

# Contents

<b>Preface</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>List of Abbreviations</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>GENERAL INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>PART I</b>	
<b>POLITICAL COOPERATION IN RETROSPECT AND IN THE FUTURE</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Chapter 1</b>	
<b>Political Cooperation in Retrospect: Contact Group, EU, OSCE, NATO, G-8 and UN Working toward a Kosovo Settlement</b>	
<b>By Albrecht Schnabel</b>	<b>23</b>
Introduction	23
The Roles of the Contact Group, EU, OSCE, NATO, G-8 and the UN	26
The UN Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK): Structure and Challenges	39
Conclusion	43
<b>Chapter 2</b>	
<b>Why Did Milosevic Give in? Political Cooperation in Retrospect</b>	
<b>By Domitilla Sagramoso</b>	<b>47</b>
Introduction	47
Serbian Military Objectives in Kosovo	48
Milosevic's First Attempts at Reaching a Negotiated Settlement	50
The Evolution in Russia's Position and Its Impact on Milosevic's Behavior	52
The West and Russia Present a United Front	56
The Role of Military Power	58
Conclusion	60
<b>Chapter 3</b>	
<b>The Emergency Response of NATO and Humanitarian Agencies</b>	
<b>By Lukas Haynes</b>	<b>63</b>
Introduction	63
Background to the Kosovo Crisis	64
Key Features of the Humanitarian Dimension	68
So What Are the Lessons?	75
Conclusion	80

<b>Chapter 4</b>	
<b>Reconstructing Kosovo: The Ethnic Dimension</b>	
<b>By Eric A. Witte</b>	<b>83</b>
Introduction	83
The Main Ethnic Groups	86
Recommendations	93
Conclusion	102

**PART II**  
**THE BROADER FRAMEWORK**  
**OF THE KOSOVO PROBLEM** **103**

<b>Chapter 5</b>	
<b>The Kosovo Crisis and its Consequences</b>	
<b>for a European Security Architecture</b>	
<b>By Roberta N. Haar</b>	<b>105</b>
Was There a European Security Architecture Prior to the Kosovo Crisis?	105
Lessons Learned from the Kosovo Crisis	114
Kosovo's Potential for Europe's Security Building	120
Conclusion: an Emerging Architecture or More Gardening?	126

<b>Chapter 6</b>	
<b>The Military Operation in Kosovo and the European Security System:</b>	
<b>Lessons Unlearned</b>	
<b>By Anastasia V. Mitrofanova</b>	<b>129</b>
The Basic Principles of the Post-Cold War European Security Structure	129
Kosovo as an Implication of the New European Security System	138
The Painful Lessons of the Operation in Kosovo	152

<b>Chapter 7</b>	
<b>The Kosovo Crisis and the European Union:</b>	
<b>The Stability Pact and its Consequences for EU Enlargement</b>	
<b>By Johannes Varwick</b>	<b>159</b>
Introduction	159
Europe at a Crossroads	160
Southeastern Europe: From a "Black Hole"	
to a Road Map for European Integration?	162
Core Functions of the European Integration Process,	
or "Deepening" Versus "Widening" the EU	164
Requirements for Enlargement	166
The Stability Pact and its Predecessors	167

“Membership Light” for the Balkan States?	170
Consequences for the European Union	174
Conclusion	177
<b>Chapter 8</b>	
<b>The United States and the Lessons of the Kosovo Campaign</b>	
<b>By Andrew B. Denison</b>	<b>179</b>
Introduction	179
Military Power as a Coercive Instrument	182
Multilateralism as a Motif of U.S. Foreign Policy: NATO, the United Nations and the Lessons of Kosovo	192
Constraints and Opportunities in Domestic Politics	201
Conclusion: The Lessons of Kosovo and the Purpose of American Power	204
<b>Chapter 9</b>	
<b>Russia’s Policy on the Kosovo Crisis: The Limits of “Cooperative Peacemaking”</b>	
<b>By Ekaterina Stepanova</b>	<b>207</b>
Western Perceptions of Russia’s Kosovo Policy	207
The Russia-NATO Context	212
“Counter-measures” and Constraints	216
The Domestic Context	221
Russia in KFOR	224
Conclusion	229
<b>SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY</b>	<b>231</b>
<b>About the Authors</b>	<b>239</b>
<b>Agenda of the New Faces Conference 1999</b>	<b>241</b>
<b>List of Participants at the New Faces Conference 1999</b>	<b>245</b>

## Preface

In 1997 the Center for Security Studies and Conflict Research at the ETH Zürich and the Research Institute of the German Society for Foreign Affairs in Bonn/Berlin began a project aimed at facilitating an international approach to understanding and analyzing international and regional problems beyond merely national perspectives. It is a specific goal of the project to involve young scholars and new elites in debates on international foreign policy subjects.

The editors invited young and promising scholars from European countries, from North America, Asia, Australia and Russia to participate in New Faces Conferences. The first was held in Bonn in 1997, the second in Chexbres near Lausanne in 1998. The third took place in Berlin in late 1999. Unlike the International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS), which organized New Faces Conferences for a considerable period, our New Faces Conferences were not only intended to bring together young and talented scholars, but also to let them have an impact in terms of creativity and innovation. It was for this reason that we devoted the individual conferences to certain subjects and invited young scholars with relevant expertise to write papers.

While the first two New Faces Conferences dealt with the rather broad subject “International Security Challenges in a Changing World,” the third one was more focussed in addressing the Kosovo crisis and its consequences. The results of the first two conferences were reflected in a publication that came out at the end of 1999.<sup>1</sup> The best papers of the third conference are presented here.

1 Spillmann, Kurt R. and Joachim Krause, eds. *International Security Challenges in a Changing World*. Studien zu Zeitgeschichte und Sicherheitspolitik/Studies in Contemporary History and Security Policy, no. 3. Bern, etc.: Peter Lang, 1999.

The editors would like to thank the Robert Bosch Stiftung (Stuttgart) and the German Marshall Fund of the United States for their support of these conferences.

The editors also thank all the conference participants for their contributions. They particularly appreciate the efforts of the speakers in revising and updating their papers. For the organization of the conference, their many thanks go to their staff, particularly to Bernhard May and Ingrid Bodem from the DGAP.

With regard to the organization and scope of this book, Claude Nicolet merits special mention and gratitude. The editors would also like to thank Iona D'Souza for her help with the manuscript.

The views expressed in these conference papers are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the institutions and individuals they are associated with.

## List of Abbreviations

AWACS	Airborne Early Warning and Control System
CDPSP	Current Digest of the Post Soviet Press
CEE	Central and Eastern Europe(an)
CFSP	Common Foreign and Security Policy
CIS	Commonwealth of Independent States
CJTF	Combined Joint Task Force
CPN	Conflict Prevention Network (initiated by the EU)
CSCE	Conference for Security and Cooperation in Europe
EC	European Community
EMU	Economic and Monetary Union
ESDI	European Security and Defense Identity
EU	European Union
FRY	Federal Republic of Yugoslavia
FYROM	Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
G-8	Group of the seven major industrialized countries plus Russia
ICTY	International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia
IDP	Internally Displaced Persons
IFOR	Implementation Force
JDAM	Joint Direct Attack Munition
KFOR	Kosovo Force

KLA	Kosovo Liberation Army
KPC	Kosovo Protection Corps
KPS	Kosovo Police Services
LDK	Democratic League of Kosovo
MOD	Ministry of Defense
MUP	Interior Ministry Forces
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NGO	Nongovernmental organization
NNA	Neutral and non-aligned states
OCHA	(UN) Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
OSCE	Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe
PfP	(NATO) Partnership for Peace Program
PVO	Private voluntary organization
RMA	Revolution in Military Affairs
SACEUR	Supreme Allied Commander Europe
SEAD	Suppression of enemy air defenses
SFOR	Stabilisation Force
UN	United Nations
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNIP	United Nations International Police
UNMIK	United Nations Mission in Kosovo
USCR	United States Committee for Refugees
USECOM	United States European Command
WEU	Western European Union

## **General Introduction**



The Kosovo crisis of 1999 was one of the most challenging events for cooperative security. Since the end of the Cold War, the European states, the United States and Canada have made progress in devising a new security architecture. This architecture was supposed to create a framework for an international order based on liberal values and international institutions. The developments in the former Yugoslavia have constantly been at odds with these endeavors and the wars in the former Yugoslavia seemed to indicate that the new international order was not able to live up to its expectations.

The Dayton Peace Accord of 1995 was a last-ditch attempt to quench the fire in a way at least comparable to the lofty goals set up within the Charter of Paris of 1990. The Kosovo crisis, which started in early 1998, very vividly demonstrated that the problems of the past have not subsided in the former Yugoslavia. For the fourth time in eight years the Yugoslav president Slobodan Milosevic and those political forces he stands for tried to resolve an ethnic problem by means of ethnic cleansing. Unlike in Bosnia-Herzegovina or in Croatia, the Western world reacted with much more determination and resolve. Only half a year after the Serbs had begun their ethnic cleansing campaign in Kosovo, NATO was pondering the use of military force against Yugoslavia. In October 1998, NATO for the first time in the Kosovo conflict presented Milosevic with an ultimatum, which, at least for the time being, resulted in the withdrawal of Serbian troops from Kosovo. It was only after the renewed resumption of ethnic cleansing in January 1999, that the Western states, step by step, were ready to use military force, and on 24 March, a six week-long air campaign against Yugoslavia started. The outcome was a solution, which led to the factual secession of Kosovo from Yugoslavia, notwithstanding the fact that in legal terms Kosovo still is considered to be a part of Serbia and hence also of the Yugoslav Federation. The accord that was made in early June 1999 has to be seen against the backdrop of a major international crisis, during which the real danger existed that Russia might side with Serbia – with unforeseeable consequences given the chaotic nature of Russian domestic politics.

This book critically examines the various efforts to deal with the Kosovo problem by ways of cooperative security. It also deals with the

problems that started after the agreement of 9 June 1999. Furthermore, it tries to shed light on the broader regional and international aspects of that crisis.

The first part of this book deals with the political cooperation before, during and after the Kosovo crisis. Albrecht Schnabel in his contribution gives an account of the network of political cooperation that evolved during the crisis. He deals with the Contact Group, the European Union, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), NATO and the United Nations in their attempts to work towards a Kosovo settlement. He also refers to the role the Group of the seven major industrialized countries plus Russia (G-8) have assumed and he covers the United Nations Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK). Schnabel concludes that inter-organizational cooperation seems to work poorly in conflict prevention, is worse during the conflict itself, but is much better during the post-conflict phase. The chapter by Domitilla Sagramoso deals with the question of why Milosevic did eventually give in. When the EU-negotiator, the Finnish president Martti Ahtisaari came to the Cologne summit in early June 1999 with the message that Milosevic was ready to accept the conditions of the international community, this was greeted with much surprise in the Western world. Sagramoso discusses various explanations for the turnabout in the Serbian position and concludes that the eventual united front of the West and Russia may have been essential for this turnabout.

Lukas Haynes deals with one aspect that is often overlooked but was of no lesser strategic relevance than the air campaign conducted by NATO: the emergency response of NATO and humanitarian agencies after the Yugoslav side had started to use mass displacement of the Albanian population as a means of war in order to destabilize its neighboring states and NATO's overall position. In his contribution, he describes how the Western Alliance, in cooperation with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) were able to cope with this crisis and to deny success to the rootless Yugoslav effort. Eric A. Witte in his contribution asks how this ethnic cleansing campaign has aggravated the inter-ethnic tensions and problems in the former Kosovo. As a consequence, it is almost impossible to imagine that the

former ethnic structure could be re-established. Witte predicts that the international community will have to maintain a dangerous, expensive and frustrating presence in Kosovo for years to come.

The second part of the book deals with the broader framework of the Kosovo problem. Roberta N. Haar addresses the consequences the Kosovo crisis will have for the attempts to create a European security architecture. She outlines that the success or failure of international attempts to cope with the problems of Kosovo will have a crucial impact on the future of the international order in Europe. While her contribution represents the common Western view, Anastasia V. Mitrofanova from Russia draws the opposite conclusion. In her opinion the handling of the Kosovo crisis by the West has violated all the lessons learned so far and has to be seen as a major setback for all efforts towards the creation of a new international order.

Johannes Varwick deals with the European dimension of the Kosovo crisis. He especially refers to the fact that the European Union bears the brunt of the reconstruction efforts and has the main responsibility for securing the re-establishment of political order in Kosovo. The contributions by Andrew B. Denison and Ekaterina Stepanova cover the broader strategic aspects of the crisis and represent two opposing views. To a certain degree both represent the marked differences in perspectives between the United States and the West on the one hand and Russia on the other. It demonstrates that a certain rift has begun to evolve, which separates the West from Russia and which indicates that more than only differences in perceptions are involved.

Taken together, these contributions provide numerous lessons learned from the Kosovo crisis. This book's criticism of the international community's handling of the crisis before, during and after the culmination of Spring 1999 may be helpful whenever the world community is called upon to deal with a conflict of similar proportions.

ALBRECHT SCHNABEL

## Political Cooperation in Retrospect: Contact Group, EU, OSCE, NATO, G-8 and UN Working toward a Kosovo Settlement

### Introduction<sup>1</sup>

The United Nations and regional organizations have long realized that they need to coordinate their activities and collaborate in their efforts to address the local, international and global insecurity and fears that have continued to destabilize the international environment throughout the past 10 years since the end of the Cold War. It is widely recognized that a partnership between the UN and regional partners, but also increasingly among regional organizations, is crucial in meeting the numerous potential and actual sources of conflict and insecurity in the years to come.

The international community did have many chances to prove that a new, improved, global community could emerge at the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. However, it missed most of these opportunities – partly because of ignorance, partly because of indifference. While the Gulf War proved to be reasonably successful (contrary to the international community's response to the continuing threat of Iraq), Somalia and Rwanda turned into debacles. Rwanda was probably the lowest point of a series of post-Cold War disappointments, signifying the international community's indifference to grave conflicts and great human suffering in cases where the key interests of the major powers were not

1 The author wishes to acknowledge Charisse Gulosino for her valuable research assistance and Heidi Ullrich for her insightful comments on an earlier draft of this paper. This chapter expresses the personal opinion of the author. It does not necessarily reflect the views of the United Nations University.

threatened, or where involvement would be dangerous and costly. As a consequence, the conflicts in the former Yugoslavia, including Kosovo, were approached with extreme care and hesitation. The intra- and interstate wars following the break-up of the former Yugoslavia and the escalating crisis in Kosovo were closer to Western Europe and within the vicinity of major regional security organizations. There is little doubt that, if these same conflicts had erupted somewhere in Africa, for instance, they would not have generated the level of involvement witnessed in the Balkans between 1991 and 1999. Nevertheless, despite many early warnings and calls for preventive measures, little or nothing was done before violence and war actually broke out. Even then, the responses were cautious, out of fear of becoming drawn into unpopular and costly wars between what was primarily (but wrongly) perceived as ethnic groups fighting their primordial and, for an outsider, irrational struggles.

The lessons from the former Yugoslavia were (not necessarily wisely) applied to the Kosovo crisis in 1998/99, and a highly assertive NATO conducted an 11-week long bombing campaign against Yugoslav forces – without the explicit authorization of the UN Security Council and, overall, with limited success. In part, NATO acted out of frustration with the political process of great power politics within the Security Council. The US and its allies wanted to act and, in fact, needed to act after months of empty threats and a credibility vacuum of the Alliance, but feared that Russian and Chinese objections in the Security Council would result in little action beyond empty rhetoric. NATO's air strikes failed to force Belgrade into quick surrender. While Belgrade hoped for a speedy end to the air campaign, it also used the opportunity created by NATO bombing and the reluctance of the Alliance to wage a ground war to engage in brutal ethnic cleansing and expulsion of large parts of the Kosovo Albanian population. While this did not come as a surprise to NATO, it had hoped that Belgrade would give up before it completed its malicious "mission" in Kosovo. In the end, NATO and other parts of the international community tried desperately to find a way out of this dilemma, without losing too much face and credibility.

The various political, economic and security organizations in Europe served as platforms to allow the United States and Russia in particular to reach an arrangement on an offer of settlement acceptable to both the West and Milosevic. In the end a mutually agreeable proposal to end the war, drafted by the G-8, was accepted by all sides of the conflict. Belgrade ended up with a more favorable settlement than what it was offered as part of the peace treaty presented in Rambouillet a few months earlier. However, the structural, human and economic damage inflicted on Yugoslavia and Kosovo are severe. Moreover, peace has not yet returned to Kosovo, where the returning Albanian refugees turned against the remaining Serb community (and local Roma). While the various international alliances, groups and organizations managed to reach a settlement of the conflict (more *ad hoc* than by design), they are now called upon to engage in more meaningful and effective collaboration to secure the peacebuilding process of Kosovo, Yugoslavia and the greater Balkans.

The actual process toward a settlement was not a tremendous achievement – it was an embarrassing, but not necessarily unusual, process of major power politics. However, the post-conflict peacebuilding process, hopefully in the near future including a Yugoslavia that has freed itself of the Milosevic regime, will present the real challenge for the international community. UNMIK is testimony to the cooperative approach taken by the international community in addressing post-conflict situations, based at least in part on lessons learned from post-Dayton Bosnia. UNMIK features a collaborative peacebuilding effort and, in fact, a protectorate of a group of international organizations working within one framework – the UN, EU, OSCE and NATO.

The Kosovo experience teaches us that inter-organizational cooperation seems to work poorly in conflict prevention, is worse during the conflict itself and on the path towards settlement, but is much better during the post-conflict phase. However, as the peacebuilders of today are the preventers and conflict managers of tomorrow, Kosovo will likely be an important step in the maturing of cooperative frameworks between international and regional organizations in the provision of regional, international and human security.

The chapter is divided into three parts. Following the introduction, the chapter examines the efforts of the Contact Group, the EU, OSCE, NATO, G-8 and the United Nations in addressing the challenges of settling the Kosovo crisis, by themselves or in collaboration with others. The chapter then concludes with thoughts on the winners and the losers of this process, and the challenges ahead in moving beyond settlement to resolve the Kosovo and larger Balkan security crisis.

### The Roles of the Contact Group, EU, OSCE, NATO, G-8 and the UN

In their responses to the unfolding conflict in Kosovo, the work of regional and international organizations, themselves “intergovernmental,” was mostly characterized by the most influential member states and their interests. Three groups of states have been most influential – the members of NATO, the members of the G-8 and the Permanent Five of the Security Council. The two most influential actors were Russia and the United States. As throughout the turbulent history of the Balkans, it was again in large part the major European powers (and the US) who determined the future of the Balkans.

All the states that were directly or only marginally involved in the Kosovo conflict were driven by a wide range of motivations: ethnic reasons, political reasons, and ideology, economic interests and “peer pressure” were clearly among the main forces for states’ responses to the unfolding crisis in Kosovo and NATO’s actions. While humanitarian concerns were at the core of many states’ rhetoric, less idealistic reasons, such as the credibility of the Alliance for NATO members, were the decisive factors for outside intervention and public support.<sup>2</sup> It

2 For a detailed analysis of all the main state and non-state actors during the Kosovo crisis, see Schnabel, Albrecht and Ramesh Thakur. *Kosovo and the International Community: Selective Indignation, Collective Intervention, and the Changing Contours of World Politics*. Tokyo: UNU Press, forthcoming.

remains to be seen, however, if the decisions taken by the various outside actors, individually and in cooperation with others, were beneficial for long-term stability in the region. The historical record so far has not been encouraging.

All of the major European regional organizations and the UN were closely involved in bringing about a settlement to the Kosovo conflict. One can detect a pattern of gradual involvement, resembling an evolutionary approach towards more cooperation in the face of “failure” by any one actor to bring about a settlement. Once negotiations reached an impasse in the context of one organization, more or less the same group of actors pursued further negotiations in a new context, i.e. another organization.

#### *The Contact Group: the road to Rambouillet*

The Contact Group (France, Germany, Italy, the United Kingdom, the United States and Russia) voiced its first official concern about the evolving crisis in Kosovo in September 1997 and called for international negotiations to take place. The Contact Group established a working group on this issue and sent a delegation to Belgrade. It called on Belgrade to initiate a peaceful dialogue with Pristina, accept the deployment of an OSCE observer mission to Kosovo, Sandzak and Vojvodina, welcome international mediation and grant a special status to Kosovo acceptable to both Belgrade and Pristina (Moscow Declaration of 25 February 1998).<sup>3</sup>

In June 1998, the Contact Group responded to the escalating crisis within Kosovo – Belgrade’s attacks on Albanian population centers in its war against the Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA). It became clear at this point that, unless a solution to the crisis could be ensured, NATO military involvement and its political consequences and complications

3 This account is offered by Calic, Marie-Janine. “Kosovo in the Twentieth Century – A Historical Account.” Paper presented at *Kosovo and the International Community*, an international project workshop organized by the United Nations University, Budapest, 19-21 September 1999, 13.

would make further efforts towards an internationally mediated political solution very difficult.<sup>4</sup> In October 1998, the Contact Group met in London for a new attempt to resolve the Kosovo crisis by peaceful means. They confirmed their key demand that Belgrade fulfill UN Security Council Resolution 1199, and reinforced the main positions on which all the members of the Contact Group agreed: an end to mutual violence; the withdrawal of troops and heavy arms from Kosovo; the return of refugees; free access to refugees by international humanitarian organizations; full cooperation of Yugoslavia with the international tribunal; and constructive negotiations among all the parties involved in the conflict. Serious differences existed, however, between Russia and other members of the Contact Group over the potential use of NATO force in the event that Belgrade refused to cooperate with the Contact Group's recommendations. Russia insisted that military actions could be taken only after specific authorization by the Security Council, and it threatened to break off all contacts with NATO in the event of unauthorized military actions.<sup>5</sup>

In January 1999, the Contact Group renewed its commitment to apply pressure to both Serb and Albanian sides to move them towards peace negotiations. The EU members' foreign ministers backed this new push for a peace settlement and the Contact Group's plans for an international peace conference. Russia particularly pushed for further political solutions to the crisis, as it feared NATO actions in Kosovo and the negative consequences this would have for East-West relations.<sup>6</sup>

In February 1999, the Contact Group initiated negotiations on the legal status of Kosovo at Rambouillet, France. This resembled a major attempt by Europe to find a political, not military, solution to the conflict. Although hesitantly, both the Serb and Kosovo delegations agreed to come to Rambouillet, where the Contact Group presented an

4 "International: Kosovo Action." *Oxford Analytica Brief*, 12 June 1998.

