

Kosovo Crisis: Lessons Learnt in Crisis Management

Challenges and dangers that the modern international community encounters have smaller specific weight regarding to cataclysmic scenarios from the period of the Cold War. However, given in such scale, they represent an alternative for insecurity. Ethnic conflicts, radical nationalism and internal conflicts represent the scenario of the modern international scene, staged by the new relations and the old suffocated contents.¹ Apart from this, modern international relations have acquired new attributes which emerged as a result of the unequal economic development, demographic expansion, and so on.² Namely, the new challenges and temptations only confirm the fact that international relations are vitally changing and the international community has to bare that in mind. Complex crises do not recognise national borders and unless they are managed properly they could influence the security and stability on macro and micro level. In that course precisely is focused the question on how to explain in such conditions the division of “stability zone” and “crisis zones”?³ Perhaps as a substitute for the division “East – West”? Although we cannot perceive them as equal generators of instability, there is still a strong prerequisite that the “crisis zones” will represent a challenge. This emphasises the fact that endangering the peace and the security has modified the itinerary or its priority. That means that within the relation peace-conflict-crises-war little serious interference has occurred. That is why the crisis concept established within a wider context of the cycle depends on the strategy determination when handling crises, which on the other hand is accepted as an assumption that the contingency concept, which is an adequate for a conflict phase, is a rational approach.

In that sense, it is necessary to make a distinction in the crisis management strategies in sense of avoiding the crisis, its prevention, crisis management, when solving the crisis and according to which crisis management is consisted of effort for situation maintenance on high tensions and confrontations. In that manner we are making distinction between conflict prevention based on the prevention techniques from management, that is crisis management.

The distinction is significant because of the fact that the crises have their own developing cycle which reach on an appropriate techniques. That is why the crisis management should be understood as a part of a process, that is an activity which is established as a complex approach for a certain conflict. The crisis by itself, cannot and should not be observed isolated from the conflict cycle as a whole, but the potentials for crisis management are part of the complexity of approaches and the mechanisms for peace and security maintenance.⁴

In that sense, we can initially start from a triple dimension of a conflict that is: prevention of conflicts in order to prevent forcible elements to occur, crisis management for prevention of escalation of crisis and peace establishment.⁵

The triple format of a conflict or its structural components can be observed partially, but they are connected and the interaction is very complex.⁶

¹ Vukadinovic R., *Medunarodni odnosi*, (Zagreb: Fakultet politickih znanosti, 1995): 89.

² McNamara R.S., *The Changing Nature of Global Security and its Impact on South Asia*, (Washington DC: Washington Council on Non Proliferation, 1992): 3-4.

³ Singer M. and Widawsky A., *The Real World Order: Zones of Peace Zones of Turmoil*, (New York & New Jersey, 1993): 3.

⁴ Gocevski T., Ortakovski V., Georgieva L., *Transformacija na sovremenite konflikti*, (Kumanovo: Makedonska riznica, 1999): 364.

⁵ Gocevski T., Mitrevska M., *Krizen Menadzment*, (Kumanovo: Makedonska riznica, 2001, forthcoming): 150.

Each state has to have at its disposal mechanisms and procedures for conflict management and proper organisation, procedures and agreements for crisis management and conflict prevention. In that sense, the crisis management should assist in the creation of pre-conditions for prevention of crisis on macro and micro level. In this case a political analysis of the possibility for crisis prevention is executed in connection with the relation of the super powers and military-political alliances, military confrontation within Europe as a priority. Nowadays, regarding the new political situation, all those elements have lost that meaning. According to that, the modified nature of the conflicts and the crises facing Europe (e.g. Kosovo crisis) leads to the importance of creating more subtle approach in connection to crisis management versus the current ones which are less efficient.⁷ This emphasises the fact that when a crisis is overcome nobody pays any attention to analyse the results, for when other crises in future occur, to be managed and solved with more efficiency and flexible mechanisms.

All that leads to the conclusion that the international community should pay more attention in the creation of a situation which will require establishment and development of a new approach in crisis management.

