo’s independence and is using all diplomatic means to do so. Serbia has brought the issue of the legality of Kosovo’s independence to the International Court of Justice, which has started processing the case. In the meantime, parallel structures continue to operate in Kosovo, and the new state continues not to have control of all of its territory. The biggest concern and challenge remains the general weakness of the state, often exacerbated by a complex system of international and domestic lines of authority.

Management of the independence of Kosovo, and of its post-independence stage has put the EU to the test. While it is indeed the EU (through its EULEX mission) that has taken the lead in assisting stabilization and state-building in Kosovo, while also carrying a degree of executive powers, the Union has not wholly endorsed the emergence of the new state, as some of its member states have not recognised Kosovo. This divided stance on the status of Kosovo erodes the EU’s credibility and effectiveness in the state-building process. Overall, the series of competing sources of authority in Kosovo serves to create more disunity and ineffective governance than democratic consolidation.

**NATO’s Presence:** The effects of NATO’s presence in the region are mixed. As its military presence has progressively decreased, mainly due to the closing of the SFOR mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina, NATO has pursued other paths and employed various mechanisms to engage the region. In fact, even in Kosovo, where NATO continues to have an important military presence, forces have decreased to about 10,000 and they will progressively do so in the future. In Bosnia and Herzegovina, after the closing of the SFOR mission in 2004 and the hand-over to the EU-led EUFOR mission, NATO continues to play an important role through the NATO Sarajevo Headquarters as a supporter of the EU mission on issues of planning, logistics, and command, within the framework of the Berlin Plus package agreements that govern EU-NATO cooperation. The mandate of the current form of NATO presence in Bosnia, the NATO Sarajevo Headquarters, is to assist in the adoption and
implementation of defence reforms, helping Bosnia toward eventual NATO accession.

In April 2009, Albania and Croatia became NATO members with full rights. The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia was also meant to join the Alliance in this round, but its accession remains subject to the resolution of the name dispute with Greece. Montenegro has applied for and received NATO’s Membership Action Plan. Bosnia and Herzegovina has also applied, and continues to await an invitation to join MAP. Making this step sooner rather than later is important to sustain the credibility of the country’s Euro-Atlantic future, as well as to sustain the security investments that have been made over the past fifteen years.

Serbia has joined the Partnership for Peace, NATO’s program of practical bilateral relations that enables the establishment of tailored cooperation between an individual country and NATO. Though Serbia has thus far refrained from following the same membership path as its neighbours, cooperation with NATO has intensified, and the country is expected to soon open its mission in NATO. Apart from cooperation in defence and security, the formal basis of the PfP entails mutual commitments “to preserve democratic societies; to maintain the principles of international law; to fulfil obligations under the UN Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Helsinki Final Act and international disarmament and arms control agreements; to refrain from the threat or use of force against other states; to respect existing borders; and to settle disputes peacefully.” Such a basis for cooperation is not insignificant. On the contrary, the presence of political will and formal mechanisms to strengthen adherence to the same principles paves the way for sustainable peace and stability in the region.

EU Integration: Since the Thessaloniki Summit in 2003, which firmly established the Stabilization and Association process as the EU policy framework for the integration of the region into the Union, the EU has generally maintained in both rhetoric and action its commitment to the region’s future as part of the EU. Official statements during all of these
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years, the progress of the SAp in many countries, the continued provision of financial and technical assistance, visa facilitation and liberalization, as well as the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty have all served to reiterate that commitment.

All countries of the region have the prospect of EU integration, have the political will to pursue that objective and are intensively working towards it. However, they are all at different stages and different combinations of the various aspects of the process towards membership. Gaining a comparative view in assessing these countries’ progress is often difficult due to each country’s particular conditions and challenges.

Croatia is a candidate country, and accession negotiations have continued since 2005. In addition to the Copenhagen criteria that are applicable to all countries aspiring to EU membership, Croatia was also subject to the additional requirement of cooperation with the ICTY. It was in fact only after Croatia was found to be fully cooperating with the ICTY that Croatia’s integration process picked up pace. Accession negotiations were once more held back due to Croatia’s border dispute with Slovenia. After positive moves to resolve the dispute bilaterally, Croatia is now reaching the end of accession negotiations. In terms of visas, which are one of the main conditionality tools of the EU, Croatia still has no visa regime.\(^9\)

FYROM is also a candidate country, as of 2005, but accession negotiations are still to be opened. The three-year-long pending opening [Author: wouldn’t it be 5 years?] of accession negotiations, just FYROM’s process toward NATO membership, indicates how progress towards integration in Euro-Atlantic structures remains tied to the bilateral name dispute with Greece. The continued impasse on this issue threatens the sustainability of the progress FYROM has made thus far. In the meantime, FYROM has enjoyed visa liberalization for its citizens as of December 2009, providing some balance to the other deadlocks, which are unjustified in terms of FYROM’s preparedness.

\(^{9}\) The Republic of Croatia has long had special agreements with three neighboring Schengen states: Italy, Slovenia, and Hungary.
Albania’s SAA with the Union entered into force in April 2009, at the same time at which the country became a NATO member with full rights, together with Croatia. Albania applied for EU membership that same month, but it later failed to be included in the first wave of visa liberalization in the region. Missing this first round of liberalization created a spirit of competitiveness in the region, seeing Albania intensify its efforts to meet the Roadmap benchmarks in hopes of being granted liberalization in the course of 2010. Response to the membership application as well as progress in terms of visa liberalization risks being negatively affected by the political deadlock in the country since the elections of 28 June 2009. The conduct of elections was eventually assessed as meeting most international standards set by the OSCE, but the biggest opposition party, which won 66 out of 140 parliamentary seats, has contested the results. The opposition has, in fact, been maintaining a boycott of Parliament, stalling the progress of many key reforms.

Montenegro is also a potential candidate country that filed its application for membership in December 2008. After having filled out and handed in the extensive Commission’s Questionnaire, it still awaits a positive opinion on its application. Montenegro has also benefitted from visa liberalization since December 2009.

Serbia’s SAA with the Union has been signed following its positive moves towards cooperation with the ICTY, and the ratification process is expected to begin soon. Serbia has also been granted visa liberalization, has applied for membership, and awaits the Commission’s Questionnaire. Serbia has the potential to move rapidly toward EU integration, but its progress remains conditioned by full cooperation with the ICTY.

Bosnia and Herzegovina has also signed an SAA with the EU and is likely to file an application for membership soon. Bosnia and Herzegovina was not part of the first visa liberalization proposal, but is working to qualify for it in the course of 2010. The credibility of Bosnia’s EU future must be maintained through concrete steps.
Kosovo is a rather different case from its neighbours, due to its particular circumstances outlined above. The EU has reiterated its commitment to Kosovo’s future in the Union and has attempted to follow a multilayered approach to setting the country on the EU integration path, despite member states’ disagreements over Kosovo’s status. In fact, the visa dialogue has been opened with Kosovo as a step to bring Kosovo in with its neighbours towards the EU and to provide concrete incentives for progress.

Global Economic Crisis: The global economic and financial crisis is far from being a negligible factor in the region. The effects of the crisis began to be felt in the Western Balkans later than in other parts of the world. Economic downfall is a known factor in security concerns; thus, the region’s already precarious economic standing holds the potential of morphing into a security issue. The reallocation of resources that the crisis has imposed at the EU, NATO, and national level, its effects on the region’s trade volume, investment and domestic development are affecting the political sphere as well as the focus on state building. The effects of the world economic crisis in state functionality can no longer be ignored in the regional security and development analysis.

