

Partnership for Peace Consortium
of Defence Academies and Security Studies Institutes
Working Group on Crisis Management in South-East Europe

CIVIL-MILITARY RELATIONS IN SOUTH-EAST EUROPE

**A SURVEY OF THE NATIONAL PERSPECTIVES
AND OF THE ADAPTATION PROCESS TO THE
PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE STANDARDS**

Edited by Plamen Pantev

Publishers

Institut für Internationale Friedenssicherung, Vienna
Institute for Security and International Studies, Sofia
in Co-operation with the PfP-Consortium

Editor

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Plamen Pantev

Managing Editors, Correction and Layout

Capt Mag. Ernst M. Felberbauer

Mag. Sandra S. Kick

Mag. Andreas Wannemacher

National Defence Academy Vienna

Stiftgasse 2a, 1070 Vienna/Austria

Tel. (+43) 5200/40393, Fax: (+43) 5200/17262

ISBN: 3-901328-54-8

Production Manager

WO1 Johann Jakob

Cover Design

Dipl. Graph. Franz Stierschneider

Copyright © April 2001

National Defence Academy Vienna

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I	Foreword	<i>(Col Gustav E. Gustenau)</i>	5
II	Introduction	<i>(Plamen Pantev)</i>	7
III	National Perspectives on Civil-Military Relations		15
	1. Civil-Military Relations in Albania: Phases of Evolution		
	<i>(Sabit Brokaj)</i>	15
	2. Civil-Military Relations in Bulgaria: Aspects, Factors, Problems.. <i>(Plamen Pantev, Valeri Ratchev, Todor Tagarev)..</i>		31
	3. Development of Civil-Military Relations in Croatia		
	<i>(Radovan Vukadinovic, Lidija Cehulic)</i>	63
	4. From Civilian-Military to Civil-Military Relations in FRY		
	<i>(Dragan Simic)</i>	89
	5. Breakthrough of Civil-Military Relations in Hungary		
	<i>(Tibor Babos)</i>	111
	6. Civil-Military Relations in Macedonia: Between Peace and War	<i>(Biljana Vankovska)</i>	133
	7. Civil-Military Relations in Romania: Objectives and Priorities	<i>(Claudiu Degeratu)</i>	157
	8. Civil-Military Relations in Slovenia: Aspects, Factors, Problems	<i>(Beno Arnejcic, Igor Vah)</i>	175
IV	Analysis and Conclusions	<i>(Plamen Pantev)</i>	205
V	List of Abbreviations		215
VI	Authors		217

I Foreword

The PfP Consortium of Defence Academies and Security Studies Institutes finds its roots in a proposal by US Secretary of Defence Cohen at the meeting of the Ministers of Defence of the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council on 12 June 1998. The Consortium aims primarily at strengthening the institutional co-operation between the 44 Euro-Atlantic Partner Countries. In this way, a higher level of professionalism and efficiency can be reached in the fields of training and education of both soldiers and civil servants.

Within the framework of the "Washington Summit" in April 1999, the PfP Education and Training Programme was welcomed by the governments of NATO and EAPC countries. It is based upon three initiatives, namely the "PfP-Consortium of Defence Academies and Security Studies Institutes", the "PfP Simulation Network" and the "Co-operative Network of PfP Training Centres". Their main efforts centre on joint civilian and military training and education on the national security-political and strategic levels of planning with an aim of strengthening multinationality. In this network between professionals, scientists and experts, substantial exchange of information can take place on various levels.

Next to the six Working Groups (*Curriculum Development, Publications, Information Technology, Research, Simulations, Advanced Distributed Learning*) and the Secretariat Working Group, six new Working Groups were founded at this meeting (*Military History, Digital Library, Lessons Learned, European Security and Defence Identity, Crisis Management in South-East Europe, PfP Training Centres*). The Working Group "Crisis Management in South-East Europe" is headed by the Institut für Internationale Friedenssicherung of the Austrian National Defence Academy (IIF/LVAk).

As head of the Institute, I would like to stress the enormous security-political relevance of the publication: Austria understands her role within the Working Group as providing a firm basis for dialogue on matters that have been a pivot of European politics during the last

decade. "Civil-Military Relations in South-East Europe. A Survey of the National Perspectives and of the Adaptation Process to the PfP Standards" combines papers by distinguished research fellows and experts from the region, above all from Albania, Bulgaria, Croatia, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Hungary, Romania, Slovenia and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. Within the publication, an overview over the common interests and differences within the civil-military structures in the South-East European region will provide ample space for further academic discourse.