5 Bazhenov, Sergei and Vitaly Makarchev. "Contact Group Okays Further Peaceful Moves on Kosovo." *ITAR – News Wire*, New York, 9 October 1998.

6 "Pressure Rises on Kosovo Sides." *Financial Times*, London, 26 January 1999.

interim agreement on the status of Kosovo, providing a large degree of self-government for Kosovo Albanians as well as the imposition of an international implementation force.<sup>7</sup> A revised agreement was signed by the Kosovo delegation on the basis of two conditions: NATO would send and command a peacekeeping force, and there would be a referendum on the future constitutional status of Kosovo in the year 2002. Not too surprisingly, the Serb delegation rejected this proposal, which required foreign NATO-lead military intervention on its territory and the virtually assured loss of Kosovo a few years later. Belgrade's refusal to sign the agreement triggered the start of NATO's air campaign against Serb troops and military installations throughout the Yugoslav Federation.

*The European Union: in search of a meaningful role in the Balkans*

Before 1997 the European Union failed to take any initiatives to oppose the deteriorating situation in Kosovo. However, in 1997 the Commission initiated a Conflict Prevention Network (CPN), centered at the *Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik* near Munich, Germany. The CPN was asked to focus its initial work on Zaire and Kosovo.<sup>8</sup> The CPN's recommendations, presented in June 1997, called for short-term, medium-term and long-term measures that would gradually increase the EU's role in the unfolding crisis. The study influenced the EU's policy towards Yugoslavia. The EU expressed its wish to establish an office in Pristina, offered financial assistance for educational programs and, in October 1997, released a draft declaration calling for solutions to the ethnic and minority problems in Kosovo and the region.<sup>9</sup> During the

7 Calic, "Kosovo in the Twentieth Century," 14.

8 The Conflict Prevention Network has so far produced two yearbooks: Cross, Peter, ed. *Contributing to Preventive Action*. Baden-Baden: Nomos, 1998; and Cross, Peter and Guenola Rasamoelina, eds. *Conflict Prevention Policy of the European Union*. Baden-Baden: Nomos, 1999.

9 Troebst, Stefan. "Conflict in Kosovo: Causes and Cures: An Analytical Documentation." In *The Southeast European Challenge: Ethnic Conflict and the*

NATO bombing the EU collaborated with the Contact Group and the G-8 and sent special envoys to Belgrade to negotiate with Milosevic. The Finnish President Martti Ahtisaari, the EU's envoy, traveled to Belgrade together with the Russian envoy Viktor Chernomyrdin, the first top-level European envoy to visit Belgrade since the beginning of the bombing. It was particularly important that a party other than Russia and the US became directly involved in negotiations.<sup>10</sup>

The war in Kosovo has shown that Europe has no credible military force structure of its own. Chris Patten, the European Commissioner responsible for external relations, argues that “[w]hat we need are credible military forces that can be brought together quickly and in a flexible manner.” However, as he argues, the EU should not replace NATO, but focus on “peacekeeping, crisis management and humanitarian intervention.”<sup>11</sup> These are ambitious plans for an organization that has so far not been involved in military and peace operations. Its traditional strength is in economic development assistance, agricultural development and other long-term infrastructure and market development activities. However, the EU attempts to produce a common voice through its Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and become more actively engaged in the region through its Stability Pact for Southeastern Europe. This points to a more assertive role for the European Union on security questions. These are also the areas in which UNMIK utilizes the EU and its comparative expertise. Finally, numerous candidates and aspirants of EU member states point to the need for the EU to expand its economic security blanket across larger parts of Eastern and Southeastern Europe. This would eliminate one of the major root causes of conflict in the Balkans: economic under-

*International Response*, eds. Hans-Georg Ehrhart and Albrecht Schnabel, 102-103. Baden-Baden: Nomos, 1999.

10 Mitchener, Brandon and Neil King Jr. “Security Issues to Dominate EU Summit – Hopes Arise Yugoslavia Will Accept Peace Plan.” *Wall Street Journal*, 3 June 1999.

11 Norton-Taylor, Richard. “Patten Urges EU Defence Links: Kosovo Proved Europe Needs More Effective Spending on Armed Forces, Commissioner Tells MEPs.” *The Guardian*, 17 August 1999.

development and poor access to Western Europe's markets (and, of course, subsidies).

*OSCE: a post-conflict peacebuilder*

The OSCE sees itself partly responsible for the crisis that developed in Kosovo. Max van der Stoep, the OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities, argues that the international community made three crucial mistakes before the conflict erupted: it took too long to find a partial solution to the problem; international organizations such as the OSCE did not develop an alternative approach to address the crisis before the outbreak of war; and priority attention was only extended once the conflict had broken out.<sup>12</sup> In the post-conflict phase, the OSCE can draw on its vast experience from Bosnia. Its collaboration with NATO, EU and UN as part of UNMIK will further define its role as post-conflict peacebuilder.

The OSCE has emerged from post-war Bosnia as a well-respected and well-functioning peacebuilder. It has developed a reputation for even-handedness and assertive action when it comes to the implementation of peace agreements and election results. Russia, in particular, favored OSCE involvement in the Kosovo crisis. This reputation led to the UN Security Council's call for the deployment of a 2000-person strong OSCE Verification Mission in the fall of 1998. However, the deteriorating security environment forced the OSCE to withdraw its mission before it even reached full deployment. Partly because of the OSCE's lack of an enforcement mechanism of its own, its cooperative security framework is best suited for preventive and post-conflict involvement.<sup>13</sup> Its role in rebuilding democracy and good governance, and in promoting and monitoring adherence to human rights standards,

12 Denaxa, Evangelos. Rapporteur's report of the session "Crisis Management through the OSCE – The Case of Kosovo," OSCE Seminar on *Cooperation Among International Organizations and Institutions: Experience and Prospects in Southeastern Europe*, Sofia, Bulgaria, 17-19 May 1999.

13 Zhukovsky, Konstantin and Vadim Lagutin. "UN, OSCE Can Have Part in Kosovo Settlement." *ITAR – TASS News Wire*, 8 April 1999.

is key to the success of UNMIK.

*NATO: from defiance to compliance*

NATO's strategy in the Balkans was one of "diplomacy backed by credible force." In this context it is important to recall that the Alliance considered its air strikes against Bosnian Serb military targets in 1995 as the trigger that brought the Serbs and other conflicting parties to Dayton. Moreover, its decision to use military power improved its credibility, harmed by several years of indecisiveness. NATO assumed that the same approach would also work in Kosovo. In June 1998, NATO staged air exercises in the region and, throughout the summer, it increased its military preparedness for a potential air campaign in an effort to deter Belgrade from further incursions against Kosovo Albanians. Security Council Resolution 1199 called for a cease-fire and withdrawal of forces by both Serbs and the KLA. On 13 October 1998, NATO announced its first 96-hour ultimatum, after which it threatened to begin air strikes. As a consequence, an agreement was reached to allow the already mentioned 2000-person strong OSCE Verification Mission to monitor troop withdrawals on both sides in Kosovo (with NATO monitoring from the air).

Again, it was the threat of air strikes that seemed to have forced Belgrade into compliance with external demands. Nevertheless, the situation was not improving. In January 1999 NATO again threatened air strikes, in support of the Contact Group's efforts to reach a peace deal in Rambouillet. After the talks broke down, NATO's credibility was at stake.<sup>14</sup>

NATO insisted throughout the 11-week air campaign that it was justified in intending to halt a humanitarian catastrophe in Kosovo and secure a political solution to the conflict. However, it had a difficult

14 See Butler, Nicola. "NATO: From Collective Defence to Peace Enforcement." Paper presented at *Kosovo and the International Community*, an international project workshop organized by the United Nations University, Budapest, 19-21 September 1999, 3.

time in convincing many others of this argument. Rather than halting a humanitarian catastrophe, NATO actions allowed Belgrade to pursue its campaign against Albanian civilians more relentlessly than ever before. While NATO announced that it would not use ground troops as part of its military campaign, its air war from 15,000 feet proved to be inaccurate, struck a number of Albanian civilian targets as well as the Chinese Embassy, and failed to strike a lethal blow to Milosevic's military presence in Kosovo. Soon NATO and a number of its member states became eager to end this conflict, without losing face in this increasingly embarrassing war against Yugoslavia. As Air Marshall Ray Funnell argues,

The conclusion that emerges from the conflict in Kosovo is that the decision-making elites of the world and, in this case in particular, NATO, do not know how to use military power wisely. If the leaders of NATO had had a better knowledge of military power with the consequent ability to use it wisely and the skill to avoid its misuse, Kosovo would not be the political and social mess it is today and thousands of Kosovars, Serbs and Albanians alike would not now be dead.<sup>15</sup>

NATO decided to take international law and norms into its own hands. At its 1999 Washington summit, the alliance went as far as to proclaim virtual independence from the need for Security Council mandates for its military operation within and outside its regional confines (a position championed by the USA against other members, among those France). What seemed at first a novel approach to “do something” about a humanitarian tragedy when the UN, blocked by Security Council differences, could not act, turned out to be a political debacle. To counterbalance America's role in Europe, at its Cologne Summit of June 1999 the European Council called for further strengthening of the European Security and Defense Identity (ESDI) and a stronger military role for the Western European Union (WEU) in close cooperation with

15 Funnell, Ray. “The Use of Military Power in the Kosovo Conflict – Military History Overturned: Did Air Power Win the War?” Paper presented at *Kosovo and the International Community*, an international project workshop organized by the United Nations University, Budapest, 19-21 September 1999, 9.

the EU.

It is very possible that some NATO and American decisionmakers actually believed that Milosevic would have been intimidated enough after the first few days of air strikes to give up and sign the Rambouillet peace plan, withdraw his forces from Kosovo and enter into political negotiations (similar to the experience in Bosnia only a few years earlier). Once it became clear that this would not happen, NATO action had already gone wrong. NATO was helped by Russia and the G-8 in finding a face-saving exit in this war with its many blunders. While NATO had maneuvered itself into this trouble by not cooperating with other organizations, most prominently the UN, the post-war phase shows a NATO committed to cooperation with other regional and international organizations. None seem to be trying to impose their preferred approach, and all works focus on their comparative advantage and expertise.

#### *The G-8: preparing the eventual peace settlement*

Neither the Contact Group's diplomacy nor NATO's military power was able to bring an end to the war. The G-8 emerged as the most effective forum to reach a peace settlement. Although its membership is not much different from that of the Contact Group (the same members, plus Japan and Canada), it nevertheless allowed for a fresh approach to the crisis.

The UN Security Council Resolution 1244, the framework for the settlement of the Kosovo conflict, follows very closely the general principles on the political solution of the Kosovo crisis that were offered by the G-8 foreign ministers on 6 May 1999.<sup>16</sup> The G-8's general principles, added to the UN resolution as Annex 1, call for the following actions:

- Immediate and verifiable end of violence and repression in Kosovo;

<sup>16</sup> The full text of Resolution 1244 is available on the Internet at [http://www.un.org/ Docs/scres/1999/99sc1244.htm](http://www.un.org/Docs/scres/1999/99sc1244.htm)

- Withdrawal from Kosovo of military, police and paramilitary forces;
- Deployment in Kosovo of effective international civil and security presences, endorsed and adopted by the United Nations, capable of guaranteeing the achievement of the common objectives;
- Establishment of an interim administration for Kosovo to be decided by the Security Council of the United Nations to ensure conditions for a peaceful and normal life for all inhabitants in Kosovo;
- The safe and free return of all refugees and displaced persons and unimpeded access to Kosovo by humanitarian aid organizations;
- A political process toward the establishment of an interim political framework agreement providing for a substantial self-government for Kosovo, taking full account of the Rambouillet accords and the principles of sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the other countries of the region, and the demilitarization of the KLA;
- Comprehensive approach to the economic development and stabilization of the crisis region.

Annex 2 of UN Security Council Resolution 1244 also includes a number of principles offered and ratified by the Yugoslav parliament. Beyond issues already raised in Annex 1, the focus is on the UN as the leading agency, military protection for all peoples of Kosovo (Albanian and Serb), an autonomous Kosovo within the existing borders of Yugoslavia, and the return of a limited number of Serb border guards and other military personnel to Kosovo.

Yugoslavia indicated on 28 May that it would accept the principles put forth by the G-8. The principles offer substantial guarantees to Yugoslavia, preserve its sovereignty, vow to demilitarize the KLA, and bring in the United Nations (not NATO or any other organization) as the leading coordinator of a framework of peacebuilding and reconstruction in Kosovo. The principles offered by the G-8 were clearly attractive to Belgrade, which was, as much as NATO and the G-8 countries, searching for a way out of this war. By that time Bel-

grade had severely weakened the KLA, showed its defiance of the NATO resolve, and was agreeable to the idea of an autonomous, although not separate, Kosovo. In many ways, the G-8 recommendations and UN Security Council Resolution 1244 appear much more attractive to Belgrade than the original “offer” from Rambouillet, which offered little UN, lots of NATO and a definite secession of Kosovo in a few years’ time. If presented to Belgrade in mid-March instead of the Rambouillet Accords, Resolution 1244 would have possibly been accepted by Belgrade – although in all likelihood not by the KLA. Russia’s influence in the G-8 deliberations was clearly reflected in the chairman’s statement. It becomes again difficult to understand why the war over Kosovo has been fought, why so much human suffering had been caused, if in the end Belgrade received the concessions it had already pursued at Rambouillet.

*The United Nations: from oblivion to lead agency*

The UN has been on a political roller coaster in its involvement in Kosovo. As the crisis escalated in early 1999, the UN became sidelined for reasons of perceived inefficiency to address the evolving crisis, partly because of the indecisiveness of a Security Council hampered by pro-Belgrade policies of Permanent Five–members Russia and China. Opinions clash when it comes to the legitimacy of the NATO action. On the one hand, no clear mandate was given to NATO to engage military force. On the other hand, coded language within related UN Security Council resolutions did allow for some margin of action. Resolution 1203 (October 1998) “[u]rges Member States and others concerned to provide adequate resources for humanitarian assistance in the region.”<sup>17</sup> As in Somalia, this could have well included the use of military force. This, however, is too far a stretch for many, and it is indeed difficult to imagine that the UN would have authorized NATO to use military force against Yugoslavia – not least as it had not done

17 “Resolution 1203 (1998), adopted by the Security Council at its 3937th meeting, on 24 October 1998.”  
<http://www.un.org/Docs/scres/1998/sres1203.htm>

so in many other conflicts raging throughout the world.

Nevertheless, on 10 June 1999, the UN Security Council retroactively endorsed NATO's action through Resolution 1244. The resolution, passed with 14 favorable votes and one abstention from China, builds on two documents – the statement by the Chairman at the conclusion of the G-8 foreign ministers on 6 May 1999, and the agreement of a set of principles developed by the Yugoslav government on 2 June 1999. The resolution authorizes international civil and security presence in Kosovo.

It is useful to recall some of the main principles of this resolution, as well as the annexes prepared by the G-8 and the Yugoslav government. The resolution aims to resolve the grave humanitarian situation in Kosovo and to enable the return of refugees and internally displaced persons (IDPs). It condemns all acts of violence in Kosovo – an important issue in the context of current atrocities committed by the returning Albanian population against Serbs living in Kosovo. It reaffirms the jurisdiction and mandate of the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY), which had just indicted Yugoslav President Milosevic – the first time an acting Head of State was indicted for crimes against humanity. The resolution reaffirms the commitment of all member states to uphold the territorial integrity and sovereignty of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia, Montenegro and Kosovo). At the same time, however, the resolution calls for “substantial autonomy and meaningful self-administration of Kosovo.”<sup>18</sup> The resolution places its action under Chapter VII of the Charter. Further, the resolution calls for Yugoslav troop withdrawal and international troop deployment. However, it does allow limited numbers of Serb and Yugoslav police and military to return to Kosovo. It calls for an immediate deployment of security forces to deter renewed hostilities and enforce the cease-fire, demilitarize the KLA, establish

18 Resolution 1244: <http://www.un.org/Docs/scres/1999/99sc1244.htm>

a secure environment in which refugees and displaced persons can return home in safety, the international civil presence can operate, a transitional administration can be established, and humanitarian aid can be delivered.<sup>19</sup>

The resolution calls upon military forces to ensure public safety, supervise de-mining activities, patrol borders, and ensure protection and freedom of movement of all organizations involved in peace-building efforts.

Finally, the resolution authorizes the secretary-general to put in place an international interim administration to support the development towards democratic self-governing institutions. Other tasks, including the holding of elections, infrastructure and economic development, humanitarian and disaster relief, and the maintenance of civil law and order as well as the protection of returning refugees and human rights, are part of the UN mission's mandate. Reference is made throughout to the initial contents of the Rambouillet Accords. The resolution devotes an entire article to the potential role of the European Union, seen as a major source of development assistance in the Balkans. The resolution calls upon

the European Union and other international organizations to develop a comprehensive approach to the economic development and stabilization of the region affected by the Kosovo crisis, including the implementation of a Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe with broad international participation in order to further the promotion of democracy, economic prosperity, stability and regional cooperation.

This is a strong appeal to the community of organizations in Europe to work together in finding a "comprehensive" approach toward the long-term stabilization of Kosovo and the region.<sup>20</sup>

19 *Ibid.*

20 *Ibid.*

## The UN Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK): Structure and Challenges

### *Structure*

The United Nations Mission in Kosovo is a complex framework for inter-organizational collaboration and division of labor. At the top of the mission's hierarchy (thus giving the UN the overall lead over the mission) stand the special representative of the secretary-general and his deputy. Attached are the Military Liaison Office, the Legal Advisor, the Chief of Staff, the Political Office, and the Spokesman's office. The heart of the mission is what can be described as a *de facto* civilian and political protectorate over Kosovo. Resolution 1244

[a]uthorizes the secretary-general, with the assistance of relevant international organizations, to establish an international civil presence in Kosovo in order to provide an interim administration for Kosovo under which the people of Kosovo can enjoy substantial autonomy within the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, and which will provide transitional administration while establishing and overseeing the development of provisional democratic self-governing institutions to ensure conditions for a peaceful and normal life for all inhabitants of Kosovo.<sup>21</sup>

What does this translate into on the ground? The UN's work is divided along four main pillars, all headed by a different organization: The Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs comes from UNHCR. UNHCR is responsible for resettlement efforts, relief efforts and mine action. The Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Interim Civil Administration comes from the United Nations. The UN's tasks are three-fold. Firstly, it organizes the civilian policy component of the mission, including the Civilian Police (CIVPOL), special police and border police. Secondly, it deals with judicial affairs, by establishing courts and tribunals, penal management and legal documentation. Thirdly, it organizes civil affairs, such as planning, finance and budget,

21 *Ibid.*

public health, education and culture, social services, civil services and public utilities.

The Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Institution-Building comes from the OSCE. The OSCE is also responsible for three main areas. Firstly, it organizes human resources and capacity building, by training judges, establishing a police academy and training of local administrators. Secondly, as in Bosnia-Herzegovina, the OSCE supports democratization and good governance, by supporting and organizing civil society and nongovernmental organization (NGO) development, political party development, local media development and election monitoring. Thirdly, the Organization supports human rights observance through its monitoring of violations and through the work of an Ombudsperson.

The Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Reconstruction comes from the European Union. The EU focuses its contribution on the provision of shelter, the rebuilding of transportation and communication lines, of utilities, agriculture and other infrastructure development. Of course, NATO plays a major role in the international military presence through the Kosovo Force (KFOR). Thus, all the major European international/regional organizations are key players in the rebuilding of post-war Kosovo, based on their comparative advantage in peacebuilding: UNHCR deals mainly with refugees and IDPs, the UN with police, judiciary and civil affairs, the OSCE with democratization and human rights, the EU with rebuilding and economic development, and NATO with military protection.

#### *Challenges to UNMIK's post-conflict role*

The deployment of UNMIK and KFOR was (and still is) faced with numerous challenges. The peace plan asks for an immediate and verifiable end to violence and repression in Kosovo. However, withdrawing Serb troops continued to leave a path of destruction during their withdrawal, and returning Albanian refugees began terrorizing the remaining Serb population. An estimated 250,000 Serbs and Roma, mostly innocent civilians accused of compliance with Serb military atrocities committed against Kosovars, had so far been driven out by

returning refugees. Demands for a withdrawal of military, police and paramilitary forces still did not resolve the problem of a strong and influential KLA, which was only too eager to fill the initial power vacuum before UNMIK and KFOR had been fully deployed. KFOR's ability to protect the work of UNMIK depends on the willingness of local parties to remain committed to the peace process. If fighting re-erupts, it is not clear if KFOR would remain committed to its security mandate, and the complicated military and civil collaboration between the UN and various regional organizations could easily fall apart.