Conclusions

The only long-term, sustainable solution of desecuritization in the Western Balkans remains integration based on deep reforms that seek to strengthen democracy, rule of law and state functionality, and market economies. The EU’s conditionality approach—offering the prospect of membership (attractive to all countries of the region) as an incentive for necessary reforms—has often been accompanied by inconsistencies, however. For instance, the perception has remained that Romania and Bulgaria were “smuggled” into the EU, rather than gaining membership based on merit. Also, Croatia’s accession negotiations suffered because of a bilateral dispute with Slovenia, and FYROM’s accession negotiations continue to await resolution of the bilateral name dispute with Greece. Such cases may serve to hamper the effectiveness of the EU’s conditionality approach by highlighting the political considerations behind membership.
Another issue that weakens the EU’s ability to sustain transformative processes towards stable democracies and market economies is the management of financial assistance. Various aspects of assistance—amounts of aid, timeframes for projects, funding priorities, checks on implementation, sustainability and assistance conditions—do not correspond to needs and realities. Especially as the financial crisis hits the region, adequate funding in key development areas is needed. Very often, the duration of projects with ambitious aims (such as fighting corruption) is too short to realistically make an impact. Funding priorities sometimes do not correspond to pressing needs in the countries. In other cases, such as assistance for professional technical public administration, the funds used to raise capacities are not conditioned upon public administration stability.

Persisting low levels of local ownership hamper the progress of integration projects and democratization of the countries of the Western Balkans. Donor-driven agendas of civil society, assistance overlap and ineffectiveness, and low awareness of the benefits and responsibilities of meeting EU and/or NATO requirements for the countries and societies themselves continue to significant degrees despite steps to address them. The political use of “integration” as an excuse for purposes of domestic legitimacy certainly exacerbates the situation. Low levels of local ownership of the integration projects is a region-wide concern, evidencing itself clearly in the still low intensity of regional initiatives for cooperation in security, economic, transport, cultural, and other spheres. Very often, the rationale bringing regional representatives together is fulfilment of the EU’s requirement of “regional cooperation,” rather than the substantial exploration of cooperation avenues based on the tangible interests of each country, such as economic development and trade integration.
Recommendations

- The EU especially ought to take note of the perceptions of double standards in the region if it is to maintain the credibility, resonance, and effectiveness of its normative approach. The record of politically and security driven EU accession needs to be balanced by the practice of rewarding membership to nations in the region based on their merits. States’ progress towards integration should follow in practice the rhetoric of individual merits. Visa liberalization for Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well as the fast and concrete progress of the visa dialogue with Kosovo are crucial in that respect.
- EU assistance programs need to be more responsive to key needs on the ground.
- The risks that the global economic and financial crisis poses to stability and progress in the region needs to be taken into account in funding amounts and priorities.
- Management of financial assistance needs to be reformed in order to address current ineffectiveness, overlap, and lack of implementation controls and sustainability guarantees.
- State-building, stabilization, and association work in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Kosovo need to take note of the structural and systemic impact on democratic governance of the incoherent and competing international presence(s) in these countries.
- Countries of the region need to intensify cooperation and establish sustainable mechanisms and structures of regional political dialogue to drive a cooperation agenda based on issues of common interest and benefit, in particular transport and trade.
- All actors—the EU, NATO, governments, and civil societies—need to enhance their efforts to raise awareness of the situations that might predictably arise post-membership, so as to minimize the negative effects of unrealistic expectations.
Supporting Bosnia and Herzegovina: The Challenge of Reaching Self-Sustainability in a Post-War Environment

Predrag Jureković

Overview of the Peace- and State-building Process in Bosnia and Herzegovina

Progress has been lacking for more than three years in the peace-building process, since the Bosnian and Herzegovina (BiH) parliament failed in April 2006 to decide on a new constitution which would make “Dayton-Bosnia” a more viable state, with rational institutions compatible with future EU and NATO membership. As a consequence, BiH remains a dysfunctional state, with frequently blocked decision-making mechanisms, nationalistic rhetoric and policies, as well as a lack of cross-entity and cross-ethnic cooperation.

The “Prud Process” – a political dialogue started on the future of BiH in 2008 between the heads of the leading Serb, Bosniac and Croat parties – raised hope that a political culture of compromise could be developed in this post-war country and that the local actors in BiH could finally become the “owners” of their state as well as of the peace-building process.

Apart from the common decision in the parliament of BiH to amend the Dayton constitution by anchoring the status of the Brčko District, concrete political results are missing. The Prud Process itself has shown contradictory signals, being partly discredited by the anti-state and separatist rhetoric of its Serb member, Milorad Dodik, the Prime Minister of
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the Serb dominated entity, Republika Srpska (RS). Obviously clientelistic interests of the leading politicians in both entities, above all in the RS, prevent BiH from functioning as a “normal” state.

Further reforms in the security sector have been hindered as a consequence of continuing nationalistic rhetoric, despite having shown some successes in the past. This is primarily evident in the police sector, which is still subject to strong political influence and manipulation. In order to prevent BiH from becoming a failed state, which could again become a considerable security risk inside Europe; effective measures supported by the international actors present in BiH are necessary in all fields of reform.

The appointment in March of this year of a new High Representative (HR) and EU Special Representative (EUSR) for BiH, the Austrian diplomat Valentin Inzko, could be used as a catalyst for a more pro-active international policy towards BiH. On the other hand the time available for inducing such a policy is short; bearing in mind that the 2010 parliamentary elections will forestall any constructive way out of BiH's bleak situation, causing it to fall behind the other countries in the region as far as integration in Euro-Atlantic organizations is concerned.

**Recommendations on the Political Development**

The leading politicians in BiH seem neither willing nor able to achieve agreement on a proper constitutional framework for this country, which – beside other factors – is a precondition for peaceful interethnic relations and normally functioning state institutions. What is needed is a new *contrat social* which enables civil society to contribute more than it has so far to positive changes.

Concretely, a constitutional task force could be established by the HR/EUSR, comprised of delegates of political parties, legal experts, and civil society representatives. Input from civil society groups would reduce the danger of political manipulation in vital fields and could ensure that reforms really meet the interests of the citizens of BiH. Extended involvement of civil society groups from different parts of BiH in rele-
vant reform processes could enhance solidarity between the different ethnic groups. This would be helpful for delegitimizing nationalistic politics in BiH. As a consequence a genuine truth and reconciliation process could begin.

The initiative for an action plan for BiH has to be launched by the HR/EUSR. His role as a protectorate power with far reaching competencies – the so-called Bonn Powers – was terminated *de facto* during Christian Schwarz Schilling’s mandate.\(^\text{11}\) What remains is the necessity for the HR/EUSR to act as a driving force in the state- and peace-building process.

This demands a substantial mandate for the future EUSR and close cooperation between the EU and the U.S. government as the most influential international actors in BiH.

There should be a strong single leader for international assistance and influence in BiH. This has to be the HR/EUSR. All international partners need to agree not to pull in different directions and give contradictory signals. Otherwise the local politicians will take full advantage of such situations and play international actors off against each other.