The unique character of the Consortium Working Group on South-East Europe finds its aim in bringing together military and civilian research institutions and academies concerned with security politics from the region. Through the improved access to information, academies and institutions will be able to improve the efficiency of their training. Security-political institutions are being offered the chance of channelling the results of their research directly into the educational system. This publication might help to provide all participants of Consortium Working Group as well as institutions and experts not directly participating in the PfP process with access to the same spectrum of information from - sometimes - diverging national viewpoints.

In accordance with this basic concept the Working Group aims at furthering the unique academic dialogue that has been created between its participants and the workshops in Reichenau in 2000 and 2001 with a perspective of improving the coherence within the Euro-Atlantic strategic community.

Finally I want to thank all authors for their efforts to complete a unique study that will be both informative for all interested in this issues and helpful for the co-operative relations of the countries from the region. Special thanks should go to Prof. Dr. Plamen Pantev who did a tremendous work as the editor.

The support of the Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces and the PfP-Consortium in this endeavour has been decisive.

II Introduction

The last decade of the Twentieth century brought the issue of civil-military relations to the centre of political, national security, legal and broader social studies in the countries of South-East Europe or the Balkans. There is no surprise, because the need of more and efficient civilian democratic control over the security sector has been in the focus of the political and social debate of the countries that were undergoing fundamental systemic changes.

There are *five major specific aspects* of the issue of civil-military relations in South-East Europe that comprise the analytical framework's accents of this study, carried out by the Institute for Security and International Studies (ISIS), Sofia with the fundamental support of the Institut für Internationale Friedessicherung (IIF) at the National Defence Academy, Vienna and in co-operation with the Partnership for Peace (PfP) Consortium of the Defence Academies and the Security Studies Institutes of the PfP countries.

First, the issue of civil-military relations is a basic transitional problem, i.e., part of the very substance of the changes from the societies of "real", Yugoslav or Albanian socialism to democratic societies, from centrally planned to market-regulated economies.

Second, civil-military relations in South-East Europe in the period 1990-2000 experienced the impact of the post-Yugoslav conflicts and wars. The consequences of these conflicts and wars and their reflection on civil-military relations were different in the individual countries of the region.

Third, the changing civil-military relations are an element of the nascent and gradually evolving Balkan security community and of the region's build-up as a prospective compatible component of the Euro-Atlantic security and civic zone.

Fourth, civil-military relations in South-East Europe are undergoing the influence of the transforming security and defence agenda of the

post-Cold War Europe and the world. The new threats to security in the end of the Twentieth and the beginning of Twenty First centuries require deep national security sector reforms in terms of policy, instruments of dealing with the risks, challenges or imminent dangers. A significant component of the needed changes is the adaptation to participation in multilateral peacekeeping, peace-enforcement, humanitarian and rescue missions and operations. All these new developments inevitably have repercussions on the civil-military relations, on the role society plays in shaping new and effective organisation and instruments of coping with the threats for the nations, the regions and the world.

Fifth, civil-military relations in South-East Europe and the various changes they have undergone and continue to experience are closely linked with the roles and influences of some international organisations and institutions. Both the stage of mature transformations for some countries in the Balkans and the start in the very end of the Twentieth century of changes in the civil-military relations sector for others are invariably linked to the activities of NATO, its PfP programme and the enlargement and co-operation policy of the European Union (EU). Other institutions and forums as the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) and the Pact of Stability for South-East Europe also contribute to the improvement of the civil-military relations in the region, their approximation to the best standards in this area for democratic civilian control of the armed forces and the security institutions in general.

1. As an issue of **the transition** of the societies of South-East European civil-military relations were both a subject of social-political debate and of research interest throughout the nineties of the previous century for some of the countries of the region, and for other Balkan states the complexity of the problem just started to be realised in the last year of the decade. The differences in the transition of the different countries of South-East Europe were clearly reflected on the civil-military relationship of the respective societies. With a different rate of ripening of the problem and with a different level of realisation of its essence by the broader social groups, however, for one decade most of the Balkan countries' elites understood that democratic civilian control of the armed forces guarantees

accountability and preserves legitimacy for the maintenance and the eventual application of the force of the state. In a differentiated pattern the culture of disengaging and non-involving the military in domestic politics was gaining grounds in the troubled for long region. The values of securing civilian democratic control on the defence policy-making and of limiting the role of the military in foreign-policy issues, including on the deployment of national forces out of the country were gradually understood and are already utilised in the practical activities of some of the countries from the region. This gradually evolving process is additionally motivated by the similarly gradual realisation that democracies cannot or will not be able to go to war against each other.