The greatest problem, however, is the still unresolved constitutional status of Kosovo. Will the interim UN administration lead to Kosovar self-rule, to shared rule with Belgrade, and to respect for Yugoslavia's sovereignty, as expressed in Resolution 1244? While there might be much sympathy for Kosovar self-rule in the context of the current Milosevic government, a new, more democratic and tolerant government may nullify Kosovo's insistence on secession and self-rule.<sup>22</sup>

In more operational terms, UNMIK is faced with a tremendous challenge: Kosovo is in shambles after years of Serb repression and a three-month long war. Law and order have not yet been established, the KLA has placed itself in positions of local governance, Serb/ Albanian animosities run as high as ever, the local economy has been shattered, and basic services such as water, phone and electric services are either lacking or non-existent. UNMIK is coming under pressure from Albanians for its slow response to these challenges and the UN, in turn, is suffering from a lack of resources and personnel to act as quickly and efficiently as it had hoped. As of September 1999, only a fraction of UNMIK's police force (an anticipated 3,100) has been in place, and its civilian staff was still below 1,000. Kosovars are quarreling among themselves over property rights. UNMIK has declared valid all pre-war Serbian laws, except those that violated international human rights norms. However, Kosovo Albanian politicians and judges asked that all laws adopted after the removal of Kosovo's partial autonomy in 1989

22 Ruppe, David. "Lots of Questions: Getting Peace in Kosovo Won't Be Simple." <http://www.abcnews.com>, 14 May 1999.

be disbanded. The international aid community has created a service sector that drives up prices and access to rental space and limits opportunities to those who are not lucky enough to find employment in aid agencies.<sup>23</sup> As Pula notes,

In the euphoria of their perceived victory and new-found liberty, most Kosovo Albanians have started rebuilding their homes and lives with gusto and are optimistic about the future. However, a moribund economy, limited employment prospects, and the absence of proper law-enforcement may yet push many towards crime, political radicalization, or migration to the West.<sup>24</sup>

Collaboration between a UN specialized agency (UNHCR), the UN Secretariat and two regional organizations (OSCE and EU), along with NATO and the military component of the international community's presence in Kosovo, presents a collaborative effort whose success and failures, and trials and tribulations, will need careful study to extrapolate lessons for similar future missions. In theory, this mission is an ideal case of collaboration between the UN and regional organizations, between civilian and military components of an outside (benevolent) intervention.

Of course, this mission may not turn out to be a blueprint for other similar post-conflict situations: even if it turns out to be a useful and effective collaborative effort, the requirements in terms of political will and economic and human investment on the part of all the organizations and states involved are tremendous. As for lessons for other parts of the world: neither a similar degree of political will nor the necessary resources to respond collectively to such a crisis are likely to be available anywhere else in the world. Nevertheless, it would be important for Europe that this "experiment" succeeds. The future European security structure will be strongly influenced by the experience of collaboration in rebuilding Kosovo (and Bosnia-Herze-

23 This account is provided by Pula, Besnik. "Trouble Ahead." *Balkan Crisis Reports* (Institute of War & Peace Reporting), 17 August 1999.

24 *Ibid.*

govina). If this collaborative effort fails, it will cast great doubt on the usefulness of the many interlocking regional organizations and their devotion to peace, security and stability in Europe – and it would certainly throw an even bleaker picture on potential efforts of a similar magnitude in another regional context with less sophisticated and endowed organizations.

## Conclusion

Cooperation between Europe's regional organizations and between them and the United Nations was limited during the period leading up to the unfolding conflict between radicalized KLA troops in Kosovo and Serb military and security forces. Starting with Dayton, when there was ample opportunity to include the Kosovo question in the peace talks between the leaders of the major warring parties in Croatia, Bosnia and Serbia, the international community failed Kosovo. This failure gradually led to the radicalization of parts of the Kosovo Albanian community, which realized that only force would get them the attention of external actors needed to oppose Belgrade's rule and oppression in Kosovo.

Once the crisis developed, various organizations – the Contact Group, the EU, the OSCE and the UN – issued statements and opinions on the evolving crisis. NATO, convinced that its use of air strikes in 1995 against Bosnian Serbs had triggered the subsequent success at Dayton, resorted to military threats. It hoped it could bully Milosevic into compliance with international demands to cease its offensive against the Kosovo Albanian population, and to return a modicum of self-rule to its southern province. Despite the initial enthusiasm by the international community to grant recognition of independence and secession to other parts of the former Yugoslavia, it did not extend this overture to the Kosovars. Only the Rambouillet peace plan came close to recognition of the eventual self-rule of Kosovo, but at a point where cynics would argue that the plan would have never been signed by both parties anyhow. In the face of an expected breakdown of peace talks between

Belgrade and Pristina, it seemed easy to be generous and extend far-reaching hopes for Kosovo independence. In any case, the proposed peace plan by the G-8 and the subsequent UN Security Council Resolution 1244 lack any reference to Kosovo's independence and uphold Yugoslavia's territorial integrity and sovereignty.

NATO deliberately excluded the UN from its anticipated actions in Kosovo, assuming that the Security Council (i.e. Russia and China) would not authorize military force to stem back the Serb incursion. NATO gambled high and lost. Instead of a quick and full surrender from Belgrade, Yugoslavia withstood the pressure of NATO air strikes – while the Alliance itself managed to stay together, but not without showing clear lines of disagreement between its member states over the justification and mandate of its actions. The mass expulsion of Albanians and scores of atrocities committed against the civilian population took place right under the watchful eye of NATO fighter jets flying 15,000 feet over Kosovo. During the air war, a number of serious questions were raised about NATO's air campaign. Had all diplomatic solutions been exhausted before going to war? Was the war really fought for humanitarian reasons, or for reasons much closer to NATO's credibility as a "new" defense alliance? Is it legal for regional alliances to conduct military operations against a sovereign state without the blessing of the Security Council? And if so, is an air war – and the strict resistance to use ground troops – a morally acceptable, efficient, and effective way to fight wars in the future? What is the purpose and effect of military actions that are premised on the concept of "zero-casualty warfare?"

Throughout the duration of the air strikes, various regional organizations and groupings attempted to bring the conflicting parties back to the negotiating table. They searched for face-saving mechanisms that would allow NATO to stop bombing, give Russia the feeling that it had been instrumental in ending NATO actions, and in limiting the damage and pain inflicted on the Kosovo Albanian population (and neighboring countries weakened by the influx of refugees) by Serb actions and NATO air strikes.

After the war close cooperation is not only desirable, but also required. The peace plan developed by the G-8 and announced by the Security

Council calls for two regional organizations, the UN Secretariat and one specialized agency to work together to stabilize and build on the Kosovo settlement. As their work progresses, numerous lessons will be learned about such inter-organizational cooperation, for a continuing international presence in the Balkans and for similar situations elsewhere in the world.

Who were the winners and who were the losers of the international confrontation over Kosovo? It appears that, among the various organizations involved in the settlement of the conflict, only the G-8 could claim to have gained status and recognition. The OSCE's failed monitoring mission and the failure of the UN Security Council to decide on actions against Belgrade sidelined both organizations. NATO lost much of its respect as it used its overwhelming force with little regard to the UN and the international community at large, and as it did only barely achieve part of its initial goals, after a much longer time than anticipated and only with the help of Russia. The EU could do little during the conflict, but has now re-engaged itself in the region – with its own initiative, and in collaboration with the UN (UNMIK). The Contact Group has failed to bring about peace, but essentially re-grouped itself in the context of the G-8. The crucial role played by the G-8 is, however, worrying. It signifies that only a combination of great power interest, money and military strength will carry the day in (war) diplomacy.

The post-conflict environment has seen a much different constellation. Initially, it seemed that NATO and its assertive supporters would walk away from this conflict as the clear winners. However, their gamble did not fully pay off. Political negotiations, with Russia and through the utilization of various regional organizations, sidelined NATO and brought the UN back in. The UN, NATO, OSCE and EU will all have an important part to play in the eventual settlement and possible resolution of the Kosovo conflict. Peace and stability in Kosovo and Yugoslavia, as well as in the larger Balkan region, will depend on the ability of these organizations to blend their comparative advantages in the division of labor that characterizes UNMIK's work in Kosovo.

It is yet very difficult to say who won or who lost the Kosovo conflict. If the Kosovo conflict, despite the casualties and uprooting it has

caused, eventually results in a new Yugoslav government, a renewed commitment of the European and international community to the Balkans, a stronger, because tested, community of states with differing opinions and approaches to Balkan politics, and a freer life for all Kosovars – both Serb and Albanian – the lives lost during the conflict were not lost in vain. At the moment, however, the Albanian community has suffered much, the Kosovo Serb and Roma communities are suffering the Kosovo Albanians' revenge, and the Serbs in Serbia proper suffer as long as Milosevic remains in power. This century will end with an uprooted Yugoslavia and wider Balkans. The great variety of European regional organizations, along with the UN, should be able to bring peace, stability and economic development to the Balkans within the next few years. Whether that can be achieved in other parts of the world, where fewer interests of less powerful states and organizations are at stake, is questionable. In the end, the UN would not be able to resolve the Kosovo problems by itself – other organizations are available as partners. That luxury is limited to Europe and is absent in other parts of the world.

If not on a global scale, the Kosovo conflict could and should lay the foundation for an improved European traditional and non-traditional security system. This includes reasonable and effective relations between regional organizations and the UN. If regional and international organizations can be used to exchange, understand and harmonize foreign, security and defense related policies across all member states, they will be able to establish themselves as independent actors, removed from the claws of major powers. This will be necessary to allow much faster responses from regional and international organizations to escalating crisis situations. Conflict prevention requires a greater resolve than situations of conflict management after a war has erupted. Conflict prevention will need greater attention, and preventive measures have to be harmonized among organization. Europe and the wider international community need to follow and study very carefully UNMIK's performance, trials and tribulations. Much will be learned from this example of extensive inter-agency and inter-organization cooperation, for Europe and elsewhere in the world.

DOMITILLA SAGRAMOSO

## Why Did Milosevic Give in? Political Cooperation in Retrospect<sup>1</sup>

### Introduction

The decision by Serbian President Slobodan Milosevic to abide by NATO's terms in early June 1999 has opened an interesting debate among scholars and politicians on the factors behind the Serbian leader's behavior. Traditional assessments have placed particular emphasis on the impact of NATO's military campaign and the threat of a ground invasion, whereas more far-fetched evaluations have mentioned the existence of a Russian-Yugoslav plan to carve up Kosovo.<sup>2</sup> This chapter, while not totally dismissing the impact of the military campaign, will instead argue that the creation of a united front including all the NATO allies, as well as Russia, proved to be a determinant factor in compelling Milosevic to agree to NATO's demands. However, other factors strongly influenced Milosevic's decision, and these had little to do with international political cooperation. They included among others, Milosevic's own tactical and strategic calculations, the threats posed by the West to Milosevic's own personal interests, the prospect of continuing air bombardment, and

1 The author would like to thank Dr. Susan Woodward for her valuable assistance and comments on the paper.

2 For example, Richard J. Newman argued that attacks on Yugoslav citizens induced Milosevic to accept NATO's terms: Newman, Richard J. "The Bombs that Failed in Kosovo." *US News and World Report*, 20 September 1999: <http://www.usnews.com/usnews/issue/990920/Kosovo.htm>. Flora Lewis backed Zbigniew Brzezinski's argument that Serbia agreed with Russia on a plan to carve up Kosovo: Lewis, Flora. "A Clash with Russia in Kosovo Came Too Close for Comfort." *International Herald Tribune*, 1 October 1999.

Milosevic's indictment by the War Crimes Tribunal, to name but a few.

The question as to why Milosevic gave in to Western demands is actually two-fold. On the one hand, why did Milosevic accept Western terms and on the other, why did he accept them at the particular time he did? Although there seems to be little doubt that the persistent bombing campaign convinced Milosevic that he had to reach an agreement with the West, disagreements remain as to why he gave in on 3 June 1999, and not earlier or later. The answer to these questions is to be found in a careful analysis of Milosevic's behavior after the bombing started, and on the position of Russia, the main supporter of Serbia's concerns, throughout most of the air campaign.

### Serbian Military Objectives in Kosovo

Ever since the first outbursts of violence in the Kosovo province in the winter of 1997-98, the Serbian leadership in Belgrade attempted to restore control over the troublesome region through an effective counter-insurgency campaign. The initial Serbian efforts, however, proved ineffective. In the spring of 1998, KLA fighters, enjoying increasingly widespread support among the local Albanian population, managed to take control over almost forty percent of Kosovo's territory. The KLA victories, however, proved to be short-lived. During the summer of 1998, Serbian Interior Ministry troops with the support of units belonging to the Yugoslav army inflicted a severe defeat on the KLA forces. During July and August 1998, one after the other, KLA strongholds crumbled when faced with Serbian regular military formations equipped with heavy weapons and superior light equipment. The systematic attack and destruction of Albanian towns and villages forced the KLA fighters and local Albanian inhabitants to take refuge in the mountainous regions. Despite these major setbacks, the KLA fighters still managed to regroup their forces and during most of the

autumn and winter of 1998-99 conducted a relatively effective guerrilla campaign against Serbian forces stationed in Kosovo.<sup>3</sup> Regular attacks by KLA fighters against Serbian police stations, patrols and roadblocks brought to light the difficulties in completely subduing the KLA militarily. Serbian forces had managed quite successfully during the summer of 1998 to cut KLA supply lines through Albania, by creating an effective 10-km long “safety belt” along the Albanian-Kosovo border. However, alternative routes through Montenegro and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYROM) soon emerged, allowing the KLA to modernize its military stocks with sophisticated German, Austrian and Swiss light weapons, and thus present a constant threat to Serbian forces.<sup>4</sup> The Serbian military commanders faced great difficulties in keeping total control over the province and rebuking KLA attacks. Many more than 25,000 men – the number allowed by the October 1998 Holbrooke-Milosevic agreements – were needed to completely defeat the KLA.

The withdrawal of the Kosovo Verification Mission on 20 March 1999 and the prospect of a NATO air campaign provided Milosevic with a window of opportunity to deal a final blow to the KLA. Devoid of international observation, Serbian forces launched a major offensive against KLA strongholds in the central regions of Mitrovica, Vushtrii, and Drenica on 19-20 March and thereafter conducted a savage but extremely effective military campaign, which almost completely dislodged the KLA from the entire province.<sup>5</sup> Through a policy of ethnic cleansing, summary executions, destruction of houses and burning of villages, Milosevic managed to inflict a severe defeat on the KLA and to cut its links with its power base – the local population. By early April 1999, the KLA fighters were finding it increasingly hard to regroup their forces and coordinate their activities. Cut off from their

3 Nativi, Andrea. “Tecniche per un massacro.” *Limes*, no. 1 (1999): supplement, 37.

4 Smith, Chris and Domitilla Sagramoso. “Small Arms Trafficking May Export Albania’s Anarchy.” *Jane’s Intelligence Review* 11, no. 1 (1999): 37.

5 *RFE/RL Newslines* 3, no. 56, part II, 22 March 1999.

power base and supply lines, the KLA fighters were forced to withdraw from most of their strongholds in the Drenica region and to abandon their direct and open fight against Serbian forces. Only the Decani region still held an important KLA presence.<sup>6</sup> Deterred by Serbian anti-aircraft defenses, NATO planes concentrated their attacks on fixed targets in Serbia and Montenegro, thus proving unable to stop the Serbian military campaign in Kosovo.

### Milosevic's First Attempts at Reaching a Negotiated Settlement

Satisfied with his successes in Kosovo and aware that some sort of agreement had to be reached with NATO for the bombings to stop and in order to secure his military victories in the rebellious province, Milosevic thought that the time was ripe for negotiations to start. On 6 April 1999, the Serbian leader declared a unilateral cease-fire, after having indicated to the Russian mediators his readiness to negotiate with Western allies if NATO stopped providing military support to the separatists and withdrew its forces from the region.<sup>7</sup> Milosevic believed that having routed the KLA, and enjoying the diplomatic support of Russia, he could now negotiate from a position of strength. However, NATO ignored Russia's concerns and refused to agree to Milosevic's terms. Instead, the Western leaders remained unanimous in their insistence that all Serbian forces had to be withdrawn from Kosovo for an agreement to be reached, and that a NATO-led international military force be introduced in the province.

6 Trean, Claire. "La nouvelle tactique psychologique et militaire du président Yugoslave." *Le Monde*, 3 April 1999.

7 Lapsy, Vladimir. "First Steps Towards Peace in the Balkans." *Rossiiskaya gazeta*, 1 April 1999, in *Current Digest of the Post Soviet Press (CDPSP)* 51, no. 13 (1999): 4; "La mission du premier ministre russe à Belgrade a échoué." *Le Monde*, 1 April 1999.

Confident that eventually the NATO countries would falter in their support for a prolonged air campaign and would never reach agreement on a ground invasion, Milosevic continued to resist NATO's attacks as he tried to negotiate an agreement which would satisfy his main objectives – the neutralization of the KLA, the preservation of the territorial integrity of Yugoslavia, and the avoidance of a NATO military presence in Yugoslavia. For this, he hoped to count on Russia's support. Throughout the entire bombing campaign, the Russian leadership had refused to provide Yugoslav forces with military aid, had refrained from exercising a display of force to intimidate NATO, and had avoided endorsing Milosevic's calls for a military-political union between Yugoslavia, Belarus and Russia. However, the Russian leaders strongly sympathized with Milosevic's positions and shared many of his concerns. But Russia's support for Yugoslavia's positions resulted less from a sympathy for Milosevic's regime and his policies, and more from a desire to stop NATO's "open aggression" against a European sovereign state. The Russian leaders were eager to put an end to the violation of international law and restore the leading role of the UN in the resolution of the crisis. During the initial phase of the negotiations, Russia tried to play the role of an honest mediator, by trying to bring the contrasting positions closer together. However, the NATO countries, particularly the United States and Great Britain, remained adamant in their refusal to negotiate with Milosevic. Instead, they proved eager to impose their conditions upon him. Such a situation left Russia little room to maneuver. Devoid of any effective political and economic leverage over the NATO countries, and eager not to ruin permanently its relations with the West, upon which it depended economically, Russia eventually accommodated Western demands. The NATO allies managed to shift Russia's position from impartial mediator to upholder of NATO's principles. Once a united front was presented to Milosevic, the latter was left with very few alternatives but to abide by NATO's terms.

## The Evolution in Russia's Position and Its Impact on Milosevic's Behavior

The launching of Operation Allied Force provoked an extremely negative reaction among Russian leaders. Russia broke off all dialogues with NATO and tried unsuccessfully to pass a UN Security Council resolution, which would condemn NATO's aggression. Moreover, Russian military officials and politicians, including President Yeltsin, made strong pronouncements about the risk of an outbreak of a world war. Nevertheless, the Russian leadership engaged in negotiations with Serbian leaders in order to find a peaceful settlement to the crisis. The first diplomatic efforts conducted by Prime Minister Evgeny Primakov in late March 1999 were aimed primarily at brokering a settlement that would take Yugoslav interests into account. However, Primakov's proposals, apparently based on a partition of Kosovo, fell far short of Western requirements. Nevertheless, such initiatives led Milosevic to believe that he had a strong partner he could rely on, and therefore deferred any attempts by Belgrade to comply with Western demands. NATO's air campaign was not severely hampering Yugoslavia's military campaign against the Kosovar separatist forces, nor was it yet having a negative effect on the economic infrastructure of the country. Moreover, domestic support for Milosevic was not eroding as had been expected by NATO allies.

The first meeting held between US Secretary of State Madeleine Albright and Russian Foreign Minister Igor Ivanov, on 13 April in Oslo, brought to light the major differences still existing between Western and Russian positions. Both the officials agreed on a set of principles that would form the basis of an agreement. These included an end to the violence in Kosovo, the withdrawal of Serbian military, paramilitary and police forces from the region, and the need to allow refugees to return. However, no agreement was reached on the introduction of a military force.<sup>8</sup> Although Ivanov recognized that "some

8 Smirnov, Aleksei. "A Step Towards Peace in Yugoslavia." *Novoe Izvestiya*, 14 April 1999, in *CDPSP* 51, no. 15 (1999): 10; Sysoyev, Gennady. "Russia Called a Great Power." *Kommersant*, 14 April 1999, in *ibid.*: 10.

acceptable form of international presence would be needed in Kosovo,” he insisted on the necessity of Belgrade’s consent for the introduction of a foreign military force into the country.<sup>9</sup> Milosevic, however, remained adamant in his refusal to allow such a force to intervene.<sup>10</sup>

The appointment of Viktor Chernomyrdin as President Yeltsin’s special envoy to the talks on 14 April 1999 seemed to indicate a willingness by Russia to work constructively with Western allies towards a resolution of the crisis. However, Russia’s position on the Balkan conflict remained extremely erratic. The Russian leaders issued contradictory statements ranging from declarations that “Russia would use exclusively diplomatic methods to reach a settlement,” to remarks indicating that Russia “would not allow Yugoslavia to be vanquished.”<sup>11</sup> Despite these contradictory statements, Chernomyrdin began coordinating his efforts with Western leaders and started putting pressure on Milosevic to accept the presence of an international military force. However, Chernomyrdin made it clear that the force had to be under UN mandate and had to include a strong Russian contingent. Moreover, Russia insisted that the force be introduced only with Belgrade’s consent, and only after a political agreement had been reached. Russia’s insistence on Belgrade’s consent for the introduction of a military force reflected Russia’s eagerness both to avoid a further violation of international law, and a NATO ground invasion. Such a position, however, also coincided with Belgrade’s own wishes. Consequently, Russia’s position provided Milosevic with additional room to maneuver, and reduced the pressure exerted on him by the West.