An action plan for BiH, aside from the constitutional task force mentioned, should include the launching of a broad task force responsible for the social and economic challenges that BiH faces. It should change the partly discriminatory electoral law to guarantee equality of citizens regardless of where they live and which ethnic group they belong to in BiH, as well as push for youth programmes. The latter is closely connected to visa liberalisation.

\(^{11}\) Although formally still in force, the Bonn Powers are not used anymore by the High Representative as an instrument for influencing the peace- and state-building process in BiH. They are regarded as a “last ditch means” to prevent political radicalization, as demonstrated by the decision by High Representative Valentin Inzko in June 2009 against a declaration of the parliament of the Republika Srpska which was considered as “anti-Dayton”.
BiH’s progress towards EU accession needs to be assessed based on the implementation of effective measures, not promises, treaties, laws or agreements, as the politicians in BiH have demonstrated a willingness to delay concrete progress through such means. Otherwise EU credibility will drop even lower and future progress will be even slower.

**Recommendations on the Economic Development**

In BiH the interplay of a criminalised economy, a weak state, informal security networks and ethno-nationalistic political elites produces a vicious circle. Corruption represents a huge obstacle for economic recovery. The privatisation process is not transparent; companies directly linked to the political sphere are privileged.

In order to break this vicious circle the international actors have to change their strategy towards corrupt politicians in BiH. So far, documented corruption was used by the international actors to put political pressure on them to be more constructive in the peace- and state-building process. This strategy has not proven successful. Instead, the strengthening of law enforcement agencies is imperative in order to prosecute criminal politicians in BiH for their illegal activities. Bringing criminal politicians from BiH to trial could increase the chances to normalize political relations in this post-war country. Nationalistic mobilization would probably lose its usefulness in securing special zones of interest and maintaining clientelistic relations.

**Recommendations regarding Regional Factors of Influence**

Croatia and Serbia substantially influence ethnic Croat and Serb politicians in BiH. The EU, the US government and NATO should use their influence on the governments in Zagreb and Belgrade to gain their support for the peace-building process in BiH. The EU especially could promote constructive policies of neighbouring countries (above all of Serbia) towards BiH by making them a core condition for future membership. Due to the fact that the successor of the Stability Pact for South
East Europe, the Regional Cooperation Council, is situated in Sarajevo, the position of BiH as a centre for regional cooperation should be promoted more effectively.

**Recommendations on Defence Reform**\(^{12}\)

Generally, defence reform in BiH can be regarded a success. NATO’s support for this reform, the setting of clear, non-negotiable standards, as well as the prospect of future membership in the Alliance has contributed significantly to the formation of a single armed force out of the three previously antagonistic armies. However, some important tasks remain:

- The acceptance of BiH’s application to NATO’s Membership Action Plan (MAP) by the end of this year would be an additional reward for the successful implementation of reforms. It could also be an important signal for some nationalistic BiH political leaders that the process of state-building is irreversible. BiH’s entering into the MAP process would probably silence those politicians who demand the dissolution of the Armed Forces of BiH (AFBiH).
- NATO must support the MoD in rearranging a very negative budgetary distribution. At present, personnel costs approach 84% of the total defence budget. Almost no money remains for the modernization, appropriate education and training of the AFBiH. Furthermore, a strengthening of the NATO Trust Fund to support BiH seems to be appropriate, bearing in mind the forthcoming demobilization of 2,400 AFBiH officials who will reach their age limit next year.
- Increasing pressure on local politicians to adopt the law on fixed and mobile arms property would enable the AFBiH to reduce the financial and human resources which are presently needed for securing surplus weapons and storage locations.
- Recognizing NATO’s important role in the defence reform process, it seems reasonable to induce AFBiH cooperation with the European Security and Defence Policy as well. This could send a very positive

---

\(^{12}\) With special contribution of Mr. Denis Hadžović, Secretary General of the Sarajevo-based Centre for Security Studies.
signal to the BiH public that the defence reform is doubly contributing – to NATO and to EU integration.

- Joint Armed Forces in BiH require a joint system of military education.
- In strengthening the state’s role in the field of higher education there is a greater chance for an *esprit de corps* to develop within the AFBiH. Combined AFBiH operations abroad with the UN, EU or NATO could also gain efficiency.

**Recommendations on Police Reform**

Constitutional reform is urgent to promote, in sense of the EU integration, further police reform; the current system is dysfunctional and allows small minorities to block effective reforms, including those suggested below.

State police institutions that are dealing with border control, and fighting organized crime and terrorism, must be strengthened. Compared to the entity police forces, who offer better conditions for officials, they are disadvantaged. The state police institutions need more staff, better equipment and adequate training. The existing structure needs better legal regulation, as some of the tasks and authorities overlap and is not clearly defined in the current regulations.

Threat assessments of Organised Crime and Corruption (OCC) in BiH are characterized by huge information gaps that result from political influence on police and prosecutors. No ministry or agency at present has the capacity to formulate an accurate OCC threat assessment for BiH. To improve the situation:

- Properly defined lines of responsibility and accountability between the Ministry of Security and police agencies are required and new OCC strategies with action plans need to be implemented.
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The State Investigation and Protection Agency (SIPA) needs improved capacity to deal with OCC cases where high level corruption is suspected; the SIPA (especially those individuals who resist political interference) needs strong and visible international political support. Outreach is required to combat the potent voice of the political parties in the local media in this regard. The citizens put great stock in media reporting and some balance needs to be restored.

- Financial independence of the police agencies would limit political (corrupt) interference into operational matters.
- The state-level law enforcement agencies need to be strengthened and brought to full capacity by providing adequate budgets.
- Professional functioning of chains of command should be encouraged (through outreach for public accountability), and ethnic bypassing of the chain discouraged.
- Reform of the appointment process to eliminate politically motivated appointments, as well as the huge conflicts of interest they promote, is required.
- Laws on the seizure of criminally gained assets need to be strengthened, to include placing some of the burden of proof on the defence, and making an assets investigation a requirement in all OCC cases.
- OCC corruption investigation teams need more training and mentoring by collocated international experts, in particular for non-executive personnel such as prosecutors, financial investigators and intelligence analysts.
- Strong international pressure is needed to unblock the establishment of police reform bodies, in particular the appointment of the Independent Board, currently held hostage to political manoeuvring since a new law was passed in 2008.

Recommendations on Religious Radicalism

BiH's weakness as a state maintains and partly extends the influence of radical religious representatives and groups that interfere in the political sphere. This interference must be curbed. Curbing undue influence by radical religious groups will be accomplished by improving BiH’s “state functionality,” i.e. fighting criminal politicians, strengthening tolerant
civil society groups, inducing positive economic development and aligning with the EU.

**Recommendations on the Media and the Educational System as Important Factors in the Process of Peace Building**

The media play a significant role in the BiH peace process. They can either contribute to a relaxation of inter-state relations or can be used by nationalistic politicians for negative purposes. Shortly after the Dayton Accord, international actors paid close attention to media development, but this important sector has been neglected since the removal of the most nationalistic politicians from the political scene. About 75% of Bosnia’s media depend on financial support from state or entity institutions. This dependency causes most journalists to self-censor, especially in the Serb-dominated entity, where huge pressure is exerted on the media. Western donors should once again be more active in supporting independent media in BiH. Unprofessional media reporting has led to apathy about the criminal activities of local politicians.

The role of education in the peace-building process in BiH has been generally underestimated by international actors. Various curricula present in the educational sector, as well as nationalistic political interference, hamper initiatives for educational cooperation inside BiH.