2. The experience of **the Balkan conflicts and wars** by the different countries from the region was differently reflected on the respective civil-military relations. The post-Yugoslav states that emerged after the end of the federation received a specific mark on their civil-military relations, depending on the particular cases. The establishment of statehood for all these new states was a problem itself. However, it has been specifically worsened by the dominating militarily Serbia for each one of them. At the same time, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (FRY) and Bosnia and Herzegovina – due to the policy for a decade by Belgrade, were left with the worst of problems in terms of establishing in a clear-cut fashion of civil-military relations: in the case of FRY the existence of several armed forces, belonging to Serbia inside and outside the country did not allow the definition of civil-military relations within a state. The presence of international forces added to the complexity of this particular case. In the case of Bosnia, the persistence of several contending projects for hosting the sovereign state complicated the issue of civil-military relations because of the contradicting nature of the respective state projects. In the Albanian case the Balkan war that involved Kosovo negatively influenced the fragile economy and state, though the state survived a really harsh experience. In the cases of Romania and Bulgaria, the wars greatly diminished the rate of the two countries' integration efforts in the EU. The dramatic experience, however, accelerated their military reform processes, leading the two countries closer to NATO membership.

3. The building-up of a **regional security community** and of the region as a normal European region requires re-assessment of the role of the armed forces, of the defence and national security concepts, of the real value of the principles and norms of democracy in a nascent Balkan regional civil society. The state of civil-military relations in the individual countries of South-East Europe and of the region in general is both an indicator of the level of evolution of the security community and an opportunity to name the obstacles on the way of this developing process. Reaching a higher level of homogeneity in the area of civil-military relations is a stable step-stone on the way of building a regional security community in South-East Europe.

4. The Balkan conflicts and wars throughout the last decade of the Twentieth century clearly demonstrated to the states and societies of the region the emergence of a new, post-Cold War **security and defence agenda**. Most importantly - the new security threats require new responses, which are not necessarily military. Political accentuation and economic investment in police forces, border guards, customs forces and crisis management facilities are the right response to many new security threats¹. In the cases when a military response is required for meeting the new security threats not only new military capabilities would be needed in terms of equipment, logistics, command, control and communication structures, but also new skills by the military, including of operating outside their home countries. Civil-military relations in such circumstances would require a new and higher reliance on the skills of civilians and not always depend on the soldiers. The adaptation to these new, post-Cold War security and defence requirements are conceived by the states in the region as a necessary pre-condition to join the cooperative and partnership arrangements of the Euro-Atlantic zone of stability and prosperity. However, the different countries of South-East Europe have different capacity and rate of adaptation to these needs. The overcoming of this deficiency is stimulated by developing the partner and co-operative relations, alongside with the

¹ Chris Donnelly, Shaping soldiers for the 21st century, in: *NATO review*, Summer/Autumn 2000, p. 28-31.

internal, domestic economic, social, political, financial and defence reform progress.

5. **International, especially Western support** has become a crucial factor in both conceptualising the transformations in civil-military relations in South-East Europe and in finding the practical ways of establishing new types of relationships between democratising with different velocity Balkan societies and their respective military establishments. NATO and its PfP programme have played a central and a leading role in the international efforts of supporting the adaptation to democratic control over the security and defence institutions, especially over the armed forces. Apart from a solidarity approach in reconstructing on the basis of democracy the former authoritarian and totalitarian societies, NATO and the PfP programme were instrumental in finding practical ways of involving the individual Balkan nations in peacekeeping missions. The main direction of achieving this goal has been improving the interoperability of the equipment, standardising the operating procedures and the command, control and communications of the partnering military units. The gradual formation of a common security and strategic culture through the PfP Consortium of the Defence Academies and the Security Studies Institutes is certainly one of the most ambitious projects of the Partnership for Peace Programme. It is also a most appropriate means of clarifying and eventually – homogenising the understanding of the fundamental meaning of civilian democratic control over the military – a task that has been set by the Study on NATO Enlargement in 1995. The Pact of Stability for South-East Europe acknowledges the important contribution of NATO to stability in the region by its PfP and Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC). The Pact underscores that “the Alliance has an important role to play in achieving the objectives of the Pact, noting in particular NATO’s recent decisions to reach out to countries of the region”². Memberships, the Membership Action Plans and the prospects for membership facilitate the establishment of standards the applicant countries are