9 “Difficult Progress Towards Peace,” *Rossiiskaya gazeta*, 15 April 1999, in *CDPSP* 51, no. 15 (1999): 12; Trean, Claire. “L’offensive diplomatique promet, elle aussi, d’être longue et difficile.” *Le Monde*, 15 April 1999. (Translation D.S.).

10 Pour, Afsané Bassir. “Les serbes refusent catégoriquement le plan de paix de l’ONU.” *Le Monde*, 18-19 April 1999.

11 Koretsky, Aleksandr. “Milosevic Won’t Capitulate.” *Segodnya*, 20 April 1999, in *CDPSP* 51, no. 16 (1999): 8.

Despite the disagreements between Russian and NATO positions, particularly as far as the nature and the composition of the force were concerned – NATO insisted that the force had to be NATO-led and that a UN Security Council resolution stipulating the introduction of the force was enough for its presence to be legal – a major success was then achieved by Western allies on 6 May 1999. At the G-8 meeting in Bonn, Western leaders and Russia managed to agree on a common set of principles which would eventually form the basis of a UN Security Council Resolution. The G-8 leaders agreed on the need for an immediate and verifiable end to violence, the withdrawal of military, paramilitary and police forces from Kosovo, the deployment of an effective international civilian and security presence endorsed and approved by a UN resolution, an interim administration of Kosovo, the safe return of refugees, the development of a political process to determine the status of Kosovo, and the disarmament of the KLA. Although no reference was made to a NATO-led force, agreement was reached on the need for a military presence to ensure the safe return of refugees and the implementation of a political agreement.

The presentation for the first time since the beginning of Operation Allied Force of a united front significantly altered the picture and reduced Milosevic's ability to oppose Western demands. Further pressure was exerted by the prospect of a prolongation of the bombing campaign over several months and the absence of any cracks among Western allies' positions. On 10 May, Milosevic announced a partial retreat of the Yugoslav army and police forces from Kosovo and showed a readiness to explore the possibility of reaching a settlement on the basis of the G-8 principles. Moreover, on 13 May, according to Russian sources Milosevic expressed his willingness to accept the deployment of an international force, on condition that the force be placed under UN command, that the territorial integrity of Yugoslavia be preserved, and that Western countries did not interfere in Yugoslav domestic affairs.<sup>12</sup> Although by mid-May the Russian and Western positions had moved closer together, disagreements persisted on several

12 "Kosovo: La paix passe par Moscou." *Le Monde*, 14 May 1999.

crucial issues. Firstly, although Russia accepted an important NATO presence within the international military force, it proposed a division of Kosovo into several areas with a separate command for each area. NATO instead insisted on unity of command. Secondly, whereas the West insisted on a total withdrawal of Serbian military, police and paramilitary forces, Russia upheld the Serbian view that some forces should be allowed to stay in the province. Thirdly, Moscow insisted that the overall plan needed Belgrade's approval in order to be implemented. These disagreements allowed Milosevic to think that he still could negotiate an agreement with the West which would preserve the territorial integrity of Yugoslavia, prevent a NATO force from dominating the peacekeeping operation, and if possible, have Russian forces occupy the northern regions of Kosovo which were most dear to Serbia. It was this reasoning that eventually brought him to agree to the final deal presented by the West.

During the last two weeks of May, Milosevic tried hard to rely on Russia for the conduct of negotiations that would take Belgrade's interests into account. Milosevic hoped that some kind of deal that would secure his interests would be reached with the West, as the Dayton peace accords had done four years earlier. On 28 May, during Chernomyrdin's visit to Belgrade, a new Russian-Yugoslav plan was devised and proposed to NATO allies. The plan envisaged, on the one hand, that Milosevic would abide by the G-8 principles, which would form the basis of a UN Security Council resolution. On the other hand, the plan foresaw the introduction of a military force with a substantial NATO contingent. The force would be organized in the following way: NATO forces would be in charge of assisting the return of refugees, disarming the KLA and patrolling the Albanian and FYROM borders of Kosovo, whereas Russian forces would be placed in the northern parts of Kosovo. All the international forces would be under the command of a neutral country, and not under NATO command. Moreover, the Serbian forces would withdraw only partially. Some Serbian forces would be allowed to remain in order to assist the international force in communication and de-mining activities. The NATO countries, however, rejected this option.

## The West and Russia Present a United Front

Despite this setback, the diplomatic efforts continued. On 2 June 1999, Chernomyrdin held long negotiations with US Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott, German Chancellor Gerhard Schröder and Finnish President Martti Ahtisaari. As a result of these talks, Chernomyrdin accepted most of NATO's demands as far as the international force was concerned.<sup>13</sup> It was agreed that NATO would play an essential role in the international force which would be deployed in Kosovo, that this force would be under unified, albeit UN, command, and that no individual sectors would be created. Moreover, it was also agreed that all Serbian forces would withdraw from Kosovo. Russian forces would be present in Kosovo, but their exact chain of command remained to be defined, given that Russia did not want its troops to be under NATO command. In addition, Russia also accepted that the agreement form the basis of a Security Council resolution, within the Chapter 7 framework of the UN Charter. In other words, Russia and NATO were introducing a UN resolution, which if approved by the Security Council would be binding on Milosevic, and after which force could be used legally to impose it.

The joint visit of Chernomyrdin and Ahtisaari to Belgrade on 3 June placed the final necessary pressure on Milosevic to accept the plan. Apparently, during the visit, Chernomyrdin not only assured Milosevic that the document presented to him had been fully cleared with the Kremlin and reflected the views of President Yeltsin and the Russian

13 According to Russian sources, Chernomyrdin dropped a plan that had already been worked out by Russian, American, and Finnish military experts, and which stipulated for the division of the province into four sectors, Russian forces occupying the northern parts of Kosovo, and NATO forces occupying the southern parts of the province close to the Albanian and Macedonian border. The Russian military blamed Chernomyrdin for not being able to uphold the agreed plan and instead "succumbing" to American pressure: Gornostayev, Dmitry and Igor Korotchenko. "Washington Made Skillful Use of Chernomyrdin." *Nezavisimaya gazeta*, 8 June 1999, in *CDPSP* 51, no. 23 (1999): 2. However, as indicated above, Russia's efforts to secure a Russian sector had regularly failed.

foreign ministry, but also told him that this was his last chance.<sup>14</sup> Russia was not ready to support Milosevic if the West decided to send in ground troops, which by now seemed to have become an increasingly likely option. Faced with this alternative, Milosevic decided to agree to Western demands, incorrectly believing that such a move did not represent a total defeat and that many of Serbia's interests were still being secured by the agreement. The territorial integrity of Yugoslavia was being guaranteed, Kosovo was being placed temporarily under UN administration, a referendum on Kosovo's future status was being ruled out, the KLA was to be disarmed, and Serbian forces, albeit in small number, were eventually allowed to return to Kosovo, to secure frontiers and holy places. Although Milosevic would have had to accept an international military presence in Kosovo, primarily dominated by NATO forces, an important Russian contingent would also be part of the forces placed under UN command.

Milosevic was certainly aware that he could not defeat NATO militarily and the prospect of a prolonged air campaign and a potential ground invasion probably tilted the decision in favor of an agreement, especially after having lost the support of Russia, the key upholder of his positions, and the only country that had any chance of exerting real influence on NATO's policy. Probably, the indictment of Milosevic by the War Crimes Tribunal in the Hague and the threats to Milosevic's own financial interests also argued in favor of reaching a deal with NATO.<sup>15</sup>

Several authors have also argued that the main factor which prompted Milosevic to accept NATO's conditions was the reaching of a "secret deal" between him and Chernomyrdin during his visit to Belgrade on 28

14 Gornostayev/Korotchenko, "Washington Made Skillful Use of Chernomyrdin," 1.

15 In late May, the EU drew a "black list" of 300 Serbian people – mostly Milosevic's associates and members of the Serbian leadership – whose bank accounts and property in the EU were seized, and who were barred from entering the EU. The EU demanded that candidates for EU membership also support these measures, thus striking a direct blow to Milosevic's economic interests, located primarily in Cyprus.

May. The deal apparently consisted of Milosevic agreeing to the G-8 principles and Russia securing the northern parts of Kosovo with its military forces. As was already indicated, Chernomyrdin did present to the West a plan which divided Kosovo into zones of military responsibility and which gave Russia control over the northern regions of the province. However, the West rejected such a plan and a new agreement was reached with Chernomyrdin which stipulated a unified command. The “dash to Pristina” was orchestrated by the Russian military, in particular by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who were extremely dissatisfied with the agreement reached by Chernomyrdin. The main aim of Russia’s move was to limit NATO’s gain and to secure for itself a sector which would not be under NATO command. However, logistic difficulties and the absence of diplomatic support from Bulgaria and Romania soon brought to light the limitations of Russia’s operations, and its reliability on NATO forces for supplies and pay.

## The Role of Military Power

The joint Russian-NATO diplomacy certainly played a major role in compelling Milosevic to agree on 3 June to what he probably perceived as a tactical retreat. However, it would be a mistake to dismiss completely other factors, primarily the role of military power, which also contributed to the overall decision by Milosevic to accept Western terms. Operation Allied Force turned out to be a very successful campaign of strategic bombardment. NATO’s attacks eliminated virtually all of Serbia’s oil refining capacities, substantially reduced Serbia’s military stockpiles, and seriously disrupted transportation arteries. However, NATO forces proved unable to defeat Yugoslav military and police forces in Kosovo. It became clear, after the war ended, that despite NATO’s claims to the contrary, the Yugoslav army was able to withdraw from Kosovo almost intact. Very few pieces of destroyed heavy equipment were ever found in Kosovo and no army or police units were decimated by NATO air attacks. However, the air campaign did have an important effect. Although not very effective from a

military point of view, NATO's capacity to sustain a long campaign over many months compelled Milosevic to negotiate his way out of the crisis. His readiness to negotiate resulted most probably from the prospect of facing continuing bombardment over an extended period of time.

Furthermore, by late May, a NATO ground invasion became a more likely possibility, in view of the military ineffectiveness of the air campaign and the negative impact that the coming winter would have on refugees spread throughout Albania, Montenegro and the FYROM. NATO's military strategy as far as a ground invasion is concerned had been confused and incoherent throughout most of the war. Most hints of a ground invasion by Western military or civilian officials were regularly dismissed by NATO leaders. However, the ground option seems to have been discussed more seriously in late May 1999, although doubts remain as to the certitude of NATO's intentions. On 25 May, the NATO leaders agreed to increase the number of KFOR forces stationed in Albania and the FYROM from 28,000 to 45,000 troops, and apparently on 3 June, Clinton threatened a ground invasion if Milosevic did not accept the terms. Whether or not NATO was ready to send in ground troops is difficult to know. In late May, NATO's official position remained that forces would be deployed in Kosovo "within a permissive environment," in other words, only with the agreement of Belgrade. The German and Italian governments remained extremely reluctant to send ground forces and Russia was vehemently opposed to such an alternative. It is still not clear whether NATO was ready to risk internal dissension and further disruption in relations with Russia for the sake of Kosovo, and it is therefore hard to tell whether such threats really affected Milosevic's behavior.

It has also been argued that the growing successes of the KLA against the Serb forces in Kosovo were putting growing pressure on Milosevic to reach a negotiated agreement. The KLA had indeed managed to reorganize itself in mid-May after having suffered severe defeats in April and early May 1999, and had launched several offensives which forced Serb units to concentrate and expose their armor and troops, making them more vulnerable to NATO air power. However, the KLA was far from defeating or dislodging the Serbian forces from Kosovo, as the

Muslims and Croats had done in Bosnia during 1995. It is therefore difficult to argue that the KLA attacks in late May 1999 had a major impact on Milosevic's decision. However, it is possible that the prospect of a military defeat in the near future, by a NATO-supported KLA, argued in favor of negotiating an agreement.

It can therefore be argued that although NATO's bombing campaign did force Milosevic to agree to Western demands, it does not explain why he did so on 3 June 1999. The presentation of a united Russia-NATO front which significantly reduced Milosevic's room for maneuver, and Russia's pressures on Milosevic during Chernomyrdin's trip with Ahtisaari on 3 June very much explain why Milosevic decided to agree at that particular time to Western demands. However, Milosevic was probably convinced that his move was only a tactical retreat, since his army remained intact and the territorial integrity of Yugoslavia was being preserved. Still, he made a complete miscalculation, because NATO forces were introduced in full strength, and the chances of demilitarizing the KLA remained slim.

## Conclusion

NATO's war in Kosovo surprised many in the West because of the cohesiveness of the Alliance and the absence of significant dissenting voices among the various European and American capitals. Political cooperation and the unity of objectives allowed the NATO countries to project their power and impose a "New European Order" in the conflict-ridden area of the Balkans. However, the war had other more negative longer-term consequences. At the regional level, restoration of law and order, reconciliation and economic development proved harder to achieve than initially envisaged. At the European level, Operation Allied Force brought to an end the period of close Russian-Western cooperation, which had become one of the main pillars of post-Cold War European security. Although the war clearly indicated that Russia remained an essential player of European security, little attention was paid to Russia's concerns over the entire military operation. Russia's

initial support for the Yugoslav position provided only a glimpse of how a Russia hostile to the West could potentially hamper European interests and policies. The importance of positive Russian-Western relations for European stability has long been acknowledged by European and American leaders. However, no effective long-term cooperation framework has been established yet, and a tendency to accept as inevitable the degradation of Russian-Western relations seems to have developed among the Western countries. However, only trusting and effective cooperation with Russia can provide an answer to European security.

LUKAS HAYNES

## The Emergency Response of NATO and Humanitarian Agencies

### Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to review the key humanitarian facts of the Kosovo crisis, to outline key features of the humanitarian dimension for the purposes of the conference, to offer my own analysis of those issues for your consideration, and to try and link these issues and lessons to the overall theme of the book – distilling broader lessons for future attempts at cooperative security.<sup>1</sup>

On the surface, one might assume that it should be relatively easy to analyze the humanitarian response to Kosovo, figure out what should have been done differently, and resolve to do that the next time the international community faces a humanitarian emergency with similar features. In fact, my experience in analyzing international efforts in Bosnia, Liberia, Sierra Leone, and now Kosovo taught me at least two important things: Firstly, it is very difficult to find new lessons. The same old issues seem to be arising time and time again and humanitarian practitioners tire pretty quickly of analysts who note a case-specific lesson where they see a chronic structural problem. Secondly, while most complex emergencies exhibit some basic similarities, the political and historical context is always unique. The simple fact remains, that the proverbial 800-pound gorilla hangs over the subject of this

<sup>1</sup> This article is an adaptation of an oral presentation to the New Faces Conference. As such, it is written in a rather informal style and relies on very few footnotes. It should be used for an introduction to the issues and is not intended as research scholarship. The author would like to thank Debby Kleyn, Toby Porter, and David Shearer for their own insights and referrals.

conference and that gorilla is called NATO. As I will argue a bit later, NATO's role in relief efforts affects every aspect of the topic being examined today and unless we can predict NATO's next humanitarian intervention, there may not be too many Kosovo lessons that can be applied elsewhere in the world.

With that said, let us turn to the humanitarian dimension and all its various aspects. The least controversial thing that can be said is that humanitarian agencies were not prepared for the massive numbers of refugees who crossed the border into Albania, Montenegro, and Macedonia during the first days of the NATO bombing campaign against Serbia. During the first week of the campaign, which began on 24 March, some 85,000 refugees fled Kosovo into Albania, some 14,000 fled into Macedonia, and 25,000 into Montenegro. By 9 May, UNHCR estimated that 407,000 people had crossed the border into Albania, 230,000 into Macedonia, and 62,000 into Montenegro. As many experts have observed, the scale of the refugee crisis was certainly greater than any seen in Europe since 1945.<sup>2</sup>

## Background to the Kosovo Crisis

Private voluntary organizations (PVOs) have traced last summer's refugee crisis to various points in 1998, but the UNHCR identifies February 1998 as a turning point, in which serious clashes between the "Yugoslav and Serbian security forces" and the "KLA or suspected sympathizers" led to "severe human rights abuses by Serb security forces," the emergence of the KLA and its increasing control over territory. During this period there was a "limited need" for relief

2 Select Committee on International Development. *Third Special Report, House of Commons, United Kingdom*, 27 July 1999.

assistance but UNHCR and its partners began a major contingency planning exercise which will be described below.<sup>3</sup>

A new stage began in late July 1998, when a “large-scale counter-offensive by Serb security forces” helped them re-establish control over a number of key areas, while intensifying a “campaign of terror and intimidation” including the forced displacement of the civilian population. As a result there was an “increasing need for humanitarian relief assistance” during the summer of 1998 even as the civilian population’s greatest need continued to be physical security.

When Sadako Ogata, the UN High Commissioner for Refugees, arrived in Kosovo in the last week of September 1998, over 300,000 persons were already displaced inside and outside the Kosovo province. The central conclusion of Ogata’s mission was that “no just and lasting solution” could be found without a fundamental change in Belgrade’s attitude towards the Kosovo Albanians. Without this change, Ogata believed, the “ability of the international community to protect displaced persons was clearly limited” and the large-scale humanitarian operation, led by UNHCR, and which involved private relief agencies such as the International Rescue Committee and the *Médecins sans Frontières* would face increasing difficulties.

With the adoption of UN Security Council Resolution 1199 on 23 September 1998, the international community significantly increased its engagement. During the latter half of October 1998, the Serb forces began a partial withdrawal and the KLA began to re-establish its presence. With the deployment of the unarmed OSCE Kosovo Verification Mission and the onset of winter, a significant number of those displaced within Kosovo returned home, or at least to the vicinity of their damaged homes, and in the short term security improved. It was understood, however, that this was an interim humanitarian measure, and not itself the urgently needed political solution.

By late December 1998, the cease-fire was already breaking down and

3 “Appendix 2: Response to the Select Committee’s Third Report from the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.” *Ibid.*

the security forces had embarked with apparent impunity on a series of “winter exercises” with live ammunition aimed at KLA strongholds. These exercises accelerated the cease-fire’s breakdown and caused new displacements of civilians from areas that had not been affected previously. The humanitarian operation expanded accordingly.

A combination of the breakdown of the cease-fire, security threats to the OSCE mission, and highly publicized events such as the Rac’ak massacre on 15 January 1999, led the international community to launch the Rambouillet negotiating process in February. The violence and displacement continued, and accelerated quickly after the talks at Rambouillet adjourned without an agreement on 23 February.

The humanitarian response can be traced back to February 1998, when UNHCR and its partners undertook an intensive round of contingency planning within the region, facilitated by a senior officer from the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), seconded to the office of the UNHCR Special Envoy in the region. These plans, which were adjusted as necessary, met the needs of both the grave situation inside Kosovo described above and of the *limited* movement of refugees and displaced persons in 1998. The 1998 contingency plans underpinned the two appeals the United Nations made that year to the international community for resources to deal with the humanitarian consequences of the crisis, and a fuller description of the results of the contingency planning can be found in those appeals.<sup>4</sup>

However, with the start of the Rambouillet peace process, UNHCR argues that international attention, and thus its own, shifted to preparations for implementing an agreed political settlement. UNHCR was indeed urged by governments to prepare for such a settlement and high-level meetings were convened by the European Commission and governments in February 1999 to consider issues relating to the return

4 United Nations Consolidated Inter-Agency Flash Appeal for Humanitarian Assistance Needs related to the Kosovo Crisis, 1 June-31 August 1998 (June 1998); United Nations Consolidated Inter-Agency Appeal for Humanitarian Assistance Related to the Crisis in Kosovo, 1 June-31 December 1998 (August 1998).

of refugees and displaced persons, as well as to reconstruction in Kosovo.

By early 1999, the humanitarian operation inside Kosovo had a number of the characteristics of UNHCR's operation during the war in Bosnia-Herzegovina, including international convoy teams. By then, some Serb civilians in Kosovo were also in need of protection from the KLA. As was the case during the earlier conflicts in the former Yugoslavia, UNHCR claims that the humanitarian operation made no distinctions except on the basis of needs among the displaced, returnees and others directly affected by the conflict but not displaced. Some 400,000 persons in Kosovo were receiving assistance from an operation widely seen as effective and well coordinated. But the limitations of humanitarian action, in the absence of successful political action, had again been made starkly clear.

Thus, a week before the start of the NATO bombing on 24 March, UNHCR was leading a major humanitarian operation inside Kosovo with 51 expatriate staff. Indeed, UNHCR believes that a key positive element in the early response was the fact that it could deploy staff temporarily evacuated from Kosovo to the FYROM and Albania from the first day of the influxes, and could benefit in these countries from the support of the OSCE Kosovo Verification Mission staff, with whom it had been working closely inside Kosovo.