Conceptualizing a strategy of “brain gain” instead of accepting a situation of “brain drain” is of high importance. Educational institutions that contribute to the formation of new elites who strive for interethnic tolerance and cooperation need much more support. Examples for this are the human rights centres that have been established at universities in Sarajevo, Banja Luka and Mostar.

Projects for primary and secondary education supported by the EU Commission and targeting a common approach to history should be extended to the field of higher education. In the course of approaching the EU in BiH, educational policies aiming to solidify ethnic division should be resisted as far as possible or new generations will not be able to de-
fine a common vision for their future. Moreover, internal reforms should enable young people to gain new experience abroad in order to overcome isolation.
Serbia – Stepping into Calmer or Rougher Waters? Internal Processes, Regional Implications

Djordje Popović

Evaluation of the Political Situation in Serbia

The May 2008 elections in Serbia showed that the majority of the voters opted for European integration. However, difficulties in forming the government in the period after the elections proved that Serbian society is still highly divided. The polarization between pro-Europeans and traditionalists became so intense that it provided a coalition potential to Milosevic’s Socialist Party of Serbia that even they did not expect. After an exhausting period of negotiations the Socialists decided to join the pro-European bloc, for the time-being.

A result of the electoral loss was the dissolution of the Serbian Radical Party, the leading traditionalist force in Serbia. The Radicals, who always came close to power but never, close enough, finally started to show first signs of defeat. They were not only defeated in the elections, they were defeated in depth. The leading members left the party and formed a new one. This was definitely a strong blow to the Radicals and the real impact of this separation will be seen at the next elections. Neither of the two parties will be able to gather such support as they did in the past. In view of the changes in Serbian politics it can be said with great confidence that a renunciation of EU integration is impossible in Serbia today. Although it has seemed that Serbia is closer to Russia than
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to the EU and that it tries to balance between these two powers, the pol-
icy of keeping one leg in the West and one in the East will not be tenable
in the long term. Consensus to join the EU seems to exist among the
political elite in Serbia, but with NATO accession it is quite the oppo-
site. Although the Serbian government has approved a security agree-
ment for the interchange of information with NATO, the majority citi-
zens are reluctant to join NATO.

Southern Serbia is a flashpoint. The tensions in southern Serbia between
the Albanian majority and the Serbian security apparatus could escalate
if the situation in northern Kosovo goes in the direction of secession.
Another possible crisis area is Sandžak. The ongoing conflict between
the Bosniaks has shown some violent forms. The reasons for the conflict
can not be easily determined as well as the role of the Serbian govern-
ment in it.

Regional Implications

Since the stability, security and prosperity of Serbia impacts the entire
region, all the countries of the Western Balkans closely follow the politi-
cal situation in Serbia and its implications.

Political developments in Serbia greatly influence the political scene in
Bosnia and Herzegovina, especially the Republika Srpska. This influence
can mostly be seen in the debate concerning constitutional changes.
Presently there is no political agreement on the alteration of the Consti-
tution [Note: a preliminary agreement on several key issues was con-
cluded among three major parties in Nov. 2008.]. The relations between
these two countries are also burdened by the ongoing cooperation with
the ICTY. The proclamation of Kosovo independence created tensions in
Republika Srpska, and although the situation is presently calm, it could
still be a source of conflict. Bosnian troops take part in mine disposal
operations in southern Iraq, benefiting Bosnian defence and foreign pol-
icy.

The relations between Serbia and Croatia are normalizing. The Croatian
public is very interested in what is happening in Serbia. Besides the well
known problem with the Serbian minority, Croatian recognition of Kosovo delayed the full normalization of relations. On the other hand, economic cooperation is getting stronger and the Croatian government formally supports Serbia’s accession to the EU and NATO. The biggest worry for Croatia today is the problem with the Lisbon Treaty and its possible repercussions on Croatian accession to the EU. Croatia, officially first in line for joining, is worried about a possible delay of EU enlargement.

Relations between Montenegro and Serbia are unique because they were in the same country longer than with any other former Yugoslav countries and they separated peacefully. The stronger part of the Montenegrin opposition consists of pro-Serbian parties. Therefore the expected recognition of Kosovo will be the most difficult moment for relations between Serbia and Montenegro.

One of the strongest implications of the Kosovo independence was felt in Macedonia. Along with the name dispute with Greece, the expected recognition of Kosovo is one of the main sources of tension in Macedonian political life. Macedonian progress depends on how fast it can join NATO and the EU. Delays in the accession, especially to NATO, increase the probability of a crisis between the ethnic Macedonians and ethnic Albanians. There remains no solution for the name dispute which is the only obstacle to Macedonian accession to NATO. Both parties in the dispute are firmly abiding by their positions. It is noteworthy that the majority of Macedonian citizens are against changing the name of the country regardless of the impact on Macedonia’s joining NATO. Another possible point of crisis is the dispute between the Albanian political parties in Macedonia. This dispute already created violent conflicts during the last elections.

The relations between Serbia and Albania are on a low intensity level. Albania officially considers Kosovo a new reality in the Balkans and a new state. The Albanian factor in the region has fundamental importance. Therefore, Albania’s and Croatia’s accession to NATO will become a stability factor in the Western Balkans. However, Albania is still
not a completely stable country and its economy especially needs larger scale development.

**The Role of Euro-Atlantic Institutions**

Since 2001 NATO has had other priorities, but the Balkans are still on the agenda. NATO’s primary focus in the region is Kosovo and the Alliance is pleased with developments there. NATO cooperation with Serbian armed forces was very good until NATO took a role in training the future Kosovo armed forces. After that Serbian military limited its cooperation with NATO to the minimum. The biggest challenges for NATO in Kosovo include its relationship to the EULEX mission, the dissolution of the Kosovo Protection Corps and creation of the Kosovo Security Force, and providing security for all citizens. From the NATO standpoint, all countries are in the Partnership for Peace and there is significant progress in their defence reform. Albania and Croatia will join the Alliance at the next summit, but Macedonia remains a challenge, especially because of its name dispute with Greece, a member country of NATO.

The EU presidency takes the whole region into consideration, not individual countries. During the French presidency the Kosovo issue will dominate the region. It’s the strong belief of the EU presidency that dialogue should be promoted between the United Nations Mission in Kosovo and the Serbian government. One of the main goals of the presidency is to strongly support the EULEX mission, as well as political and economic development in Kosovo.

Although the failure of the Lisbon Treaty and the recognition of Kosovo complicate internal relations within the EU, Serbia is encouraged to pursue its European rapprochement. Therefore, the European Commission will present the enlargement package in November 2008.
Recommendations to the EU

- The EU should hasten the integration process and give candidate status to all the countries of the Western Balkans as soon as possible so that they can move to technical issues.
- The failure of the Lisbon Treaty should not be allowed to endanger the integration process of the Western Balkans countries.
- There should be a targeted relaxation of the visa regime with all the countries of the Western Balkans.
- Measures should be taken to enhance trilateral confidence building, especially between the Serbs, Croats and Bosniaks in Bosnia and Herzegovina.
- The EULEX mission should be deployed in the territory of Kosovo as a whole and its deployment should be balanced with dialogue between the Serbs and the Albanians.
- The EU should help with the Macedonian name dispute since this dispute is a matter for the Common Foreign and Security Policy of the EU.
- The EU should encourage more regional cooperation between the countries of the Western Balkans through its policy of conditionality.