² Stability Pact for South-East Europe, adopted on 30 July 1999 in Sarajevo, Art. 27.

supposed to meet, including in the area of the democratic control over the military. Throughout the 1990s the EU, the WEU, the Council of Europe (CE) and the OSCE have also substantially contributed to the establishment of new, democratically based civil-military relations in the Balkans. The Phare and the Tacis programmes of the Union have significantly added to the international efforts of the internalisation of democratic norms, to facilitating the activities of the non-governmental organisations (NGOs), monitoring from a nascent civil society the development of civil-military relations. The adoption of Chapter VII of the OSCE Code of Conduct on Politico-Military Relations, constituting an important part of the Budapest Summit Declaration of 6 December 1994 is a daring effort to set new standards in the civil-military relations by introducing more transparency in national laws that regulate the relationship between society and the armed forces³. It is a very actual document after FRY was re-integrated in the OSCE, because the Code of Conduct clearly defines in its paragraph 20 that “the participating states consider the democratic control of military, paramilitary and internal security forces as well as intelligence services and the police to be an indispensable element of stability and security. They will further the integration of their armed forces with civil society as an important expression of democracy”⁴. The role of the bilateral government-to-government and military-to-military contacts of Western (NATO, EU, PfP, OSCE, CE) and individual Balkan countries is significant in the process of transformation of civil-military relations in South-East Europe towards democratic control of their armed forces and greater transparency in their defence planning and budgeting processes. However, the major effect of these bilateral efforts has consistently depended on the national abilities to utilise the support.

³ In more details: Rienk Terpstra, *The OSCE Code of Conduct: Setting new standards in the politico-military field?*, in: *Helsinki Monitor*, Volume 7 – 1996 – Number 1, p. 27-41; Gert de Nooy (ed.), *Cooperative Security, the OSCE and its Code of Conduct*, Kluwer Law International, The Hague, London, Boston, 1996, 158 pp.

⁴ *Code of Conduct on Politico-Military Aspects of Security*, par. 20.

The objectives of this study are to find how civil-military relations in South-East Europe are influenced and influence the transitional societies of the region, the conflicts and wars that marred the Balkans, the evolution of the regional security community, the new, post-Cold War security and defence agenda and the Western support. The initial ambitions were to carry out a comparative research on how civil-military relations are reflected on domestic, defence and foreign policy and on five factors that shape the civilian democratic control of the armed forces of the individual countries of South-East Europe: the external environment, the historical legacies, the domestic political, social and economic context, the institutional factors and the military culture and professionalism.

The study on civil-military relations in South-East Europe has borrowed in this endeavour from a broader project of the British Economic and Social Research Council's 'One Europe or Several?' Programme – 'The Transformation of Civil-Military Relations in a Comparative Context' under the guidance of Dr. Andrew Cottey, University College Cork and University of Bradford, Dr. Tim Edmunds, Defence Studies Department/Joint Services Command and Staff College, King's College London and Dr. Anthony Forster, Defence Studies Department/Joint Services Command and Staff College, King's College London. However, at this stage of development of civil-military relations and the studies on these issues in South-East Europe this could become possible only in the Bulgarian and the Slovenian national cases. This is why the part of the study, dealing with the individual national cases bears more the features of a survey. It registers dominating national perceptions of the peculiar and troubling, according to the authors, aspects of the civil-military relations in their own countries. This survey also produces a very useful record of information about major legal and institutional arrangements in the respective countries on the democratic control of the military. The survey highlights also important historical events and political attitudes that influence the state of the civil-military relations in the individual countries. All the national studies outline existing deficiencies in the civil-military relations in the particular countries. Concrete proposals how to deal with the problems of the democratic civilian control of the armed forces are made by each of the national-case writers.

The analytic and prescriptive part of the study treats the national cases in the context of the five aspects of the research framework. It would be premature to expect the breakthrough of civil-military relations in Hungary or the changed nature of these relations in Bulgaria to be the feature of the thorough region. However, the culture of critically and freely assessing developments in the security and defence establishments in the countries of South-East region has been shaped and bears the potential to go deeper into the roots of the issues, whose improvement is indispensable for both the evolution of the region and of its integration in the EU and NATO.