When the UN humanitarian organizations and their NGO partners had to suspend operations in Kosovo on 23 March, there were thought to be over 260,000 persons displaced within Kosovo, over 100,000 elsewhere in the region, and over 100,000 others who had sought asylum outside the region since early 1998. Unfortunately, the UNHCR's ability to expand its Kosovo operation into Albania and Macedonia was not as successful as its earlier efforts. In the first week of the NATO campaign, some 85,000 refugees fled Kosovo into Albania, 14,000 fled into Macedonia, and 25,000 fled to Montenegro. Even while all the agencies mentioned above had re-deployed staff along the Kosovo border the humanitarian relief community was quickly overwhelmed. As the Serb forces set in motion Operation Horseshoe, the plan for the systematic ethnic cleansing of Kosovo, streams of refugees flooded into Albanian border towns. Those who

were lucky enough to get across the border in the early days found chaos. But many more were forced to remain in a border zone no man's land until the humanitarian response kicked into full gear.

## Key Features of the Humanitarian Dimension

Without walking through the complex chronology of the international response, I would like to turn now to what I see as the most important features of last summer's crisis: the very fact that its occurrence took everyone by surprise. Nothing illustrates this self-evident point better than the testimony of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees, who has admitted publicly that "the speed and scale of the exodus took everyone – including UNHCR – by surprise."<sup>5</sup> Samantha Power, an experienced journalist and insightful commentator on the Balkans, analyzed this point eloquently in a summer 1999 issue of *The New Republic*. According to Power, reporters, human rights monitors, congressmen, and analysts examined every issue except the fate of the ethnic Albanians, on whose ostensible behalf NATO would intervene. Of the 120-plus media questions put to State Department officials during the three days prior to the initiation of the air campaign, just one related to the fate of Kosovar Albanians.<sup>6</sup> Of numerous op-eds and articles in the *Financial Times*, *Washington Post*, *New York Times*, and *The Economist* in the week prior to the bombing, the possibility of a bloody crackdown inside Kosovo was mentioned only in passing.

This raises the first big issue of this analysis: why did no one predict the refugee exodus from Kosovo? According to Power, those who followed the plight of the civilians most closely were also listening to the Albanian leadership, which was pushing for a bombing campaign. More importantly, sympathizers to the Kosovo Albanian cause simply

5 Select Committee on International Development.

6 Power, Samantha. "The Misreading of Milosevic: Who Knew?" *The New Republic*, 26 April and 3 May 1999: 24.

became fed up with what Zbigniew Brzezinski has described as NATO “threatening loudly but waving a wet noodle.” The sad fact is that most sympathetic, pro-bombing hawks – particularly in the humanitarian community – were so desperate to see something done – anything done – that objective analysis of the situation was surrendered. It may just be that those who were best situated to predict the humanitarian consequences of the air campaign, were too emotionally invested to do so satisfactorily. If so, humanitarian executives may have some soul-searching to do.

The second major feature of the Kosovo refugee crisis was the sheer scale of the exodus. This rather basic fact raises the following issues: why were contingency plans such a failure and why was the relief community so overwhelmed? After all, consider the players involved: numerous UN agencies, several government emergency teams, a number of government donor teams; not to mention most of the world’s experienced relief agencies, nineteen foreign military units, and an army of Western media which landed in force in Macedonia and Albania in early April. How could it be that such a broad and rich array of capacities could be overwhelmed? For a possible answer, one Washington advocacy group provides a compelling analysis.

According to the U.S. Committee for Refugees (USCR), UNHCR had planned for the arrival of 65,000 refugees into Albania in 1998 but only 18,000 had come. In 1999, UNHCR planned for 60,000 in Albania and 20,000 in Macedonia.<sup>7</sup> According to Julia Taft, the director of the U.S. State Department’s Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration,

We had also repositioned or in the procured pipeline enough food for 400,000 people for six months ... We of course thought that was going to feed the people inside Kosovo, but it still was available for redirecting them outside.

Nevertheless, USCR concludes that “Despite Taft’s praise, most NGO

<sup>7</sup> “Refugee Reports.” *News Service of the U.S. Committee for Refugees* 20, no. 4 (1999).

and UNHCR field staff in Albania and Macedonia would acknowledge that they could not cope with the massive influx.”<sup>8</sup> Clearly, UNHCR’s experience in 1998 inspired an optimistic, and inadequate, pre-positioning plan for 1999.

The inability to “cope” leads me to the next key feature of the environment: the fact that no agency took an adequate lead in coordinating the international community’s efforts from the outset. Here, David Shearer, a veteran of numerous emergencies, including Kosovo, offers valuable insight:

Having recently downsized its staff from a peak during the Bosnian and Rwandan conflicts, many personnel [of UNHCR] came on temporary assignment for short periods, filling gaps but providing little continuity. Most importantly, however, [UNHCR] failed to appreciate that the Kosovo emergency was totally different in nature from those before it. Reacting to international criticism rather than charting a course that maximized its added value as the international mandated organization for refugees, it tried to follow the template of earlier operations as a major provider of relief assistance involving trucks, water, and camp construction. However, it failed to appreciate that there was no shortage of relief supplies. Indeed warehouses were bulging. What was lacking was the coordination of effort...<sup>9</sup>

What exactly was UNHCR’s difficulty? The old, and borrowed, saying that “you cannot do coordination to people who do not want to be coordinated” appears particularly true of Albania in the first three months of the crisis. UNHCR’s staff, recently exiled from Kosovo, was simply spread too thin. It failed to establish the immediate presence that is key to fundraising in a TV emergency and as a result it received too few cash pledges because key officials in Washington, London, and Brussels vetoed key funding for UNHCR because of their disappointment in the UNHCR’s initial response. While PVOs would eventually find they never had it so good, the UNHCR was forced, unceremoniously, to go searching via CNN for funds.

By 3 April, the UNHCR turned to NATO for help, recognizing that it

8 *Ibid.*

9 Shearer, David. “Are There Heroes?” *The World Today* 55, no. 7 (1999): 5.

was overwhelmed with both the political problem of arranging refugee asylum in Macedonia and the practical logistical problems in Albania. It must be pointed out that the UNHCR requested NATO's assistance only after serious thought about the implications of working with one combatant to the conflict, and the UNHCR had NATO recognize the primacy of the humanitarian effort.

The fact and nature of NATO's involvement is the fourth feature of the emergency. It is generally recognized that the UNHCR did what it could to ensure that refugee camps would not become vulnerable to recruitment by the KLA. However, it had learned a central lesson from the Great Lakes experience; that humanitarian organizations alone cannot, and should not be expected to address disarmament issues. The UNHCR urged governments to take the necessary political and military action to ensure that these important concerns were addressed.

Another veteran of the effort, Toby Porter, provides insight on the most important aspect of NATO's involvement in relief efforts:

There have been many past examples of the military being used in disaster relief operations, and much debate around it, but nowhere has it happened on the same scale as in the Kosovo crisis. The "bilaterals," as they came to be known, were hugely important actors in the relief effort, not only providing logistical support traditionally associated with the role of the military in such instances, but also setting up and managing refugee camps on behalf of the Governments that they represented.<sup>10</sup>

At first, NATO's role was criticized because of the "blurred line between NATO as warring party inside Kosovo and NATO as humanitarian actor outside its borders." However, there was rapid acknowledgement that military logistics and materiel contributions made the crucial difference in the earliest stage in terms of saving lives and buying time for agencies to cope, and increase their capacity. Unfortunately, as Porter points out, the "bilaterals" were problematic. They

10 Unpublished off-the-record manuscript.

forged ahead with camp development, often without the input of experienced site planners. This led to some avoidable mistakes such as the poor siting of latrines, the placing of tents too close to each other and other practical concerns that could easily have been avoided had aid agencies assisted the armies at the planning stage.<sup>11</sup>

Rather than wait for the UNHCR, governments dumped funds on national military-run camps and programs and tried to draw refugees to them. For example, in the border area of Albania called Kukes, major camps in the south were displayed on public notice boards complete with photos of tents, kitchens, playgrounds, etc. Competing camps were displayed next to each other. Like small “briefcase agencies” which do not coordinate well with larger, more experienced agencies, “bilaterals” had little incentive to coordinate with the UNHCR or anybody else and camps were even put up without UNHCR’s knowledge.

Donors and “bilaterals” also encouraged national agencies to work on sites they had developed. For example, the Spanish PVOs were urged by donors to work with Spanish military-run camps, the British with British, etc. This bilateralism always undermines coordination.

The next major feature is the role that the Albanian society played in responding to the exodus. For this aspect, Shearer provides additional insight:

This rather unique and wonderful aspect has been ignored in the attempts by the relief community to establish and publicize programs. It has also been largely overlooked by the media that has focused mainly on only two stories, the bombing and the plight of the refugees coming across the border.<sup>12</sup>

Shearer estimated that 300,000 people had been transported from Kukes by buses, trucks, and train to the center and south of Albania. There, over two-thirds “lived in Albanian homes.” In some homes, a small contribution was made but in most, help was provided for free. “International assistance to ease the burden of host families” was

11 *Ibid.*

12 Shearer, “Are There Heroes?” 4.

“intermittent” and ultimately, it was wholly inadequate.<sup>13</sup>

The sixth feature is that relief funds were abundantly available. The Kosovo crisis saw the highest proliferation of agencies. Over 180 agencies were registered in Tirana, but of varying quality, from the best and most experienced to “briefcase agencies” who were simply drawn there by enormous public funding programs.

According to Porter, this led inevitably to a duplication of essential services with agencies competing for work in the same refugee camps and a great variance in standards among camps. To take one example, there is an obvious problem when people in some camps (like Shkroder on the border with Montenegro) were at serious risk of diarrhea, sleeping in gravel pits, while other refugees less than a kilometer away were enjoying hot showers, television rooms, and basketball courts. Living standards were so high that aid workers began to ask – only half jokingly – whether there should be maximum as well as minimum standards. The per capita spending on refugees varied by a factor of 15 or 20 times depending on the nationality of the camp.

An issue that arises from this discrepancy in spending is the absence of any sense of “absolute” value of money or the problem of shrinking resources. If there is enough money to do anything anywhere in a region, why not install electric showers? Meanwhile, half the refugee population received no help at all. For those living in host families or donated private accommodation – some 270,000 – not a single food distribution was made in the first two months. Porter and Shearer have suggested that this may be the single most important failing of the entire aid effort in Albania.

For the 190,000 in camps and collective centers, there were over a dozen foreign military units, all the major UN agencies, and 150 PVOs with a total budget that may never be known. Just consider the following comparisons: The development costs of the U.S. Army site known as Camp Hope, near the town of Fier, have been estimated by one veteran at \$50 million. A maximum of 3,500 refugees may have

13 *Ibid.*

lived there at any one time. The same sum, allocated to the UNHCR plan to give \$10 per person per day to hosting families would have sustained all of the 270,000 refugees in private accommodation for 4-5 months. Incidentally, the same figure would have almost fully funded the UN's 1999 appeal for Angola. As Porter observes, such comparisons are always uncomfortable, but people familiar with the international assistance system know that there are only finite resources available for overseas aid budgets. That is why comparative judgments are essential.

But the funding issue should not obscure the main achievement of the Kosovo response and my next to last point: the fact that so many people's basic needs were met. This is a truly remarkable feature. Most of the experts who were surveyed for this chapter believe that, by and large, emergency relief needs were completely met. In contrast to most other emergencies in past years, there were no outbreaks of disease, diarrhea, or cholera; no hint of starvation or famine, and no reported deaths of exposure or hypothermia. According to the same expert sources, this success should not be attributed to the international monitoring groups, Western aid missions, or NATO soldiers, but to the Albanians themselves.

Still, it was a very uneven response across the sub-region. I will just summarize some key areas of weakness in the response – given that sufficient resources may have been available to do even more. Veterans of the field operations of summer 1999 tend to identify the following areas of neglect: registration, documentation of war crimes, and expert treatment for psychosocial and mental health traumas.

It is now well-documented that refugees forced to flee Kosovo were deliberately robbed of their most precious identification documents – birth certificates, passports, social security identification, property deeds, etc. This was a deliberate strategy, by Serb forces, to deny future Kosovo Albanian claims or rights under pre-war law and presumably, to obstruct future refugee returns on the assumption that Belgrade would maintain full control over the province. Many field operatives argued, throughout the summer, that officials at border stations – particularly those from the UNHCR – should have recog-

nized this problem earlier and implemented a system of registration for refugee identification, and for documents that may have been taken.

In addition to documenting the lives of Kosovo's expelled citizens, it has also been argued that more attention should have been devoted to documenting the deaths and persecutions that took place prior to refugees reaching the borders of Albania and Macedonia. Advocates say that war crimes evidence should be gathered while memories are still fresh and before witnesses become influenced by social and political forces within refugee camps. Given that some war crimes testimony reached the media while the bombing campaign was ongoing, it can also be assumed that such testimony would have been used in NATO public relations campaigns as well.

Finally, it became painfully obvious to most humanitarian executives that once the basic needs – water, food, shelter, sanitation and urgent medical care – had been met, Kosovo's refugees faced the painful process of dealing with their loss, their trauma, and their ongoing displacement. In addressing these types of needs, refugee camps are notoriously under-staffed by experts in mental health and psychosocial support programming. This crisis is only the most recent example of this short-fall and it is particularly glaring given the rapid and brutal methods which were employed to expel more than a million people from their ancestral homelands.

## So What Are the Lessons?

This chapter identifies several lessons, but for the sake of conceptual clarity, we must distinguish between lessons about the humanitarian response and lessons, considering the focal point of this conference, for future cooperative security efforts. First, on the humanitarian response, whether one concludes that UNHCR's response was unsatisfactory or not, donor governments did not help the situation. Given the politics surrounding the NATO campaign, it became immediately evident that the military was going to be involved and PVOs, UN agencies, and donors should have adjusted quickly – knowing full well that the

military had a comparative advantage in logistics.

Second, there were innumerable calls, within the humanitarian community, for a more coordinated approach and a comprehensive strategy; integrating all the problem areas, utilizing all the agencies, covering all the countries of the sub-region, and envisioning a smooth transition to post-conflict rehabilitation and development programming. Calls for such a strategy usually included the critique that the existing approach was not sufficiently flexible and adaptable to changing circumstances. I would argue that such an emergency strategy has never existed and probably never will. Wherever one sees ad hoc, incrementalist approaches to complex problems, one can usually find calls for a “comprehensive strategy.” Such calls are usually informed by very little analysis. It is simply easier to say: “A more comprehensive strategy is clearly necessary,” than to identify the elements of such a strategy, how they interact, and how one might proceed with implementation. If operational research specialists were to try and model humanitarian emergencies, political scientists would be astounded by the array of variables at work. Such complexity defies easy analysis and organization, and given the essentially political nature of most humanitarian emergencies, no government or international governmental organization is ever going to produce the right strategy for every player in a refugee crisis.

Third, despite the enormous, and quite obvious, problems in coordination – inefficiency, duplication and varying standards of work, to name but a few – the response was impressively adequate and the death toll was negligible considering the population at risk. This is not to say that refugees from Kosovo were forced into a comfortable living situation by any civilized standard. But in comparison with recent emergencies and an evolving standard of humanitarian response, the effort to support Kosovo refugees was impressive by any definition and a comprehensive range of needs were met until this population could return. Two corollaries might be added to this “lesson.” The first is that Albanian host families played an enormous role in reinforcing the relief community’s capacity and bearing a large burden of the assistance. And the second can be overheard in the halls of many western relief agencies, and it goes like this:

If you work with refugees who are relatively well off, as compared with populations afflicted by famine in Africa, and the emergency response is of a short duration, and you throw enough money at a problem, most of the affected population's basic needs will probably be met.

This is a somewhat cynical view about the resources available to refugees from rather developed regions but probably endowed with some truth.

Fourth, the world still needs an international agency that can establish an immediate lead and properly channel the public donations that arise in response to a crisis. The learning curve of the UN's humanitarian community has climbed steeply in recent years but basic problems of coordination still exist. The UNHCR, which enjoyed a superb reputation during the war in Bosnia, suffered a crisis of confidence and funding in response to Kosovo. The OCHA lacks the institutional capacity to coordinate its larger, more functional, UN counterparts but some agency must take the lead. In Kosovo, there was no shortage of overall public resources but the deployment of those resources was clearly inefficient.

Fifth, contingency or preparedness planning is always neglected. No matter how much time or how many resources are available to humanitarian agencies, immediate demands always take precedence. Having worked in two organizations that were extremely committed to analyzing problems that were likely to occur, I can say that such forward-looking planning is never given the time, attention, or consideration it deserves. This is not a criticism; simply a reality arising from the intense pressure on humanitarian agency executives to address urgent needs and save tomorrow's crisis for another day.

Sixth, PVOs need to continue to work at coordinating their donor policy. In this arena unfortunately, those who control the money tend to divide and duplicate effort. For years, PVOs have attempted to coordinate their approach to donors and there has been tremendous progress in this regard. But in the case of emergency responses, there is clearly a lot of work that needs to be done. The most striking feature of the Kosovo crisis in the FYROM and Albania was the extent to which government donors funded programs by their national military units

and national PVOs. Perhaps this is an unavoidable inevitability of a highly public and highly politicized emergency but one wonders: if PVOs would simply refuse to work this way, what alternative would donors have?

Now for lessons that might be relevant to cooperative security. Returning to the first feature of the crisis, it can be argued that many humanitarian agencies failed to anticipate the massive ethnic cleansing campaign by Kosovo Serbs, in part, because they were blinded by a collective desire to see Serb forces punished for the atrocities of 1998 and early 1999. There are many good reasons why analysts may not have anticipated such a campaign but this motive cannot be overlooked. This may also emerge as a fundamental issue in regard to the role of humanitarian agencies in regional conflicts. For years, humanitarian practitioners have sought to understand the role that they play in the politics of conflict, and groups like the *Médecins sans Frontières* have chosen not to work in ways that benefit combatants. If these agencies, or their staff, are going to begin to choose sides or to advocate military action to deter or punish human rights violators, not only might their neutrality and credibility suffer in the field, but their objective ability to analyze events and consequences may also suffer. Objective analysis and action is made more difficult in conflicts where one combatant is intent on the aggressive destruction of civilians and those who work with the innocent are powerless to do so until a third party intervenes to punish or deter further aggression. That dilemma is only compounded when humanitarian assistance cannot be provided without the cooperation of combatants on one or both sides.

As yet, there is little evidence that the neutral, humanitarian reputation of relief agencies did suffer as a result of their collaboration with NATO during this conflict. Why, then, should they not continue to choose sides, based on judgments of who is more responsible for suffering, and cooperate closely with multilateral intervention forces on one side of a conflict? This is a question for them to ponder.

Along these lines, another clear lesson is that PVOs and military establishments need to improve their mechanisms for consultation and coordination in the future. Along those very lines, Andrew Denison has observed that NATO is considering such coordination structures at

present.<sup>14</sup>

The next lesson is one that bears very heavily on the ability of agencies to learn from their mistakes and improve on their practices. The arena of humanitarian response suffers from severe human resource depletion as a result of successive compound emergencies. As one observer confided to me about the quality of staff in Albania:

It was really the B-team that was down there as the A-team has been tied up in other regions or was already burnt out after spending 1998 and half of 1999 in the Balkans. This is a major problem. Agencies have lost their best staff through attrition and we have a tough time retaining talent and wisdom.<sup>15</sup>

Consistent with everything this conference has observed about the Kosovo crisis, there is a particular personnel shortage of individuals who combine analytical perspectives on politics, military strategy, and humanitarian response techniques. And this problem is compounded by the fact that the non-profit or public sector simply cannot compete with the corporate sector in paying competitive salaries to talented individuals.

A final lesson, and one that serves as a deliberate qualifier for this presentation, is that different rules apply to cooperative security between, and applied to, relatively wealthy governments and those of poorer regions. The resource gap is a very real feature of cooperative security, be it the political or humanitarian dimension, and different dynamics apply to NATO and Kosovo than to the Economic Community of West African States Cease-fire Monitoring Group (ECOMOG) in West Africa, to take just one example. Similarly, PVOs operating in conjunction with NATO and ECOMOG face substantially different problems in each region.

14 See Chapter 8 by Andrew B. Denison in this volume.

15 Anonymous source.

## Conclusion

For the sake of conference discussion, I would like to introduce a final issue and admit that I find this question one of the more difficult ones for me to analyze. To what extent is NATO's humanitarian intervention, or what some have described as a new doctrine of "Western moral interventionism," really a trend for NATO or Western foreign policy?

While some schools of the foreign policy elite in Russia and China fear that the U.S. and NATO have ushered in a new era of active interventionism well beyond the border of NATO member states, I tend to believe the alliance will have a limited political and geographic sphere of operation in the next few years. I do not see much rational basis for the assumption that NATO will intervene for humanitarian reasons in Africa, Central Asia, or the Mediterranean basin. But predictions in international relations are dangerous and it is not beyond the realm of imagination to envision a world security environment sufficiently changed to warrant such a change in NATO policy.