Recommendations to NATO

- NATO should keep its military presence in the Western Balkans region until all the countries of the region become members of the Alliance.
- NATO should enhance regional cooperation through the instruments of Partnership for Peace.
- NATO should create viable Membership Action Plans for all the countries of the Western Balkans region.
Cutting or Tightening the Gordian Knot? The Future of Kosovo and the Peace Process in the Western Balkans after the Decision on Independence

Predrag Jureković

General Estimation of the Post-status Development

The post-February development has neither led to cutting nor to tightening of the Gordian knot around Kosovo. It was clear for anyone involved in the Balkan peace processes that Kosovo’s declaration of independence, its recognition by the US government, most of the EU countries and by other UN members will not resolve immediately all the problems in this part of the region.

However, pessimists who feared that the whole region may fall again into chaos have not proved to be true and there are no signals that this will happen. The clarification of the status of Kosovo allowed Serb-Albanian relations to enter a new phase of conflict transformation with the opportunity to improve but also to additionally worsen these relations.

The four key issues to address for moving forward in a positive direction are:

1. Finding a practicable arrangement for the international presence in the post-status period which will prevent “rivalry” between UN and EU presence in Kosovo;
2. Finding ways to build confidence between Belgrade and Prishtina despite the political and “emotional” gaps in the Serb-Albanian re-

---

lations as well as between the Kosovo institutions and the Kosovo Serbs;
3. Preventing negative effects of the Kosovo status issue for regional stability, especially in regard to the sensitive interethnic relations in southern Serbia, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYROM) and Bosnia-Herzegovina; and
4. Optimizing the influence of the Euro-Atlantic institutions for supporting proactive policies in regard to peace-building.

Concerning the International Presence in Kosovo

As it was expected, mid June brought no clear cut and official handing over from UNMIK to EULEX and to the International Civilian Office (ICO). Most probably some elements of UNMIK will continue to exist alongside the new EU presence for a while. A negative consequence of that could be that frustration on the Kosovo Albanian side will increase with possible negative repercussions on the security situation. In order to avoid a radicalization on the Kosovo-Albanian side on the issue of international presence new attempts to achieve Russia’s and China’s consent for EULEX in the Security Council should be made. Russia seems to be in favour of Serbia’s membership in EU and would not advocate Serbian self-isolation. This circumstance could perhaps open a window of opportunity to reconcile the western and the Russian policy towards Kosovo – at least as far as the international presence there is concerned.

Measures for Building Confidence between Serbs and Albanians

The appointment of a mainly pro-European government in Belgrade in July was generally regarded as a precondition for achieving some progress in the Serb-Albanian relations and to open communication channels. Despite of the better political circumstances in Serbia, building confidence between the two sides will be a laborious and long lasting process. The Serb government will not recognize Kosovo’s independence. Direct contacts of Serb officials with representatives of the Kosovo institutions – even in a multilateral forum – are not very probable in the
foreseeable future. As a consequence of that also the Serb population in Kosovo will continue to avoid contacts with the Albanian majority and especially with the Kosovo institutions. In a short term there are just small possibilities to reduce the strong ethnic division in the Mitrovica area. Nevertheless there is a chance that Belgrade could “soften” its rhetoric on Kosovo and establish contacts with the reconfigured international civilian presence there (including EULEX), due to the Serb governments’ priority goal to move forward in the process of European integration and its more proactive policy regarding the improvement of living conditions for their co-nationals in Kosovo. Evidence of this pragmatism can be seen in the apprehension of long-time war crimes suspect Radovan Karadžić, and his extradition to The Hague in late July 2008.

A Serbian move towards a more “pragmatic” policy on Kosovo could create space for using informal ways to increase confidence between Belgrade and Prishtina as well as between the Kosovo authorities and those Kosovo Serbs, who live south of the river Ibar. A precondition for such a positive development is to find areas of common interest, which are not directly linked to the status issue.

A first important step to start with confidence-building in the Belgrade-Prishtina relations would be to exchange information – via channels of international mediators and NGOs – on missing war persons and to support the other side in investigating these cases. Both sides have hundreds of such cases, which prevent the finally closing of the war period. With regard to Serb-Albanian relations in Kosovo itself the initiative for building confidence must be taken by the Albanian majority. In order to address the Kosovo Serb tendency for self-isolation the dominantly ethnic-Albanian government of Kosovo should develop a proactive policy, which should follow the guideline of “positive discrimination.” Such a policy should include the rise of awareness for the human security needs of the Kosovo Serbs on the side of Kosovo authorities, above all in the police sector. Another measure that could contribute to a change of perception of the Albanian majority would be the Kosovo government's support for the return of Serbs as employees and workers in the public firms. The possibly less complicated way to achieve improvements in interethnic relations – especially as far as young people are concerned –
is to initiate joint educational programmes with international support and supervision.

The Macedonian experience has shown that such educational programmes are highly accepted by the youngsters of the different ethnic groups, if the courses are held in a politically and ethnically “neutral” tongue, such as English. Such initiatives would be very welcome by the EU Commission that has received credit in South East Europe for having strengthened local capacity in the field of education and having supported successfully intercultural projects. In Kosovo, the international side, compared to Bosnia and Herzegovina, has been less engaged in identifying and supporting moderate individuals and groups from civil society initiatives, NGOs or political platforms that could be driving forces for enhancing inter-ethnic confidence. Without fulfilling this precondition “confidence-building” remains an empty shell.

**Regional Implications**

The Kosovo situation influences the stability in the neighbourhood, especially in Bosnia and Herzegovina, FYROM and southern Serbia, but so far these implications are not so dramatic regarding their extent as some pessimists forecast. In the Serb dominated entity in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Republika Srpska, politicians who are involved in massive corruption, use the fear that the Kosovo situation could destabilize Bosnia and Herzegovina as a kind of shield. The international support for establishing functioning state structures in Bosnia and Herzegovina therefore should concentrate on building transparent economic structures. This would embarrass corrupt politicians in their society and would diminish their opportunities to manipulate political issues that are of importance for regional stability.

So far the status or post-status process in Kosovo has not influenced negatively the security situation in FYROM. Macedonian and ethnic-Albanian politicians reached a consensus to recognize Kosovo when the border issues will be resolved. In order to secure a common policy of Macedonian and ethnic-Albanian politicians in FYROM regarding relevant foreign issues, a faster integration of FYROM into the Euro-
Atlantic institutions would be helpful. With regard to the problems connected with the integration of FYROM into NATO this would demand a more active role of the NATO partners to persuade also the Greek side of being more flexible in achieving a compromise with the Macedonian government in the name dispute.

A spill over from Kosovo could affect more seriously southern Serbia, although the present security situation can be described as relatively calm. Some of the leading local Albanian politicians openly show their mistrust in the central government in Belgrade and draw a parallel between their political demands and the political situation in the Serb dominated northern part of Kosovo. The international actors that are involved in the processes of peace building in the region should influence the new government in Belgrade to correct the mistakes of Koštunica's government towards the Albanians in southern Serbia. This means for Belgrade to dissociate from plans to (re-)militarize southern Serbia and instead of that to take much more care of programmes stemming from the Djindjić period (2000-2003), which aimed at improving the economic situation in this underdeveloped area. In southern Serbia like in Bosnia and Herzegovina and in the other multiethnic areas of the Western Balkans, reconciliation is very much linked to economic development. More donor engagement from the international side would be necessary in this field.