Thus, “the New World order“ should be comprehended as a dynamic state where different actors play their role, state where the contradictions are clearly expressed and the divisions could bring to escalation of new crises and disorders.⁸ As a support to this view we could name the example of the warfare in Yugoslavia, that is a war which supposed to settle down the lasting crisis in Kosovo, or the example of Macedonia which was directly under the impact of flow of refugees, and its role as a host in reply to the Kosovo refugee crisis. Namely, The Republic of Macedonia became a significant factor in all the stages of the crisis. Why? Because during the Kosovo refugee crisis Macedonia hosted approximately three hundred and eighty thousand refugees (379,523); out of who approximately two hundred and ninety thousand refugees (287,423) resided in Macedonia throughout the crisis. Using an established air bridge ninety-two thousand and one hundred were transported to third countries (Chart 1):

Refugees Situation on 15 June, 1999	
<i>Refugees in Macedonia</i>	379,523
<i>Refugees in camps</i>	112,434
<i>Refugees in Host Families</i>	154,989
<i>Rest</i>	20,000
<i>Departed abroad by July,5</i>	92,100

⁶ Hill C., The EU/WEU System of Conflict Prevention: (Rome, Paper presented at the Conference “Preventing Violent Conflict in Europe“,1997).

⁷ Mitchell C.R., The structure of International Conflict, (London):97.

⁸ Podatoci od Ministerstvo za odbrana na Republika Makedonija, Aktivnosti na medunarodnite humanitarni organizacii vo Republika Makedonija, 2000.

From these 92,100:

<i>Albania</i>	7.050	<i>Malta</i>	105
<i>Australia</i>	1.781	<i>Netherlands</i>	3.828
<i>Austria</i>	4.795	<i>New Zealand</i>	45
<i>Belgium</i>	1.200	<i>Norway</i>	5.810
<i>Canada</i>	5.046	<i>Poland</i>	1.047
<i>Croatia</i>	370	<i>Portugal</i>	1.283
<i>Czech Rep.</i>	854	<i>Romania</i>	41
<i>Denmark</i>	2.789	<i>Slovakia</i>	91
<i>Finland</i>	961	<i>Slovenia</i>	627
<i>France</i>	5.556	<i>Spain</i>	916
<i>Germany</i>	14.104	<i>Sweden</i>	3.232
<i>Greece</i>	432	<i>Switzerland</i>	1.653
<i>Iceland</i>	73	<i>Turkey</i>	8.045
<i>Israel</i>	212	<i>United Kingdom</i>	4.902
<i>Italy</i>	6.501	<i>United States</i>	8.650
<i>Luxembourg</i>	101		
Total			92.100

Accordingly, the number of population in Macedonia has increased by fourteen point seventy-seven percents (14,77%) (Chart 2):

Comparison according to situation on 15 June, 1999			
Country	Current Population	Estimated Population Increase by 14,77%	Almost as the population in
<i>Macedonia</i>	1.945.932	287.423	Iceland
<i>USA</i>	253.250.000	37.406.175	Canada
<i>Germany</i>	81.591.000	12.051.361	Belgium
<i>France</i>	57.981.000	8.564.057	Guinea

The demographic structure at that moment was disturbed. Not to talk about the national and social, because at that very moment that issue was the most significant. Simply, there was a need for accepting refugees. The Kosovo crisis has caused great deal of loss for the Macedonian economy, the agriculture, industrial production, construction, etc. According to some existing analyses, the total drainages that were done to the Republic of Macedonia are around US\$ 660 mil. Beside the above mentioned loss, other additional material expenses are estimated to the end of the year (1999), and they are enormous, which caused discrepancy in the budget (Chart 3):

<i>Additional Expenditures from the Budgets of the Government Ministries for the Refugees</i>	
Ministries	Total expenditures in € for 1999
Ministry of Urbanism and Civil Eng.	14.294.105
Ministry of Health Care	11.227.907
Ministry of Labour and Social Policy	10.594.438
Ministry of Defence	25.766.294
Ministry of Transportation	3.061.091
Ministry of Interior	28.755.342
Ministry of Education	7.971
Total:	101.669.800

Republic of Macedonia has received international assistance from UN, which cannot cover the expenses that occurred, and those are around 100 mil. € for 1999.