In contrast to NATO's rather limited appetite for so-called "out-of-area" operations, those humanitarian agencies with global reach consider it their obligation to provide assistance on a universal basis. As one standard of the field says,

The right to receive assistance, and to offer it, is a fundamental principle which should be enjoyed by all citizens of all countries. As members of the international community, we recognize our obligation to provide humanitarian assistance wherever it is needed.<sup>16</sup>

Ironically, while these agencies have advocated that warring parties accept universal standards for the provision of humanitarian assistance, how often do they actually apply these principles to the balance of their own work? Should they not strive, with their donors, to ensure that the quantity and quality of assistance should be applied evenly to all

16 Code of Conduct for the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and Non-Governmental Organizations in Disaster Relief.

populations with basic relief needs, no matter where those needs arise? Presumably. But when one compares the quality and quantity of humanitarian assistance in Kosovo, Angola, Congo, Sudan, or Sierra Leone, the inequalities are immediately evident. There is literally no comparison.

If the West fails to attach a similar value to the preservation or protection of a human life in Angola as we do in Albania, we are indicating through our actions that there is no universal humanitarian principle. The statistics of the crisis say it all. For every dollar spent on a group of refugees in Europe during the summer of 1999, less than a dime was spent on the same-sized group in Africa.

ERIC A. WITTE

## Reconstructing Kosovo: The Ethnic Dimension

### Introduction

Since the end of the war for Kosovo,<sup>1</sup> the vast majority of the Kosovo Albanians expelled from the province by Serbian forces has returned. Kosovo Albanians now make up well over 90 percent of the population. In the past months, many in this overwhelming majority have taken part in attacks on Kosovo's minorities. Most notably such attacks have been against Serbs, but have also targeted Roma, Gorani and other minorities.

As NATO's KFOR, UNMIK and other agents of the international community have struggled to stop the killings and stem the flow of minority refugees from Kosovo, some have called for the West to give up its hope of restoring a multi-ethnic Kosovo. Three proponents for removing NATO forces and partitioning Kosovo and the rest of the Balkans along ethnic lines are the former US Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, columnist Charles Krauthammer and US Senator Kay Bailey Hutchison.

They argue that the Balkan peoples have fought each other for centuries and always will. As Kissinger writes:

Ethnic conflict has been endemic in the Balkans for centuries. Waves of conquests have congealed divisions between ethnic groups and religions,

1 This paper will use Serbo-Croatian place names (i.e. Kosovo, not Kosova) as these have become the English language standard; their use is not a normative statement on the status of Kosovo.

between the Eastern Orthodox and Catholic faiths; between Christianity and Islam; between the heirs of the Austrian and Ottoman Empires.<sup>2</sup>

Or, as Krauthammer simply states: “The peoples of the former Yugoslavia do not give much sign of wanting to live with each other.” He goes on to write: “If NATO insists on multi-ethnicity [in Kosovo], it will find itself playing babysitter for decades.”<sup>3</sup>

This “ancient-ethnic-hatred” argument for abandoning the Balkans to a sealed fate of bloody wars or ethnic segregation ignores long periods of interethnic tolerance. Indeed, though there have been many bloody wars in the Balkans, national awakening did not sweep Europe until the nineteenth century. Earlier bloodshed, such as the famous 1389 battle at Kosovo Polje that serves as the centerpiece of Serb nationalist mythology, were not interpreted along nationalist lines until nearly five-hundred years later.<sup>4</sup> Partitionists, who interpret Balkan history as proof of cemented ethnic divisions, buy into the historically inaccurate mythology of nationalist leaders. While Kosovo’s modern-day ethnic divide is doubtless deep, it is not ancient, and its causes being largely modern, it is not insurmountable. To assert that there are some groups of people of the “Balkan mind”<sup>5</sup> incapable of living together, is not only specious, but fundamentally at odds with the basic tenets of western liberal democracy.

2 Kissinger, Henry. “The Wrong Invasion.” *The Ottawa Citizen*, 22 February 1999.

3 Krauthammer, Charles. “Multi-Ethnic Folly.” *The Washington Post*, 17 September 1999.

4 See Calic, Marie-Janine. *Krieg und Frieden in Bosnien-Herzegovina*. Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp, 1996, 20-30; Ramet, Sabrina Petra. “War in the Balkans.” *Foreign Affairs* 71, no. 4 (1992), 79-98; Lauer, Reinhard. “Das Wüten der Mythen. Kritische Anmerkungen zur serbischen heroischen Dichtung.” In *Das jugoslawische Desaster: Historische, sprachliche und ideologische Hintergründe*, ed. Reinhard Lauer and Werner Leffeldt, 107-148. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1995; Malcolm, Noel. *Kosovo: A Short History*. New York: New York University Press, 1998, 58-80.

5 See Hoare, Attila. “Misha Glenny and the Balkan Mind.” *Bosnia Report*, March-May 1998: <http://www.bosnia.org.uk/bosrep/marmay98/misha.htm>

Senator Hutchison notes that “peace has yet to take root in Bosnia, a place patrolled by our combat troops since 1995.”<sup>6</sup> This argument against the NATO deployment in Kosovo only recognizes the success of the NATO forces in Bosnia in separating the warring factions for four years. It overlooks many critical omissions of the international community in Bosnia – omissions that have left that country on an unstable footing. The international community has largely failed to remove Bosnia’s nationalist wartime leaders from power, has failed to institute an electoral system that rewards moderates, has failed to arrest the most prominent indicted war criminals, and has failed to adequately address the structural problems of the Bosnian economy.<sup>7</sup> In short, the main lesson of Bosnia for the Kosovo protectorate is not that such intervention is futile, but rather that intervention must go beyond a minimalist approach if it is to succeed.<sup>8</sup>

Those “realists” who dismiss the idea of multi-ethnic Balkan states as “figments of the Western imagination”<sup>9</sup> do not examine the implications of their policy prescription. Not only would a partitioning of these states along ethnic lines reward “ethnic cleansing,” it would also give a green light for majority populations to finish “cleansing” the minorities in their midst. Tens of thousands of Serbs remain in Kosovo;<sup>10</sup> were Kosovo to be partitioned, any of these Serbs wanting to remain in Kosovo Albanian territory would be susceptible to attack. Likewise, any ethnic Albanians wishing to remain in Kosovo Serb territory would

6 Hutchison, Kay Bailey. “The Wrong Invasion.” *The Washington Post*, 13 September 1999.

7 See International Crisis Group. “Is Dayton Failing? Bosnia Four Years After the Peace Agreement.” 28 October 1999: <http://www.intl-crisis-group.org/projects/bosnia/reports/bh51main.htm>

8 See International Crisis Group. “Kosovo: Let’s Learn from Bosnia: Models and Methods of International Administration.” 17 May 1999: <http://www.intl-crisis-group.org/projects/sbalkans/reports/kos21maina.htm>

9 Krauthammer, “Multi-Ethnic Folly.”

10 UNHCR generally puts the figure at 90,000. KFOR claims it is 105,000. Some believe that the true figure is considerably lower. See Hundley, Tom. “Kosovo’s Serbs Fearful Despite Huge U.S. Shield.” *Chicago Tribune*, 10 November 1999.

not be able to count on outside protection. The massive population exchanges implicit in partition scenarios could not take place peacefully. Militias resisting the partition would likely spring up and war would again consume the Balkans.

The calls of partitionists must be rejected if there is to be stability in the Balkans and if the international community is to live up to the values that NATO ostensibly went to war to protect. The only viable future for Kosovo and the region is a multi-ethnic and democratic one; the only viable policy for the West is to guide Kosovo and the region to multi-ethnic, democratic stability.

This is not to deny that reestablishing a multi-ethnic Kosovo will be an enormous challenge after the events of the past ten years. When the regime of Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (FRY) President Slobodan Milosevic launched a war on the Kosovo Albanian civilian population in February 1998, interethnic relations in Kosovo – already strained – took a decided turn for the worse. The international community's failure to intervene to stop Belgrade's war then resulted in a radicalization of many Kosovo Albanians that today represents the greatest hurdle to ethnic tolerance.

There is no panacea for the problems facing minorities in Kosovo today. Efforts at protecting minorities will require many different approaches, and the international community will have to make a strong commitment of time and resources to assure success. To understand the scale of the challenges at hand, it is useful to briefly review the experiences of Kosovo's main ethnic groups.

## The Main Ethnic Groups

### *Kosovo Albanians*

In the post-World War II era, Kosovo's Albanians constituted from 65-90 percent of the province's population. In an effort to diffuse the national aspirations held by many Kosovo Albanians, Yugoslav

president Tito granted the province broad autonomy in the 1974 Yugoslav constitution.<sup>11</sup> While this new status put Kosovo (and Vojvodina) nearly on the same plane as the six Yugoslav republics, some Kosovo Albanians still were not satisfied; some wanted republic status, some outright independence, and a few even wished for union with Albania proper and the ethnic Albanian regions of Macedonia.<sup>12</sup>

In the late 1980s, Slobodan Milosevic used Kosovo to engineer his rise to power by mobilizing Serb nationalist feelings around this powerful symbol. In 1989 he stripped the autonomy of both Kosovo and Vojvodina, a move that triggered the demise of Yugoslavia.<sup>13</sup> In the wake of Belgrade's usurpation of Kosovo's autonomy, Milosevic instituted an apartheid-like regime in the province. Remarkably, resistance to this policy was led by the pacifist Ibrahim Rugova. Rugova and his Democratic League of Kosovo (LDK), enjoying the overwhelming support of Kosovo Albanians, refused to advocate violence toward the authorities or toward Serbs, and set up parallel institutions to circumvent Belgrade's control. Rugova led his people in passive resistance for almost ten years.

Patience with this strategy was severely strained by the West's refusal to include a settlement of the Kosovo issue at the Dayton negotiations in the fall of 1995. According to Vickers, "In the post-Dayton climate, there was a discernible trend throughout Kosovo and the large Kosovar

11 The same status was granted to Vojvodina, a region of northern Serbia with a sizeable Hungarian population. See Vickers, Miranda. *Between Serb and Albanian: A History of Kosovo*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1998, 178-187.

12 Most Kosovo Albanians were repelled by the poverty of Albania. Enver Hoxa's Maoist state was also largely isolated from Tito's Yugoslavia. See *ibid.*, 181-183; Malcolm, *Kosovo: A Short History*, 336-337.

13 See Silber, Laura and Alan Little. *Yugoslavia: Death of a Nation*. New York: Penguin Books, 1997, 37-69; Malcolm, *Kosovo: A Short History*, 341-344; Vickers, *Between Serb and Albanian*, 227-246.

Diaspora towards rejecting the peaceful policies advocated by Ibrahim Rugova.”<sup>14</sup>

With Belgrade’s repression continuing and little hope apparent in the pacifist strategy of Rugova, a small band of rural Kosovo Albanians grew impatient, forming the “Kosovo Liberation Army” (KLA). From April 1996, responsibility for sporadic killings of Serbs, including Interior Ministry forces (MUP), and ethnic Albanian “collaborators,” was claimed by or attributed to the KLA.<sup>15</sup> By February 1998 the KLA had claimed responsibility for some 25 killings.<sup>16</sup>

On 28 February 1998, Serbian special police units, ostensibly in response to the KLA shooting of two police officers, began shelling a number of villages in the Drenica region of Kosovo. Armored vehicles and attack helicopters were also deployed in the operation, during which twenty-five Kosovo Albanians were killed.<sup>17</sup> As villages smoldered, Belgrade built up its forces and further attacks appeared imminent, the Kosovo Albanian civilians were left to wonder who might protect them.

As Bosnia was burning in December 1992, the then US President George Bush warned Belgrade: if Milosevic were to unleash his military in Kosovo, the United States would intervene with force, unilaterally if necessary. Shortly after taking office in 1993, President Bill Clinton reiterated what has come to be known as the “Christmas Warning.” Though war raged in the Balkans until the fall of 1995, Milosevic did not dare to ignite the fuse in Kosovo. Although Kosovo, as a potent symbol of Serb national mythology, would have best served his purpose of gaining nationalist support, Milosevic knew that the

14 Vickers, *Between Serb and Albanian*, 290. The political unrest in Albania also contributed to the radicalization of the Kosovo Albanians in this period.

15 See *ibid.*, 292-313; Malcolm, *Kosovo: A Short History*, 354-355; International Crisis Group. “Kosovo Spring.” 20 March 1998: <http://www.intl-crisis-group.org/projects/sbalkans/reports/kos02main.htm>

16 International Crisis Group, “Kosovo Spring.”

17 See Human Rights Watch. “Humanitarian Law Violations in Kosovo.” *Human Rights Watch Report*, October 1998: <http://www.hrw.org/hrw/reports98/kosovo/>

United States regarded it as a powder keg, and fighting there as a potential threat to the security of all of Southeastern Europe and the NATO alliance. So it was not until February 1998, when his popularity at home was in need of reinforcement, that the Serbian dictator thought it worth risking a test of the “Christmas Warning.”

Much to the dismay of the Kosovo Albanians, the West failed Milosevic’s test. US Secretary of State Madeleine Albright declared:

The only effective way to deal with this kind of violence is through action, not rhetoric – that is the most important lesson of 1991. Moral condemnation and symbolic gestures of concern alone will get us nowhere.<sup>18</sup>

But for ethnic Albanians seeking protection in the spring of 1998, moral condemnation and gestures of concern were all they received from the West. Emboldened, Slobodan Milosevic’s forces rampaged through Kosovo, committing atrocities and rendering tens of thousands homeless.

Though Belgrade claimed its operations were designed to destroy the “terrorist” KLA, its actions, along with the inaction of the West, transformed the KLA from a fringe group into a large organization with broad popular support among Kosovo Albanians. Throughout the spring and summer of 1998, those ethnic Albanians who had lost, or feared losing family, friends or property to Serbian forces, increasingly had nowhere else to turn to for protection but the KLA. By October 1998, Serbian forces had displaced some 300,000 Kosovo Albanians, 100,000 of whom were refugees outside of Kosovo.<sup>19</sup> Beyond seeing the

18 Albright, Madeleine K. “Statement at the Contact Group Ministerial on Kosovo.” 9 March 1998: <http://secretary.state.gov/www/statements/1998/980309.html>

19 Those who blame NATO for the mass displacement of Kosovo Albanians in March-June 1999, often overlook this fact. See *UNHCR 1998 Global Report. Operations in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia*: <http://www.unhcr.ch/fdrs/gr98/fry.htm>; or *UN Inter-Agency Update on Kosovo Situation Report* 69: <http://www.notes.reliefweb.int/files/rwdomino.nsf/3a81e21068ec1871c1256633003c1c6f/ea9c9c3925a4ba9c12566b3004bdd2c?OpenDocument>

KLA as the sole organization promising to try to protect them, many Kosovo Albanians, radicalized by their losses, began to see the KLA as a vehicle for national independence and revenge.

By the time NATO delivered its ultimatum to Belgrade to agree to the Rambouillet terms for the status of Kosovo, Milosevic had over 40,000 army troops and special police firmly entrenched in Kosovo. He also already had a plan, "Operation Horseshoe," to expel hundreds of thousands of Kosovo Albanians into Albania and Macedonia in a bid to destabilize those countries and cement Serbian control over Kosovo. As NATO undertook airstrikes against the FRY from 24 March through the beginning of June 1999, Milosevic's forces carried out Operation Horseshoe with brutal efficiency. The atrocities and mass displacement endured by the Kosovo Albanians in that time led to their further radicalization.

Now that the war for Kosovo has ended and almost all the ethnic Albanians have returned, the greatest challenge to establishing a stable, multi-ethnic democracy in Kosovo is the widespread desire of the Kosovo Albanians to live without Serbs, and the willingness of many of them to act on that desire.

### *Kosovo Serbs*

Ironically, the future of Serbs in Kosovo is so tenuous today primarily because of the actions of Serbs who believed with fervor in Kosovo as the "Serb Jerusalem:" multi-ethnic perhaps, but always to be controlled by Serbs. This dogmatic view, grounded in the mythology of the 1389 Battle of Kosovo Polje, found further support in newer myths, also highlighting perceived Serb martyrdom and victimization.

One of these myths is that of the mass expulsion of Serbs at the hands of Kosovo Albanians over the last 50 years. Indeed the Serb percentage of Kosovo's population has been in consistent decline since the end of World War II. Serb nationalists attribute this to ethnic Albanian-committed "atrocities," even "genocide" in Kosovo, as well as a conscious strategy by Kosovo Albanians to out-breed the Serbs. In reality, though crime and discrimination against Serbs did cause some

to emigrate from Kosovo, the evidence shows that more mundane factors explain the decline in percentage of the Serb population (from 23.6 percent in 1961 to around 10 percent in 1991). Many Serbs emigrated from Kosovo for economic reasons, and Kosovo Serb birth rates dropped while high Kosovo Albanian birth rates were sustained for cultural reasons.<sup>20</sup>

In the period of Kosovo's autonomy, from 1974-1989, Serbs became particularly sensitive to any hint of oppression. Vickers writes: "Kosovo's Serbs, now with a strong victim mentality, felt that a surrogate Albanian national state had been created in Kosovo in which they had become an ethnic minority without the protection of Serbia."<sup>21</sup> Many Serbs were upset that knowledge of both Serbo-Croatian and Albanian was required for state jobs, and that Albanian was now the dominant language in education. Competition for jobs was aggravated by the catastrophic condition of Kosovo's economy. Reinforced by manifestations of Albanian nationalism, such as student-led riots in 1981 following the death of Tito, Serb nationalists sensationalized the "plight" of Serbs in Kosovo.<sup>22</sup> A "Memorandum," written by the Serbian Academy of Arts and Sciences in 1985, asserted that Kosovo Albanians were pursuing the "physical, political, juridical and cultural genocide" of Serbs.<sup>23</sup> The document went on to lay the intellectual groundwork for a "Greater Serbia," the later pursuit of which destroyed Yugoslavia.

The Kosovo Serbs, complaining of real and imagined abuses, were instrumental in the rise of Slobodan Milosevic. Not only did they rally around Milosevic when he came to Kosovo Polje in 1987 and played to their fears and victimization complex; the Kosovo Serbs played a leading role in staging the protests in Vojvodina that destabilized the

20 Malcolm, *Kosovo: A Short History*, 329-333. Vickers, *Between Serb and Albanian*, 170-171.

21 Vickers, *Between Serb and Albanian*, 182.

22 *Ibid.*, 180-185; Malcolm, *Kosovo: A Short History*, 334-341.

23 Quoted in Malcolm, *Kosovo: A Short History*, 340.

government there, allowing Milosevic to seize control.<sup>24</sup> Whipped into a nationalistic frenzy, Serbs throughout Yugoslavia, responding to anti-Muslim and anti-Albanian propaganda, trained their sights on Croatia and Bosnia. However, Washington's "Christmas Warning" spared Kosovo for the time being.

When the "Christmas Warning" crumbled in the spring of 1998 and Milosevic discovered that he could act with impunity in Kosovo too, many local Serbs took up arms and joined in the atrocities committed against ethnic Albanians. Much of the MUP deployed in Kosovo consisted of local Serb men; others were in the FRY army and still others joined paramilitary groups such as the "Tigers" of the notorious indicted war criminal Zelko Raznatovic ("Arkan").

It is not only those Serbs who took part in the 1998-1999 "ethnic cleansing" of Kosovo (many of whom have fled to Serbia proper) but also those Serbs who did nothing, or even the few who opposed the war, that now face retribution by the largely radicalized and nationalistic Kosovo Albanian majority. Upon the return of the Kosovo Albanian majority, many Serbs left, others have been driven out by force, and many have been murdered because of their ethnicity.

Roma, Muslim Slavs, and other minorities have also been targeted for retribution by the returning Kosovo Albanians. The ordeal of the Roma minority is particularly tragic because the Serb forces also maltreated them before and during the war. Often the Roma were forced to bury dead ethnic Albanians, or loot the homes of ethnic Albanians for the Serb forces.<sup>25</sup> Many Kosovo Albanians view the Roma as complices in Belgrade's crimes, and thus legitimate targets of revenge.

24 See Silber/Little, *Yugoslavia: Death of a Nation*, 31-61.

25 See Humanitarian Law Center. "Kosovo Roma: Targets of Abuse and Violence;" and Human Rights Watch. "Abuses Against Serbs and Roma in the New Kosovo." *Human Rights Watch Report*, August 1999.

## Recommendations<sup>26</sup>

Reestablishing a multi-ethnic Kosovo will be far from easy. Given the radicalization of the Albanian majority, in the short run the best that can be hoped for is a halt to the atmosphere of impunity in which killings and expulsions are commonplace. The wounds of Kosovo are so deep, that a real multi-ethnic society, where people of different ethnicities co-exist with genuine tolerance of one another will not be possible in this generation. If such a future is to come about, as it must for there to be stability in the southern Balkans, the international community will have to take important measures on three main fronts. The Kosovo Albanian majority must be deradicalized, much stronger security measures than those now in place must be implemented, and the stability of Kosovo's neighbors must be assured.

### *Measures to reverse the radicalization of the Kosovo Albanian majority*

#### *1. Earned independence*

After their treatment by Belgrade after 1989, but especially after February 1998, the Kosovo Albanians will never again accept Serbian control of Kosovo. Recognizing this reality, however, does not mean that Kosovo's independence should be automatic. The international community holds the future status of Kosovo in its hands and should use this tool to effect the transitions that will set Kosovo on the right path. The international community should openly promise an independent Kosovo, but one that has to be earned by the establishment of multi-ethnic tolerance, a strong civil society and a commitment to democracy. UNMIK and KFOR could clearly establish the steps leading to Kosovo's sovereignty. Backsliding in the form of attacks on

26 These recommendations largely reflect those of the International Crisis Group. See International Crisis Group. "Violence in Kosovo: Who's Killing Whom," 2 November 1999: <http://www.intl-crisis-group.org/projects/sbalkans/reports/kos29main.htm>

minorities or discrimination would publicly be announced as having pushed back the date of independence. Were this policy to be implemented, then those in the Kosovo Albanian majority who promoted ethnic chauvinism and advocated violence would be perceived as jeopardizing independence. It is conceivable that this policy could create a competition of sorts amongst ethnic Albanian leaders, in which they would each seek the claim of being the most democratic, and thus most likely to earn the reward of independence.