The Role of the Euro-Atlantic Institutions

Despite Serbia’s position on Kosovo, which contradicts that of the majority of EU and NATO member states that recognized Kosovo’s independence the EU is rightly following the course to continue with the association process. On the other hand, EU’s flexible and open minded policy towards Serbia – as far as Serbia’s efforts to integrate into the EU are concerned – may not lead to watering down the principle of regional co-operation.

So far this has been an important condition that all the Western Balkan candidate countries have to meet, in order to approach EU membership. The EU should stick to this important principle. This means for the Ser-
bian government that it has to find ways to communicate with the Kosovo representatives in regional forums by keeping at the same time its right to have a negative position towards Kosovo’s independence.

Regarding the goal to improve Serb-Albanian relations NATO’s influence on the Albanian side is certainly much bigger than in case of Serbs. This is valid in particular for Kosovo’s security sector. The NATO guided creation of the Kosovo Security Forces should have as a priority their ability to co-operate in a regional and international framework. Symbols and traditions, which could enhance fear on the side of Kosovo-Serbs, should be avoided.
Integrating the Western Balkans into NATO and the EU: Challenges, Expectations and Needs”  

Karin Grimm

Introduction

The enlargement of the European Union (EU) and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) are seen as beneficial both by bringing stability and security and introducing democratic and economic reforms. Both organisations have supported the Western Balkan countries in their respective processes of post-authoritarian democratisation, transition to market economies, and of post-conflict reconstruction. The enlargement perspective has played and continues to play a crucial role in the regional stabilisation and pacification processes.

Progress achieved by aspirant countries from South East Europe since the end of the violent conflicts is generally seen as considerable. However, the recently published EU Commission Progress Reports 2007 give an ambiguous picture: the reform processes are steady but uneven and in many areas the progress made is judged not satisfactory. In general, problems of ethnic intolerance, organised crime and widespread corruption, coupled with general underdevelopment and limited capacity, continue to hamper the reform processes in the Western Balkans.

18 Karin Grimm is Project Officer, Special Programmes, at the Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces. Valuable comments and inputs have been provided by Darko Stancić, Ernst M. Felberbauer, Predrag Jureković and Gregor Zore.
It is therefore a timely moment to look at the integration processes and challenges, expectations and needs involved. This paper offers a tour d’horizon of political, social, economic and military/security aspects of the Western Balkan countries’ integration into NATO and the EU. Although this paper looks at integration of the aspirant countries en bloc – the Western Balkan countries - the generalisation is limited as the transition and reform processes in each country follow their own paths at their own pace.

In November 2007, the state of integration of the Western Balkan region stands as follows: Subsequent to NATO’s Riga Summit in November 2006, NATO has integrated all countries from the Western Balkans into its Partnership for Peace (PfP) programme. The three Adriatic Charter countries (Albania, Croatia, and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia) are in the alliance’s Membership Action Plan (MAP) with prospects of possible accession in 2008. Croatia and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia have candidate status for EU membership. These two countries as well as Albania and Montenegro have signed respective Stabilisation and Association Agreements (SAA) with the EU. The EU Commission’s announced goal is to have concluded SAAs also with the remaining two Western Balkan countries (Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia) during 2008. With both countries, SAAs have already been initialled, but signing is likely to be dependent on their performance of the EU’s conditions. For Bosnia and Herzegovina, these include, among others, the implementation of police reform. For Serbia, the main stumbling block remains its cooperation with the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia. Furthermore, according to a recent statement by Serbia’s Prime Minister Koštunica, an “illegal EU-mission to Kosovo” could also block Serbia’s signature of the SAA.

The aspirant countries are facing various challenges related to the triple transition processes they are going through. However, these reform and modernisation processes are uneven and the EU’s and NATO’s approach

---

20 Based on the EU Commission’s Progress Reports 2007, integration of any Western Balkan country into the EU before 2012 is unlikely, except in the case of Croatia which might get full membership by 2010.
of setting benchmarks and conditions bilaterally with individual aspirants has created some tensions and asymmetries among them.

**General Overview on Political, Social, Economic and Security Aspects of Euro-Atlantic Integration**

Against the background of the region’s recent history of bloody violence characterised by ethnic hatred and nationalism, integration into Euro-Atlantic organisations is of crucial importance – for the region’s stabilisation and development, but also for the Euro-Atlantic community. On the one hand, the EU and NATO have invested considerable resources into the region and keep reaffirming their respective commitments to enlargement. On the other hand, non-integration would entail significant negative political, economic and psychological implications for the countries concerned and a negative impact on European security.

The Western Balkan countries are well on their way to becoming members of the EU and NATO, in spite of occasional temporary setbacks. This dual integration is considered necessary in order to reduce perceived fears and security dilemmas. Although alternatives have been put on the table (such as a more Russia-oriented position, a non-alignment policy or political Islam), they are clearly not viable on the long run, even if parts of the political elite in some countries will put them forward as a tactical move in internal politics. The commitment of all the countries in the region to the overall strategic goal of Euro-Atlantic integration will prevail over time, considering the irresistible “pull-factor” of the EU and NATO, and of the Western values and prosperity they represent.

**The Role of Public Opinion and Civil Society**

So far, the role of Western Balkan civil societies and NGOs in the political debate on Euro-Atlantic integration has been minimal. Their activity regarding political affairs in general is rather weak and particularly so in the security domain. Apart from the legacy of life under past authoritarian regimes, this situation is partly due to the difficult economic situation in which many people have found themselves over the past years – their
focus is on their own daily struggle rather than on the grand international picture. Furthermore, the little debate on Euro-Atlantic integration that is taking place is often characterised by stereotyping.

Despite negative perceptions (such as seeing NATO as an “aggressive military organisation”) by some NGOs, public opinion favourable to integration into NATO and the EU seems to prevail in the Western Balkan countries. Not unusual, public opinion polls tend to fluctuate in accordance with individual events: downwards after the bombing of Milosevic’s Yugoslavia in 1999, upwards after the signing of Stabilisation and Association Agreements and Partnership for Peace Agreements. In countries where the political elite is unanimously in favour of integration, the upward trend in the public opinion polls is particularly visible. However, this is less so in Montenegro and Serbia – countries in which the political elites are divided. In Bosnia and Herzegovina, the level of public approval is significantly different for integration into NATO compared to integration into the EU. As is the case of other Western Balkan countries, public opinion is more comfortable with the idea of EU integration than integration into NATO.

The Danger of Authoritarian and Nationalistic Setbacks

The Euro-Atlantic integration process has positively influenced democratic developments in the Western Balkan countries and further reduced the risk of regression to authoritarian rule. At present, democratic governments are in power in all Western Balkan countries. However, this does not exclude the possibility of internal political tensions and disputes, in fact, such occurrences are not infrequent. A possible worst case scenario could include the establishment of paternal rule within the limits of democratic rule. Other possible scenarios point at the risk of different forms of authoritarianisms in which the ruling group exercises power through economic mechanisms such as state monopolies, by control over the financial sector and/or through the control of the media. Extremist groups and organised crime may constitute additional threats to democratic developments in the region.
Endogenous Obstacles to Reform

As observed in other post-conflict countries, an ideological fight between traditionalism versus modernism is taking place among the elites in Western Balkan post-conflict societies, maybe most visibly in Serbia. This internal political struggle, characterised also by tactical manoeuvring by local politicians, makes it difficult to clearly identify common national priorities and interests (such as Euro-Atlantic integration) and transform them into coherent foreign and security policies. Moreover, local leadership often lacks expertise in issues related to Euro-Atlantic integration.