If the number of population in the United States had increased by fourteen point seventy-seven percents, it would mean to add it the population from entire Canada. Or for Germany it would mean to add it the population from entire Belgium.

All the data presented here show that the demographic structure in a physical sense would be deranged. Thus, in a condition like this every country would encounter the same or similar problems as the Republic of Macedonia did. Bearing that in mind, one could accept the lessons learnt in crisis management in Macedonia during the refugee crisis. In that sense, Macedonia offers basic recommendations as groundwork for new settlements and for better global co-operation in further crisis situations. Here are some of the most important:

- ♦ ensuring a united strategic approach towards planning of resources and co-operation with the international organisations such as NATO, United Nations, European Union, and so on;
- ♦ creating conditions for regional co-operation in crisis management;
- ♦ ensuring, in the shortest period of time, an agreed package of procedures grounded on verified international directions for co ordination and management of a certain event. That is to say, all the measures to be in co-ordination with and pemiission of the hosting country;

- ◆ undertaking responsibilities that will not exceed social resources and capacities of the country, or directly endanger its social, economic and national security
- ◆ concluding an agreement between the hosting country and the international organisations about the kind and the scope of co-operation as well as working in co-ordination with the agreed procedures and directions established for the crisis;
- ◆ consulting the hosting country about every activity that a foreign agency or organisation plan to undertake;
- ◆ providing the necessary resources and capacities for support of development of the procedures and project established by the international agencies and organisations as a response to the crisis;
- ◆ creating timely fortification of the necessary elements and resources for adequate dealing with the crisis;
- ◆ the responsible participants on domestic and international level must be interactive and have proper experience in the procedures before a crisis de facto occurs;
- ◆ the agreements and procedures determined by international organisations and agencies between countries in jeopardy and host countries for similar or same events are not compulsory for the countries that did not signed those agreements;
- ◆ unilateral modification should not be executed in order to respond to a crisis if there is sufficient time for consultations and co ordination. If there is not sufficient time for reaching consensus, the side which has taken up the measure should inform and than involve the other actors in the decision analyses;
- ◆ the crisis requirements cannot be anticipated as a whole, which is why the agencies for civil protection should be involved in the resource planning;
- ◆ in order to achieve proper planning, the required elements and resources should be identified,

Identification of the projected approaches should be timely, and it should be a priority in determination of the support procedures and also assistance for the host country and the international agencies.

- ◆ The procuring procedures in crisis should exploit domestic sources.
- ◆ Global approach towards co-ordination and financial assistance should be established and implemented before, during and after a crisis occurs.
- ◆ The legislative and the obligation should be learnt in advance in order to provide proper documentation, health care, proper accommodation and security for the refugees. All that has an important role when the type of the refugees is determined.
- ◆ The historical heritage of the host country, antiques, monuments and archaeological findings must be respected and properly protected.
- ◆ The media (press) should always be informed.
- ◆ The relevant bodies responsible for procedure identification and those which can be used as a response of a complex national crisis to provide highest level of interoperability with the procedures of other agencies and sector must be co-ordinated.

Thus, the imperative of appropriate explanation of these recommendations which emerged from the lessons learnt in crisis management consist of the need to be in co-ordination with the capabilities and the needs of the hosting country and of course with the international agreements.

At the end I will quote the Counsellor for National Security of the President of the United States, Mister Samuel Berger, whose answer to the question “What have we achieved in Kosovo?” was “More of what many people think, but less of what was needed“. Here, I would add, for the Kosovo refugee crisis the Republic of Macedonia has done much more of what many people think, the lessons are learnt, and the message is for them to be used or not to have crises and never to be used.

Dr. Marina MITREVSKA
Assistant Professor at Faculty of Philosophy,
University of Skopje, Macedonia