## *2. Release of prisoners held in Serbia*

Before, during and after the war for Kosovo, between 2,000 and 7,000 Kosovo Albanians were imprisoned and transferred to Serbia proper. Many of them have not even been charged with a crime. The evidence found by international workers in Kosovo of Serbian police brutality against prisoners, and stories trickling out of the Serbian prisons since the war give reason to believe that these prisoners are being greatly mistreated. The families and friends of the prisoners, and the Kosovo Albanian community at large, are deeply concerned about the fates of those missing in Serbian jails. The many thousands of Kosovo Albanians who are upset about the prisoner issue are thus susceptible to further radicalization. Though the international community has little leverage over Serbia to effect prisoner release, some options are available, and trying costs little.

A UN Security Council resolution could call for prisoner release. This would go a long way toward clarifying the legal ambiguity surrounding the issue. To distinguish between those arrested on legitimate grounds and political prisoners, an ad-hoc body of KFOR contingents, including Russians, together with the UNHCR and the International Committee of the Red Cross could be established. After reviewing each case, political prisoners would be released in Kosovo, and real criminals would be kept in internationally monitored prisons there. The MUP officials involved in the incarceration of these prisoners in Serbia should be identified. They should be informed that they may be involved in crimes within the jurisdiction of the ICTY, and told that their names are being forwarded to The Hague. Short of bringing about prisoner release, this measure could create more humane conditions for

those incarcerated. The MUP officials involved in holding the prisoners should have any foreign assets frozen and have their names added to the list of those banned from travel in the EU and other western countries. The international community should find suitable intermediaries for advocating prisoner release in Belgrade and add prisoner release to the conditions for a lifting of sanctions against Serbia.

### *3. Improve the administration of justice and more aggressively pursue war criminals*

Many Kosovo Albanians claim they know of Serbs living in their midst who committed war crimes between February 1998 and June 1999. The veracity of such claims is difficult to measure; some accusations may be based on motives other than a desire to see justice done. In any case, a functioning system of justice for Kosovo does not exist to sort through such claims. The failure to establish a working justice system gives many radicalized Kosovo Albanians an excuse to take justice into their own hands. Further, it contributes to the “Wild West” atmosphere in Kosovo in which most crimes of any variety go unpunished. For Kosovo to gain a sense of normality, a justice system should be rapidly established, and accusations of war crimes should be aggressively pursued. (Concrete recommendations for doing so are given below, in the section on internal security measures).

### *4. Eliminate partition as a possible outcome*

As argued in the introduction, the partition of Kosovo is not a viable option if Southeastern Europe is to be stabilized. Serb and Albanian nationalists who think a partition of Kosovo is imminent would have an incentive to create facts on the ground and pursue the eviction of all ethnic minorities in their would-be slice of Kosovo; they would also have added incentive to incite ethnic tension in an effort to show that multi-ethnic coexistence is impossible. If Kosovo were to be partitioned, it would set a precedent for others seeking ethnically “pure” states in the Balkans and elsewhere.

To make it clear that a partition will never be accepted, KFOR should urgently address the situation in the divided northern Kosovo town of Mitrovica. NATO forces should aggressively disarm communities on both sides of the ethnic divide, tear down the barricades, and maintain an overwhelming security presence in the town until violence is no longer the norm. The longer French KFOR troops allow the Mitrovica division to continue, the deeper that division will become.

KFOR should increase its presence along Kosovo's northern border with Serbia and root-out any Serbian agents. Russia should never be allowed to have its own sector in Kosovo, particularly in the North. With its dash to the Pristina airport in June, the Russian contingent showed that it could not be trusted. The move destroyed Russia's credibility in Kosovo, allowing speculation that it was part of a deal with Belgrade, whereby Milosevic would remove his troops from Kosovo if Russia would occupy the northern section of the province for later partition.<sup>27</sup> To prevent any possible move by Belgrade to create facts on the ground with an eye to partition, any Serbian military incursions into the 5km-ground or 20km-air exclusion zones should be met quickly with overwhelming force.

##### *5. Improvements to administration of the Kosovo protectorate*

Many in Kosovo are frustrated by the inadequate civilian administration of Kosovo; a lack of administration prevents a return to "normality," and heightens the sense of chaos that feeds ethnic tension. A further source of frustration is UNMIK's lack of consultation with local leaders and its efforts to hinder ad-hoc local administrators in the absence of effective international administration.<sup>28</sup> In some municipalities, such as Prizren, UNMIK has established a parallel administrative institution to the one that the Kosovo Albanians already

27 See Brzezinski, Zbigniew. "Why Milosevic Capitulated in Kosovo." *The New Leader*, 7 October 1999.

28 See International Crisis Group, "Waiting for UNMIK: Local Administration in Kosovo." 18 October 1999: <http://www.crisisweb.org/projects/sbalkans/reports/kos28main.htm>

had in place before the UN arrived. The result has been inefficiency, needless conflict and frustration. In the town of Pec on the other hand, UNMIK has found ways to work with the locals, and real progress appears possible.<sup>29</sup>

The Pec model is clearly preferable. UNMIK should work with local leaders, many of them experienced former LDK administrators of Rugova's parallel institutions, while retaining overall political control. Co-opting indigenous structures will allow UNMIK to more quickly attain an effective administration and, perhaps more importantly, not frustrate the local population. Likewise, UNMIK and other organizations such as the US Agency for International Development (USAID) should decentralize from their disproportionately large headquarters in Pristina. Doing so would put more administrators in the field where they are more needed, and give the organizations a better sense of the situation and needs throughout Kosovo. Every attempt should be made to utilize local NGOs such as the Mother Theresa Society, instead of always duplicating their efforts with international workers.

#### *6. Begin a process of "rolling" municipal elections*

While many Kosovo Albanians would like to hold municipal and provincial/national elections as soon as possible, the conditions necessary for free and fair elections clearly do not exist. On the other hand, putting off all elections for the foreseeable future could further aggravate the frustration and radicalization in the society. Another option is that of "rolling" municipal elections. The OSCE could announce that when a municipality meets its conditions for free and fair elections,<sup>30</sup> an election would be organized in that municipality. When a certain threshold number of municipalities held elections, the OSCE could hold provincial/national elections. This model has several

29 Conversation with a senior US diplomat.

30 Conditions for free and fair elections were defined at the June 1990 CSCE Conference on the Human Dimension. They are reprinted in the *ODIHR Election Observer Handbook*: <http://www.osce.org/indexe-da.htm>

advantages. By holding open the prospect of elections, Kosovo Albanians will see movement towards majority rule. By conditioning elections, that majority rule can only come about when minority protections are in place, open access to media is available, and the prevailing climate of intolerance no longer reigns. Conditionality further rewards progress toward open society while punishing backsliding. In this way local leaders might be inspired to show that they are more democratic than their rivals, and thus more likely to be contributing to local self-rule. Forces of intolerance could come to be looked upon with scorn by the local community, and rendered powerless.

#### *7. Nurture and monitor the progress of the Kosovo Protection Corps*

The formation of the Kosovo Protection Corps (KPC) as part of NATO's disarmament agreement with the KLA is a positive development. The KPC has 3,000 full-time members and 2,000 reservists, not all of whom are former KLA members. Establishing the KPC could go a long way toward co-opting popular support for hard-core KLA elements that refuse to disarm and disband. The KPC has brought the most popular faces of the KLA, such as Hashim Thaci and Agim Ceku, into a NATO-monitored organization. Kosovo Serbs have been brought into the officer corps of the new organization, which if expanded upon, could go a long way toward easing Serb distrust of the KPC. NATO should continue to closely monitor the development of the KPC, encouraging a broader ethnic integration. However, if the KPC experiment goes horribly wrong, becoming exclusively ethnic Albanian and acting out of intolerance, NATO should disband it.

## *Internal security measures*

### *1. Recommendations for KFOR*

Despite an obvious security deficit in Kosovo, KFOR's political leaders are already talking of drawdown and "exit strategies."<sup>31</sup> The only "exit strategy" that KFOR should plan for is success. That means that additional KFOR troops should be deployed, and KFOR's mandate should be more robust. Those troops hunkered-down in well-fortified bases, particularly the case in the U.S. sector, should patrol more of the countryside and offer more protection to the Serbs and other minorities remaining in Kosovo. If force protection is the preeminent concern of KFOR, its mission will fail, and in so doing will likely create even more hazardous conditions for KFOR soldiers. KFOR should seek out still-functioning elements of the KLA, disarm them and disband them. The rules of engagement for KFOR contingents vary widely, and have particularly hampered the effectiveness in the Italian, French, German and U.S. sectors. The British rules are the most robust; these should be enhanced and adopted by all the other KFOR contingents. The Russian, Italian and French contingents should be encouraged to improve cooperation with the ICTY in order to show that local concerns about justice are being addressed. KFOR should continue to take on policing duties until the United Nations International Police (UNIP) and the Kosovo Police Service (KPS) are fully functional. KFOR should act aggressively to remove any FRY operatives from Kosovo, particularly in the North. Likewise, it should more closely monitor the border with Albania to help prevent criminals from conducting widespread smuggling operations.

### *2. Recommendations for the Justice System*

Kosovo's fledgling justice system is in crisis. The core problem is that there has been no agreement on a criminal code. While some at the UN

31 For example, Canada announced on 12 November 1999 that it would withdraw most of its nearly 1,500 forces from Kosovo by summer 2000. See "Canada to Pull Most Troops out of Kosovo." *Reuters*, 12 November 1999.

insist that the Serbian code, modified to conform to European standards, should be used, the Kosovo Albanians want a code of their own. This deadlock has made it difficult for KFOR and UNIP to arrest criminals and detain them for any length of time, even if there is an abundant evidence of guilt. The UN should show flexibility in allowing a new criminal code for Kosovo, not based on that of Serbia. UNMIK has had difficulties in paying the judges in the new justice system, and requires more money from member states for this purpose.

The UNIP presence should be expanded. Only 1,000 UNIP police have been deployed so far. The Special Representative of the UN secretary-general for Kosovo, Bernard Kouchner's call for an increase in the planned force from 3,155 to 6,000 should be heeded. If 6,000 police are not enough the number should be raised again. UNIP's efficiency should be increased by decentralization; police huddled around desks in Pristina will not prevent crime. UNIP should patrol in a highly visible manner to help make a dent in the atmosphere of impunity. The first 173 graduates of KPS training began patrols on 2 November 1999; among them were eight Serbs. The training and deployment of the KPS should be closely coordinated with UNIP and KFOR, and further integration of the force should be strongly encouraged.

#### *Measures to foster Balkan stability*

The fate of Kosovo will also depend on that of its neighbors. The international community must learn to see stability in the South Balkans as indivisible. The most important regional factor for Kosovo's stability is Slobodan Milosevic's continuing grip on power in Belgrade. As long as he remains in power, he may be tempted to restart the war for Kosovo to fan the flames of nationalism and undermine his domestic opposition. The West should continue to work toward the ouster of Milosevic – the first step in Serbia's long road to democracy.

It is also conceivable that Milosevic could try to destabilize the fledgling multi-ethnic democracy in Montenegro, either by assassination, military invasion, or by flooding the tiny republic with Muslim refugees from the Sandzak region of the FRY. In any case, the overthrow of democracy in Podgorica could also destabilize Kosovo anew by

flooding it with ethnic Albanian refugees. The West should learn from its failures in Croatia, Bosnia and Kosovo, and issue a credible threat of force to Belgrade now. If Milosevic moves to undermine Montenegro despite such a threat, NATO or a coalition of the willing should react immediately and with overwhelming force. Delaying such action would again raise the costs to all involved of an inevitable intervention down the road.

Continuing instability in Albania undermines the prospects for success in Kosovo and must be addressed. The lip service paid to the Stability Pact must be backed up with resources. The European Union must take the lead in addressing Albania's political and economic problems. NATO should help the Albanian government regain control over the North of that country. Otherwise lawlessness in northern Albania will only encourage organized crime networks to further expand their operations in Kosovo. In dealing with Albania and Kosovo, it must be made clear that there will never be a "Greater Albania" and that Kosovo's borders will never change.

The threat of the FYROM unraveling is now a somewhat remote possibility, but one that nonetheless should be taken seriously by the international community. If Macedonia were to disintegrate, it would have a far-reaching impact, among other things calling into question Kosovo's borders. It is conceivable that Macedonia's ethnic Albanian minority could seek to join Kosovo. Through financial incentives, the FYROM should be encouraged to maintain its progress toward becoming a multi-ethnic democracy with adequate minority rights. It should be made clear to the Albanian minority in Macedonia that there will be no sympathy for separatist sentiments if Macedonia affords it minority protections that meet European standards.

## Conclusion

Interethnic relations in Kosovo are disastrous. Partitioning the province is not a viable option, and multi-ethnic tolerance will not likely be possible in this generation. For it to be possible in the next, the international community will have to maintain a dangerous, expensive and frustrating presence in Kosovo for years to come. The international community could have avoided this burden by intervening before it was too late – before thousands of Kosovo Albanians were systematically executed, tortured or expelled by Serb forces, before an untold number of Kosovo Albanian women were raped, and before thousands of Kosovo Albanian houses were looted and razed. By failing to act before such brutality radicalized the Kosovo Albanians, the West had a hand in creating the anarchy and intolerance prevalent in Kosovo today. It now has a responsibility to compensate for its negligence by staying until Kosovo's shattered society has healed.

ROBERTA N. HAAR

## The Kosovo Crisis and its Consequences for a European Security Architecture

It is debatable whether Europe has a “security architecture,” a term coined by James Baker III in the early 1990s. Some, such as Sir Michael Howard, have challenged the appropriateness of the architectural metaphor and have suggested that gardening might provide a closer approximation in terms of the uncertainties involved and indeed what the eventual form may look like. The question of the effect of the Kosovo crisis on Europe’s security architecture depends upon whether one believes that there was a security framework prior to the conflict and whether one might emerge as a consequence of the crisis. This chapter argues that a workable European security architecture did not exist prior to the conflict and the chances of one emerging post-crisis are mixed but better than at any time in the past ten years.

### Was There a European Security Architecture Prior to the Kosovo Crisis?

The idea of the post–Cold War security architecture was introduced by James Baker III, the then U.S. Secretary of State, to the Berlin Press Club in December 1989, in the context of his appeal for “A new Europe, a new Atlanticism.” The new architecture, Baker explained, must have a place for “old foundations and structures that remain very valuable – like NATO – while recognizing that they can also serve new collective purposes.”<sup>1</sup> Key to his ideas and subsequent iterations is the

1 See James Baker III in: Rotfeld, Adam Daniel and Walther Stütze. *Germany*

belief that the architecture should “reflect that America’s security – politically, militarily and economically – remains linked to Europe’s security.” The architecture, as such, was to center upon some type of new transatlantic bargain with NATO as the undisputed keystone in whatever structure emerged.<sup>2</sup> The basic ideas laid out in Baker’s address soon marked the boundaries of the deliberations on Europe’s future security architecture. On the one extreme were those, like Charles Kupchan, speaking of an Atlantic Union<sup>3</sup> and, on the other, the French rejection of American leadership and hegemony in favor of European (read French)-led initiatives and structures.

Earlier calls by Soviet premier Mikhail Gorbachev for a common house of Europe highlight the fact that the “Europe” in question was one of increasingly flexible geometry and would have to extend beyond the elite membership of the NATO sixteen. Although space does not permit a detailed retrospective, the Gorbachev and Baker versions of the “security architecture” illustrate the profound difficulty of tying down “Europe” in security terms. There were, by the early 1990s, at least three competing “security architectures.” First, the Russian comprehensive security concept with the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE, soon to become OSCE) as the preferred institutional base.<sup>4</sup> Second, the security architecture preferred by the

*and Europe in Transition*. Oxford: SIPRI/Oxford University Press, 1991, 96. For a good analysis on the importance of Baker’s speech see Vanhoonacker, Sophie. *The Bush Administration and the Development of a European Security Identity*. Maastricht: European Institute of Public Administration, 1999, 106-112.

- 2 Kori Schake, Amaya Bloch-Laine and Charles Grant point out that the European Community/Union (EC/U) and the U.S. have been debating the form of the new transatlantic bargain and the goal of building a European security and defense identity (ESDI) that “shares more of the transatlantic security responsibility ... for ten full years.” See Schake, Kori, Amaya Bloch-Lainé and Charles Grant. “Building a European Defence Capability.” *Survival* 41, no. 1 (1999): 20-40.
- 3 Kupchan, Charles. “Reviving the West.” *Foreign Affairs* 75, no. 3 (1996): 92-104.
- 4 The CSCE was launched in 1972 as a “process” or framework for negotiation and mediation in the field of security. All the European states, all the members

U.S. and its more Atlanticist allies, such as Britain, which was built around a slightly modified NATO with more European participation, but (implicitly) with America's continued assumption of the leading role. Finally, as the EC approached the 1991 Maastricht Summit, there was the EC member states' idea of a CFSP which had been agreed upon, although frustratingly little consensus could be found on the details. France, in particular, was anxious to promote the last option as a European alternative to an U.S.-dominated security order for Europe.

The 1990-91 Gulf War, and in particular Operation Desert Storm, shaped the debate about Europe's security although it provided little agreement. It pointed out the heavy reliance upon U.S. leadership and military resources and, incidentally, the continuing importance of basing access in Europe as a platform for American force projection. Ultimately, the Gulf War was to be less than helpful to the Europeans and their debate on future security structures for two reasons. First, the Gulf War turned out to be atypical of the type of conflict that would come to characterize post-Cold War Europe and indeed the international system. The Gulf War in other words did not act as a stimulant to the recognition of diplomatic and military challenges of intra-state rivalry. Second, the coalition that drove the Iraqi forces out of Kuwait was built around a preponderance of U.S. military power. The decisive results of at least the military campaign may have encouraged the supposition in many European capitals that there were few, if any, potential security threats to Europe that would not elicit an American response. These factors, combined with the strong attack by the Bush administration on the EC's consideration of "Europe-only" security options (in the form of the notorious Bartholomew memorandum of 1991),<sup>5</sup> encouraged dependence upon the U.S. for the shape and form of the developing security architecture.

of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), Canada and the U.S. are members.

5 See Duke, Simon. *The Elusive Quest for European Security: From EPC to CFSP*. Basingstoke: Macmillan/St. Antony's, 1999, 95-96; and Vanhoonacker, *The Bush Administration and the Development of a European Security Identity*, 119-124.

Even at the height of its unipolar moment, which was probably during the lead up to and the immediate aftermath of the Gulf War, it is not clear that Washington actually had a vision of the “architecture” beyond reinforcing NATO’s prominent role and its leadership position within the north Atlantic alliance. Moreover, the signs that the Bush administration was sending *vis-à-vis* European-led security initiatives were generally negative. The European allies however were themselves scarcely more constructive. In spite of the grandiose talk surrounding the emerging CFSP, there was little substance. Indeed, the early to mid-1990s were remarkable because of the apparent tension between discussions of CFSP and the way in which potentially far-reaching decisions on national defense and security were made (with little or no consultation amongst the NATO or WEU<sup>6</sup> allies).

Talk of emerging structures continued throughout the decade. For example, at the 1994 NATO summit in Brussels, members expressed their support for the development of an ESDI, whereby the European members of the Alliance assumed greater responsibility for common defense and security.<sup>7</sup> Real institutional change also took place. For example, the CSCE became the OSCE and gained a pan-European structure. The WEU, somewhat bizarrely, also enjoyed a revival at the hands of the French, who wished to re-launch it as the centerpiece of a European security identity, and the British, who wished to tie it firmly to the European pillar of NATO. The EU and NATO also both reached

6 The WEU has 28 states as members. Its task, as outlined in the 1991 Maastricht Treaty on European Union, is to elaborate and implement the defense-related decisions and actions of the EU. Since the December 1998 Blair-Chirac St. Malo summit and the Washington 1999 NATO summit, the WEU has been winding itself down in preparation for the transfer of certain relevant functions to the EU.

7 Kori Schake writes: “The strong pressure for an ESDI from 1990-1995 was motivated in part by concern from European governments that the United States would lose interest in Europe after the Cold War.” See Schake, Kori. “Europe after NATO Expansion: The Unfinished Security Agenda.” University of California Institute on Global Conflict and Cooperation, Policy Paper 38: <http://irpsserv26.ucsd.edu/igcc2/PolicyPapers/pp38.html>, 9.

out to Central and Eastern Europe with Europe Agreements<sup>8</sup> and the Partnership for Peace (PfP)<sup>9</sup> simultaneously but, in retrospect, with more interest in providing ante chambers rather than precise paths to membership of the select “western clubs.”