False Expectations and Prejudices

Polls indicate general misunderstandings and prejudices regarding the costs and benefits of EU and NATO membership within the population. The mismatch between self-perception and current geo-strategic realities can furthermore aggravate prejudices. High and partly unrealistic expectations towards the EU dominate public opinion, such as that integration into the EU would solve all political and economic problems of the region immediately. The profit-oriented (which means down to earth) business community in the Western Balkan countries could play a role in reducing prejudices and bringing expectations back to realistic proportions.

Economic Aspects

Modernisation of the Western Balkan countries’ economies and their competitiveness are key issues in the accession process to the EU (and NATO). Their participation in this process helps to establish a favourable environment for economic growth. A greater general sense of security and stability of the region that results from this rapprochements is something that should, for example, attract more foreign direct investment.
EU Instruments

Making EU funds accessible to Western Balkan countries sends out an affirmative signal and helps to create positive perception in the countries about the Union. The EU has a number of instruments at its disposal to financially and technically support Western Balkan countries on their way to integration. From 2000-2006 CARDS was the main pre-accession financial instrument for the Western Balkan countries in the framework of the Stabilisation and Association Process (SAP). Starting from 1 January 2007, IPA (Instrument for Pre-accession Assistance) replaced the various already existing pre-accession financial instruments including CARDS and PHARE. The Western Balkan countries with candidate status (Croatia, FYROM) and potential candidate status (Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, Serbia) will benefit from this new instrument.

NATO

Membership in NATO is generally perceived to bring greater benefits than costs, with the exception of Serbia and the young state of Montenegro where there is some public concern about the costs associated with sending troops abroad. However, it seems that the general public is uninformed about the cost-benefit ratio of NATO membership, e.g. the cost for updating the defence system to meet NATO standards versus the real and psychological benefits of higher perceived security. Aspirant countries also attach a tactical benefit to NATO membership, it being seen as stepping stone for EU membership. Other advantages that come with membership include reduced security concerns, lower defence costs as compared to individual national defence, gaining support to modernisation of the armed forces, and the positive signal NATO membership sends to foreign investors. Countries participating in the Partnership for

IPA consists of five components: 1) the transition assistance and institution building (which principally involves institution building measures with accompanying investment); 2) cross-border cooperation; 3) regional development; 4) human resources development; and 5) rural development.
Peace programme can profit from PfP instruments like PAP-DIB\textsuperscript{22}, promoting more efficient use of their resources.

**The Western Balkans’ Competitive Economic Edge**

In view of the Western Balkan countries prospects of Euro-Atlantic integration, how competitive are their economies? Will they be capable of coping with competitive pressure within the European Union? At this point in time, it is still difficult to identify the Western Balkan economies’ competitive edge as the respective competitive potentials are generally low. Market reforms undertaken due to the EU accession process have restructured the economies to a considerable degree. The privatisation of a large number of state-owned enterprises is a good indicator. However, these reforms are looked at with some concern as negative consequences on employment and social security are feared, in fact experienced.

**Security Sector Aspects**

The Western Balkan region appears to have matured enough to deal with bilateral issues (including border demarcation) on its own. While there seem to be no external threats to security of the countries in the region, the unresolved status of Kosovo is nevertheless perceived as the primary imminent security threat in the region. In this context, there is still a certain level of risk of local outbursts of violence, even armed clashes.

**The Impact of the Kosovo Status Issue**

There is no alternative to moving forward with the redefinition of the status of Kosovo. The impact of the resolution of the question of Kosovo’s status may vary in the short and in the longer term.

In the short run, possible repercussions in Serbia may be activities of extreme right-wing groups and a trend towards nationalism. Furthermore, sporadic violence is possible in Kosovo and southern Serbia, but

\begin{footnote}
\textsuperscript{22} Partnership Action Plan - Defence Institution Building (PAP-DIB).
\end{footnote}
serious violent outbursts are unlikely elsewhere in the region. While these threats to security may be limited due to Euro-Atlantic presence in the region, potentially destabilising political repercussions across the region are not impossible. In the longer run, there is the risk of a deteriorating internal situation in Kosovo due to the enormous economic, social and governance challenges. Such development could seriously threaten regional stability.

**EU/NATO and Security Sector Reform: Division of Labour or Burden Sharing**

The Euro-Atlantic institutions have been playing a key role in bringing forward security sector reform (SSR) in the region since the end of the Yugoslav wars in the 1990s. They have developed a number of tools to provide assistance to SSR: while NATO mainly engages in defence reform, the EU is active in reforming the justice and home affairs sector. Both EU and NATO maintain sizable peacekeeping contingents in the region. With all Western Balkan countries now under the umbrella of the Partnership for Peace programme, NATO can use the whole range of its PfP instruments such as IPP, IPAP, PARP, PAP-DIB to assist Western Balkan countries. The three Adriatic Charter countries, Albania, Croatia, and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, receive additional SSR assistance through MAP (Membership Action Plan).

On the other hand, the EU has steadily increased its attention to security sector governance issues by setting conditions as part of the Stabilisation and Accession Process. Building on its recently adopted framework

---

23 The democratic requirements relating to security sector governance were codified in the PfP Framework Document 1994 (facilitation of transparency in national defence planning and ensuring democratic control of defence forces) and the Membership Action Plan (1999).

24 Individual Partnership Programme (IPP); Individual Partnership Action Plan (IPAP); Planning and Review Process (PARP); Partnership Action Plan - Defence Institution Building (PAP-DIB).
strategy concept on SSR, the EU should gradually increase its capacity to tackle the SSR challenges holistically by developing and funding assistance programmes dealing with sectors and issues outside its traditional focus on justice and home affairs.

**Key SSR Challenges**

The Western Balkan countries have made considerable progress in reforming their security sector over the last years. While the reforms are heading in the right direction, they continue to suffer from occasional slowdowns and the ever possible risk of backsliding still reflect the violent legacy of the 1990s. The progress achieved differs from one country to another.

Whilst the transformation of the armed forces as well as of border services are generally seen as most successful, there remain many SSR-related areas in which more must be done, namely police, intelligence and secret services, democratic civilian control over the security sector, intra-governmental coordination and resource management. For instance, in Serbia there is still the perception that the secret services pose a threat to the public. The private security sector is largely unregulated and in some places still operates in a grey zone.

From the perspective of democratic governance of the security sector, the lack of civilian expertise in governments and parliaments, the weakness of civil society including the media, especially in the security domain, are problematic shortcomings.

**Implications for the Future Integration Process and Recommendations**

In view of the subsequent phase of the integration process, which are the most urgent problems to be tackled by the aspirant countries, on the one

---

hand, and the Euro-Atlantic organisations, on the other? What measures should be taken to make the Euro-Atlantic perspective more tangible to aspirant Western Balkan countries?

**Political and Social Aspects**

Although the Western Balkan countries are heading towards membership of the European Union and of NATO, the attainment of these goals are bound to a long-term process. Notwithstanding the considerable progress in reform that has been achieved and also acknowledged by the Euro-Atlantic organisations,\(^26\) the past years have also revealed that reform is a complex, challenging and time-consuming process. The risk of diminishing enthusiasm for reforms of the ruling elites and the slowing down of the pace is a real possibility. Therefore, in order to confirm the Euro-Atlantic organisations’ strong commitment to enlargement and to encourage the continuation of reform, tangible rewards for aspirants during the accession process should be timed in predictable short-term intervals.

Sceptics, misunderstandings and false expectations on both sides show that information and communication require improvement. The civil society and public opinion need to play an important role in the accession process but are currently neglected in the political debate. Governments in the region should invest more in carefully prepared information strategies. One strategy could be to change the attitude of institutions which the public trusts. This may be an efficient method to change public perception as the example of cooperation between the Army of Serbia and the Ohio National Guard shows. Other factors such as the influence of the business community should not be underestimated but taken into account. They should be one of the main target groups for western information campaigns and education programmes.

In order to improve the government administrations’, the local politicians’ as well as the general public’s knowledge about Euro-Atlantic

\(^{26}\) For the EU, see EU Commission Annual Progress Reports 2007, released on 6 November 2007.
organisations and accession to them, the Western Balkan governments should develop specific information strategies. The Euro-Atlantic organisations could provide or support more training and education on integration issues.

**Economic Aspects**

The range of financial tools the EU has at its disposal to support the Western Balkan countries is sufficient. Rather than creating new instruments, the existing instruments should be used more efficiently. This requires awareness-raising about the existence of these funds, as well as increased knowledge and absorption capacities in the aspirant countries. Supporting effectively the potential candidate countries on their way to reaching the full candidate status is an urgent priority. This would extend their access to much needed EU funding, helping them close the development and reform gaps more quickly. It would also reaffirm the promise of full EU membership which remains the key driving force for democratic transition of the region. During the process towards integration into Euro-Atlantic organisations, regional cooperation between the Western Balkan countries should be strengthened in order to, *inter alia*, attract foreign investors. Better EU and NATO support programmes for effective regional cooperation should be explored.

While more market reforms will be beneficial to the long-term restructuring of the Western Balkan economies, further liberalisation should go along with gradual strengthening of the still very fragile and insufficient social safety nets.

**Security Sector Aspects**

Kosovo’s status issue is a potential spoiler of the stabilisation process of the region. In order to reduce the risk of escalating outbursts of violence, the international community’s and foremost the Euro-Atlantic organisations’ engagement and presence in the region continue to be necessary.
NATO membership of Albania and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia is desirable for securing the borders and for continued stability.

Democratic institution building and SSR are urgently needed in Kosovo. Assistance from the Euro-Atlantic institutions should not wait the resolution of Kosovo’s future status.

Given that NATO presence and EU conditionality are seen as key driving factors in SSR, NATO’s and the EU’s role should remain strong and should possibly be backed by productive partnerships (Twinning programmes).

In general, more attention should be given to education and training. Though already relatively well-functioning, control and oversight mechanisms should be strengthened. Accountability, currently the weakest element of security sector governance in the Western Balkan countries, needs further support. Addressing insufficient democratic governance is particularly needed in the case of the private security sector, which should be regulated by adequate laws and properly overseen by democratic control mechanisms. Police as well as intelligence and secret services are other security sector areas where further reform is needed.
Approaching or Avoiding Cooperative Security? 
The Western Balkans in the Aftermath of the 
Kosovo Settlement Proposal and the Riga 
Summit27

Predrag Jureković

General Points

The Western Balkans still need multi-track investment initiatives to enhance cooperative security. The setting up of a regional fund for conflict transformation could be helpful, for example, in the process of reconciliation.

In order to avoid maintenance of zero-sum-game situations in regard to critical fields (status issues, majority-minority relations), bargaining methods and creative problem-solving, focusing on exchanges, trade-offs and compromises, should be more strongly supported by the IC and by regional initiatives.

As participation in Euro-Atlantic institutions seems to be the preferred way ahead for all the countries in the region, the EU and NATO must continue to insist on links between regional “good-behaviour” and integration. Already established or planned structures for enhancing regional cooperation cannot substitute for membership of the Western Balkan countries in NATO and EU. Once the countries of the region have become members of these Euro-Atlantic institutions, the need for a specific security cooperation framework in South East Europe will cease.

Unfinished Processes of State-Building

The IC contributed significantly to confidence-building between the former conflict parties by supporting the disarmament process in the post-Dayton period. In order to deepen cooperative security, the EU and NATO should now support the Western Balkan countries in sharing interests in more mundane issues, such as disaster relief, energy security, border management, transport issues, etc.

It seems clear that the resolution of Kosovo’s future status is one of the main preconditions for making cooperative security in the region self-sustainable. Although the discussion on Kosovo at the workshop confirmed the differing assessments which still exist on the Serb and the Albanian sides regarding Ahtisaari’s plan, a consensus on two important points was achieved:

Firstly, a new EU mission should replace the UNMIK administration. Secondly, the IC should intensify its efforts to pass a new resolution in the UN Security Council, in order to provide the post-status period in Kosovo with a clear legal framework. All the other options (freezing the status issue, unilateral recognition of Kosovo’s independence without a new resolution in the Security Council) should be avoided, due to their potential to induce new violence and instability.

Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH) is still in a phase of virtual statehood. The IC should press the local actors to agree on a minimum of common laws, structures and measures to strengthen Bosnia and Herzegovina as a functional state. Without becoming a functional state, BiH cannot become a predictable and cooperative partner on the regional, European and global level. The EU should attract more entrepreneurs to invest in BiH. Creating economic and social welfare is the best way to achieve common interests between the constituent peoples in BiH.

When BiH meets the political and legal criteria of the EU for entering a Stabilisation and Association Agreement (SAA), this country will need the Union’s support in implementing the SAA. BiH’s bureaucracy is not prepared and lacks the capacity to implement the SAA single-handed.
Processes of Euro-Atlantic Integration

The Euro-Atlantic institutions should support the Regional Cooperation Council (RCC), which will replace the Stability Pact for South East Europe in 2008. Designed to sustain the achievements of the latter and support recovery with a view to joining Euro-Atlantic institutions, this indigenous initiative is the direct heir to the Western European experience of functional cooperation. The EU’s and NATO’s support should contribute to making a successful clearing house of the RCC, which can replace other regional initiatives that can not be absorbed by the Western Balkan countries.

The decisions of NATO’s Riga summit brought all the Western Balkan countries under a common security umbrella of PfP. In order to use PfP membership in an optimal way for strengthening cooperative security in the region, NATO should stimulate the signing of bilateral partnership programmes between all the Western Balkan countries. These partnership programmes should not be too ambitious, due to the limited absorption capacities and the problems which the countries in the region are still facing in regard to Security Sector Reform.

The EU’s credibility as a promoter of cooperative security in South East Europe depends very much on a clear integration perspective for the Western Balkan countries. For that reason, the EU should replace its policy of freezing the integration talks with Macedonia by giving this process a new impulse.

Human Security

Developing cooperative security in the region should go hand-in-hand with strengthening human security and especially the civil society sector in the individual countries. In this regard some Western Balkan countries still show big deficits. Within the scope of their conditionality principles, the Euro-Atlantic institutions should emphasize the necessity of a parallel development of reformed state institutions and a vigorous civil society.
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