The collapse of Federal Yugoslavia and the subsequent Bosnian crisis illustrated all too well that there was no workable European security architecture whatsoever.<sup>10</sup> Responses to the crisis were centered on somewhat face-saving agendas for all of the institutions mentioned above. The CSCE/OSCE was in the midst of a facelift, based upon its 1990 Paris Charter, and events in Bosnia therefore caught it in a transition phase. A similar comment could be made concerning the EC. In the process of trying to become the EU, which early on claimed the diplomatic center stage only to be embarrassed by a very public display of disunity on the question of recognition of Croatia and Slovenia, the members were caught in disarray. As Pappas and Vanhoonacker observe,

- 8 The European Council adopted the Europe Agreements in August 1990. They were extended to Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Poland because the three were deemed the most economically and politically advanced states of the former Communist Bloc and thus had the most potential to become associated with the EC. The idea behind the agreements was that they should lead to eventual EC/EU membership.
- 9 PfP is NATO's initiative to develop a security relationship with initially 27 countries (three have since become full NATO members) of the former Communist Bloc. The idea behind PfP was to “promote a spirit of practical cooperation and commitment to the democratic principles which underpin our [the NATO] alliance:” see “Partnership for Peace: Invitation, 10-11 January 1994:” <http://www.irlgov.ie/iveagh/policy/pfp/pfpeg/pfpa2.htm>
- 10 Various scholars have argued that the large number of institutions involved in European security is part of the problem: “Why is it necessary to have so many institutions to take care of security in Europe? Is it not an obstacle to efficient crisis management in Europe? Does it not produce an unnecessary overlapping and unreliable division of labour?” See Kintis, Andreas. “NATO-WEU: An Enduring Relationship.” *European Foreign Affairs Review* 3, no. 4 (1998): 537.

...the first five years of CFSP will primarily be remembered for the EU's incapacity to deal with the crisis in Yugoslavia. Instead of being "the hour of Europe," the conflict became symbolic of the impotence of Europe's foreign policy and the continuing importance of the United States in guaranteeing European stability.<sup>11</sup>

In the end it was NATO, in the throes of developing its "New Strategic Concept," which eventually did provide a military solution.<sup>12</sup> However, this military response was built heavily upon U.S. initiative, leadership and military muscle.

One alternative "architecture," which received little or no mention in relation to the crisis in the former Yugoslavia, was the rejuvenated UN. However, the potential for immense friction between the UN (as the political authority in Bosnia) and NATO (as the provider for the military wherewithal on the ground) pointed to obvious limitations. The lack of an indigenous peacekeeping force also condemned the UN to the familiar role of providing the resolutions to underpin the diplomatic and military actions. Although Bosnia exposed some of the shortcomings of whatever structures were emerging, because the crisis occurred so early in the post-Cold War era none of the institutions or member states involved were subject to vigorous criticism or reform.

What emerged in the aftermath of the conflict in Bosnia is viewed by some as a "security architecture" although it is more of a necessary fiction based on political considerations. Two meetings of the North Atlantic Council, in Brussels and Berlin in 1994 and 1996 respectively,

11 Pappas, Spyros A. and Sophie Vanhoonacker. "CFSP and 1996: A New Inter-governmental Conference, and Old Debate?" In *The European Union's Common Foreign and Security Policy*, eds. S. A. Pappas and S. Vanhoonacker, 4. Maastricht: European Institute of Public Administration, 1996.

12 The New Strategic Concept, announced in April 1999 at NATO's 50th Anniversary Summit in Washington, D.C., is far more ambitious than the 1991 doctrine it replaced. For the European members of NATO the concept "acknowledges the resolve of the European Union to ... take decisions and approve military action where the alliance as a whole is not engaged." "An Alliance for the 21st Century: Washington Summit Communiqué, 24 April 1999:" [http://www.esteri.it/eng/archives/arch\\_press/miscpapers/do240499e.htm](http://www.esteri.it/eng/archives/arch_press/miscpapers/do240499e.htm)

assured the future of NATO's role as *primus inter pares* in European security. However, the meetings did open up the possibility of NATO *lending* resources to the WEU, which, in turn, assumed primary responsibility for "Europe-only" operations. The U.S. had in May 1994, under the first Clinton administration, already made clear in Presidential Decision Directive 25 that there may be certain circumstances in which the U.S. would have no compelling reason to intervene if no vital national interests were at stake. Specifically, the provision of "separate but not separable" forces would be provided to European members of NATO through the Combined Joint Task Force (CJTF) Concept. The precise circumstances in which NATO would loan key resources to "Europe only" operations were far from clear however. This oversight did not matter so long as there was no looming threat to European stability. More importantly, the meetings created the illusion of the "Europeanization" of NATO. As Philip Gordon observed, this resulted from the fact that "all the main players in the Berlin agreement have an interest in claiming that [Europeanization] is happening."

France needs to claim a greater role for Europe as political cover to come back into the Alliance; Germany needs to show progress toward European political unification to reassure its elite and to convince its public to accept monetary union; Britain wants to show a strong role for the WEU to forestall calls to give the EU a defense role; and the U.S. administration needs to be able to claim to Congress and the public that the Europeans are now prepared to shoulder more of the defense burden of transatlantic defense.<sup>13</sup>

At the center of what Gordon dubbed the "convenient myth" is the idea that the WEU members can address the problem of resource constraints through the use of NATO assets. But, NATO actually has very few assets of its own, with the exception of approximately 13,000 personnel assigned to NATO military commands, some air defense systems, petroleum-oil-lubricant pipelines, some fixed communication assets,

13 Gordon, Philip H. "Does the WEU Have a Role?" *The Washington Quarterly* 20, no. 1 (1997): 131.

and around thirty Airborne Early Warning and Control Systems (AWACS). Beyond these Alliance assets, any military operation (be it WEU, NATO or an *ad hoc* coalition) is reliant upon national assets, especially those of the U.S. who in certain areas is the sole possessor of certain key assets. Well-known gaps in European military assets include long-range transport vehicles, an extensive satellite monitoring network and an intelligence network.

The “convenient myth” that the Europeans could address their own regional problems, utilizing NATO assets, was also built upon the presumption of a continued U.S. military presence in Europe. Italy’s willingness to allow unlimited use of its military facilities during the Gulf War, Spain’s logistical support or Portugal’s decision to allow broad access to facilities in the Azores are all examples of Europeans accommodating U.S. military wishes in the interests of good alliance relations. On the other hand, these examples also serve as a reminder that American security commitments to Europe are essential to U.S. military projection into adjoining areas such as the Middle East or North Africa. Indeed, if developments since the end of the Gulf War are an indication, the activities of the U.S. European Command (USECOM) have grown faster than any other U.S. command (six “out-of-area” operations were either launched or sustained in 1994 alone).<sup>14</sup> The continued use of Europe-based U.S. forces for operations in the surrounding areas is however one that is more likely than not to generate disagreement between the U.S. and its European allies since in many areas of foreign policy, such as the Middle East, the respective positions have differed.

The holes in the “convenient myth” were glaringly revealed in March 1997 with the crisis in Albania, following the collapse of a government-backed pyramid investment scheme. Indeed, the Albanian crisis was to

14 USECOM has deployed forces 51 times to 30 countries since the end of the Gulf War. The six operations referred to are DESERT SHIELD/STORM (Iraq, August 1990-) PROVIDE COMFORT (Northern Iraq, 1991-December 1996), PROVIDE PROMISE (Bosnia and Herzegovina, July 1992-January 1996), DENY FLIGHT (Bosnia, April 1993-), ABLE SENTRY (FYROM, June 1993-) and SUPPORT HOPE (Rwanda, July-September 1994).

provide a telling indictment of the lack of any effective European security architecture. Following the crash of the investment scheme, widespread insurrection and looting took place while thousands of refugees appeared along the Italian coastline. However, no concerted institutional response, beyond the niceties of suitable diplomatic noises, emanated from the various organizations and member states. It was a coalition led by the Italians (as the most directly involved) that eventually secured some semblance of peace and stability in Albania. The WEU then did play an important role in re-establishing civil order with its Military Police Advisory Element.

This brief overview of post–Cold War European security prior to the Kosovo crisis leads to three conclusions. First, there was no effective security architecture in place before the crisis. Second, in spite of the development of new institutions, such as the PfP or CJTF, and the apparent relevance of an increasing number of organizations which could lay claim to some sort of legitimate security role in Europe, none were used effectively to stem the crisis. Instead *ad hoc* mechanisms were continually relied upon. Just as the Gulf War had relied upon a coalition so too were the responses to subsequent crises. Bosnia saw the emergence of the six-member Contact Group (France, Germany, Italy, Russia, Great Britain and the United States) in 1992 at the London Conference on the Former Yugoslavia. The Contact Group would later also assume importance in the Kosovo crisis. Third, there was no compelling evidence that the U.S. was prepared to assume leadership in post–Cold War European security structures which would involve substantial or even minor risk to its military personnel, nor was there evidence that the European allies were capable of organizing a “European” response on their own. The latter was made a good deal more problematic with the projected expansion of both the EU (adding neutral and non-aligned members) and NATO (which raised considerable diplomatic questions regarding Russia’s legitimate security interests in Europe).

Thus, the Kosovo crisis that unfolded in 1998-99 had consequences for individual security-related organizations and the member states thereof, but it had no consequences for a “European security architecture” since, ostensibly, it did not exist. Perhaps a more interesting issue is the

potential for the crisis to actually foster the creation of such a framework – a “European security architecture.”

## Lessons Learned from the Kosovo Crisis

Cause and effect are notoriously difficult to measure. Had there been an effective European security architecture in place, the crisis might not have erupted or it might have been less devastating. While this is essentially a matter of conjecture, we do know that experts and analysts had been warning since, at least, the 1995 Dayton Accords, of the precarious state of Belgrade-Pristina relations. Indeed, the potential for tension if not conflict was apparent from Kosovo’s notable omission from the Dayton Accords. As it turned out, however, it appeared military planning, for what became Operation Allied Force, came about only as the result of a prolonged game of bluff. More disappointingly, it appeared that there had been no proper humanitarian relief planning, needed to address the refugee crisis pouring out of Kosovo after NATO bombs began to drop.<sup>15</sup>

The “structure,” such as it was, that might have deterred Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic from his nationalist and aggressive actions was built around U.S. involvement and crucially its willingness to back diplomacy with the threat or actual use of force. After the failure of the October 1998 agreement between U.S. Balkan Envoy Richard Holbrooke and Milosevic came the fruitless Rambouillet negotiations near Paris from 6-23 February and again from 15-18 March. Both diplomatic efforts depended very much upon Milosevic’s perception of the credibility of NATO’s threat and the unity of its members. This testing of credibility was equally clear to the NATO members themselves, as Adam Roberts points out,

having become deeply involved in 1998 in international diplomacy regarding Kosovo, particularly in making military threats to Belgrade and in un-

15 “Don’t Let the Endgame Be His.” *The Economist*, 10 April 1999.

derwriting agreements, NATO would indeed have lost credibility had it not acted after it became apparent that agreements were not being observed.<sup>16</sup>

As a result, through most of the crisis the alliance showed impressive solidarity. The only wavering came from Greece and Italy, when they asked for a “bombing pause” after the first night of NATO bombing, and Germany, when it asked for a similar pause some three weeks later.<sup>17</sup> This solidarity paid off, as ultimately “the air campaign succeeded” and “NATO achieved its objectives without launching a ground invasion or changing its demands.”<sup>18</sup>

The “European option” in Kosovo, like that in Bosnia, was primarily limited to diplomatic and economic pressure. The Amsterdam Treaty, which entered into force during Operation Allied Force on 1 May 1999, saw few changes to the earlier Maastricht Treaty. In spite of the welcome addition of the High Representative’s post (*Monsieur PESC*, the French acronym for Mr. CFSP) and the Policy Planning and Early Warning Unit, neither existed in time to have any impact on the Kosovo crisis.<sup>19</sup> Moreover, despite the welcome modifications or changes that may be of benefit for future Kosovo-type scenarios (such as specifically including humanitarian and rescue tasks), the Amsterdam Treaty did nothing to change the acute nervousness of member

states towards assuming a greater military role through the CFSP.<sup>20</sup> As

16 Roberts, Adam. “NATO’s ‘Humanitarian War’ Over Kosovo.” *Survival* 41, no. 3 (1999): 102-123; 108. See also Duke, Simon. “From Amsterdam to Kosovo: Lessons for the Future of CFSP.” *Eiposcope* 2 (1999): 2-15.

17 Eurobarometer polls show that 97 percent of the Greeks were opposed to NATO air strikes. See Betts, Paul. “Italy: Demand for End to Bombing.” *Financial Times*, 27 March 1999; and Rodman, Peter W. “The Fallout from Kosovo.” *Foreign Affairs* 78, no. 4 (1999): 45-51; 46.

18 Daalder, Ivo and Michael E. O’Hanlon. “Unlearning the Lessons of Kosovo.” *Foreign Policy* 116 (1999): 128-140; 128.

19 Duke, *The Elusive Quest for European Security*, 135.

20 See Peterson, John and Helene Sjursen. eds. *A Common Foreign Policy for*

a result, the EU's role was largely confined to diplomatic intercession through the Contact Group, which represented only four of the EU's members, and economic sanctions against Serb assets held in EU countries. The WEU, the EU's military component, played only a minor role (helping Albanian police deal with the refugee crisis.<sup>21</sup> Charles Grant, the director of the Centre for European Reform in London, bluntly assessed the situation: "Post-Amsterdam," he wrote, "Europe's security architecture remains an unsatisfactory mess."<sup>22</sup>

The OSCE played a more visible role, chiefly in the October 1998 Kosovo Verification Mission, which was established after the October agreement between Holbrooke and Milosevic with the primary task of observing compliance on the ground.<sup>23</sup> But the monitors' extreme vulnerability necessitated the presence of an extraction force in nearby FYROM. This force, in turn, was under the overall direction of NATO's Supreme Allied Commander Europe (SACEUR). The OSCE's vulnerability was all the more worrying in the face of earlier Serb willingness to kidnap UN forces in Bosnia for use as human bartering chips. The OSCE was moreover slow in deploying and the limited numbers, which never reached the projected force of 2,000, also pointed to problems with the OSCE's ability to react in sizeable numbers.

Whatever architecture was, or was not, in place, the Kosovo crisis represented not only a challenge to regional security but a far wider

*Europe?* London: Routledge, 1998, for a discussion on the "capability-expectations" gap, which refers to the "gap between what CFSP is intended to achieve by its advocates, and the day-to-day reality of the reluctance of many (if not most) national governments to transfer or even share sovereignty over what is still thought to be one of the fundamentals of statehood."

21 Taylor, Simon. "Union Armed and Ready to Replace the WEU." *European Voice*, 6-11 May 1999.

22 Grant, Charles. *Can Britain Lead in Europe?* London: Centre for European Reform, 1998, 45.

23 The October agreement was designed to withdraw Serb forces from Kosovo, bring an end to the violence and allow refugees to return. Milosevic agreed to comply only after airstrikes were threatened.

challenge, the results of which are still far from clear. Admittedly, this challenge had been made before by the crises in Burundi, Rwanda and Somalia, to name but a few. But Kosovo prompted an entirely different reaction since it was part of Europe and therefore it had direct consequences for the largest congregation of big, developed and industrialized states in the international system. Kosovo brought to the fore some fundamental issues for the international community that other conflicts may have highlighted as well, but not in such a visible manner. Kosovo was, for a start, part of a sovereign state.<sup>24</sup> The implications of any projected external intervention were therefore profound for the concept of sovereignty and indeed the international system.<sup>25</sup> It was, and still is, also unclear whether any intervention on humanitarian grounds required a UN mandate or, for that matter, what the implications might be for international law. The potential effects of the crisis on Russia are likewise cloudy. Unlike crises in other parts of the world, like Burundi, Rwanda or Somalia, these issues could not be fudged in what was after all genocide happening on the edge of a continent that had collectively vowed “never again.” The longer-term consequences of intervention were far from clear as well. Might it lead to an international protectorate of sorts or “ward of the international community” and, if so, for how long and under what conditions? Moreover, as Ivo Daalder and Michael O’Hanlon point out, although the UN

was given political control of Kosovo and charged with managing the mammoth task of building a stable, peaceful, and hopefully democratic Kosovo ... [this] responsibility ... exceeds anything the organization has done before.<sup>26</sup>

There is not the space or the need to go through the crisis in detail but

24 It should be pointed out that NATO’s expressed aim was to safeguard Kosovar Albanian human and civil rights while preserving the territorial integrity of the FRY. See “Statement on Kosovo,” NATO Foreign Ministers meeting in Luxembourg, 28-29 May 1998.

25 See Roberts, “NATO’s ‘Humanitarian War’ Over Kosovo.”

26 Daalder/O’Hanlon, “Unlearning the Lessons of Kosovo,” 135.

there is a need to focus upon the outcome/impact of certain events that contributed to the formation of what was lacking prior to the crisis – a European security architecture. In short, these are the lessons learned from the Kosovo crisis:

1. NATO's role in Kosovo was central but it was also the first time that the Alliance was in combat, as opposed to merely posing as a deterrent force. The Alliance was found wanting but survived;
2. The central role of the U.S., both in terms of diplomacy and military muscle, was undermined by a lack of decisive leadership from the executive, aided and abetted by a prevaricating Congress (Republicans in Congress referred to the Kosovo crisis as "Clinton's War"). The Clinton administration's tendencies to be more concerned about the short-term domestic effects of the Kosovo crisis, translated into a European unease about U.S. commitments to the alliance;
3. In spite of the open friction between the European members of NATO, the friction did not result in a break down. The European contributions to Operation Allied Force, and the subsequent Operation Joint Guardian, point out their shortcomings but, in turn, led to a greater willingness from NATO (or, more accurately the U.S.) to make certain key assets available to the allies for "Europe only" operations. When combined with the historic initiatives taken by UK Prime Minister Tony Blair and French President Jacques Chirac in December 1998 at St. Malo,<sup>27</sup> the possibility of a working CFSP, including a defense element, is more likely than it has been for decades;
4. The Kosovo crisis severely strained relations with Russia but did not have catastrophic consequences. Clearly, any emerging security architecture will have to accommodate Russia at the table, if not in

<sup>27</sup> At St. Malo, Blair and Chirac called for the European Union to have "the capacity for autonomous action." See "Europe Takes First Steps on Road to Becoming a Military Superpower." *European Voice*, 6-11 May 1999.

the field.<sup>28</sup> The incorporation of around 2,850 Russian troops (located in the U.S., French, and German Multinational Brigade sectors) in the NATO-led KFOR bodes well for future Russian security cooperation. However, the open disagreements between General Sir Michael Jackson (UK) and NATO's commander General Wesley Clark (U.S.), regarding the former's refusal to obey orders to launch an airborne assault against the Russian forces "occupying" Pristina airfield, suggest that Russia's best accommodation might be found in the context of other European organizations, such as the EU;<sup>29</sup>

5. The OSCE, with 1,250 monitors on the ground following the October 1998 Holbrooke-Milosevic agreement, demonstrated both its utility as a monitoring organization as well as its deficiencies, after its unarmed monitors were so easily endangered; and
6. The crisis demonstrated, at least to all of the Europeans involved, that the costs of conflict management are far greater than the costs of conflict prevention. The message is that effective diplomacy rests upon the ability to link diplomatic intercession, with economic leverage and military force.

It is perhaps the final point that is the most important lesson learned for future endeavors to build a European security architecture. In order to prevent future crises on the European continent, or indeed further east, the Europeans need a framework that allows them to pursue more effective diplomacy that is linked and backed by a capable military

28 See Danilov, Dmitriy and Stephan De Spiegeleire. *From Decoupling to Recoupling: A New Security Relationship Between Russian and Western Europe?* Chaillot Papers no. 31. Paris: Institute for Security Studies of Western European Union, 1998. Danilov and De Spiegeleire write, "For Western Europe, Russia's geopolitical and geoeconomic location and weight make finding an appropriate interface for this country within the broader European security architecture a paramount policy objective. Furthermore, Russia has certain operational assets that are complementary to those of Western Europe."

29 See *The Guardian*, 3 August 1999, on the dispute between Clark and Jackson. In refusing to follow orders, Jackson is reported to have said, "I'm not going to start the third world war for you."

arm.

## Kosovo's Potential for Europe's Security Building

In practical terms, the Kosovo crisis has already created a greater willingness to think seriously about Europe's future security architecture. For example, soon after he was approved as NATO's new secretary-general, British Defense Minister George Robertson began speaking about this greater willingness and the need for Europeans to work together: "Kosovo brought home ... that we must be much more co-operative in the way we do things in Europe."<sup>30</sup> Robertson, along with Blair, led the calls for a European defense identity, notably at the December 1998 Blair-Chirac declaration from St. Malo. Despite these calls for a greater European role in any European security architecture, Robertson equally stresses the continued importance of the Atlantic alliance to European security, hence his approval as the new NATO head. Indeed, *The Financial Times* described him as "one of those rare British beasts, a staunchly pro-European Atlanticist."<sup>31</sup> As a consequence, Robertson's appointment adds to the prospects for an enhanced European defense identity. Indeed, today such prospects are much higher than ever in the past decade. This is in no small part due to an apparent change in Britain's long-time phobia of anything "European" in the security or defense fields.<sup>32</sup> This shift is partly the result of administration changes in Britain; the Conservative-led government in the UK had been consistently opposed to an independent European defense identity that might appear to put into jeopardy the transatlantic link. But the main impetus behind the recent British

30 Gibson, Helen. "The New Boy on the NATO Bloc." *Time*, 16 August 1999.

31 *Financial Times*, 6 August 1999: <http://www.globalarchive.ft.com/search/FTJSPController.html>

32 See Duke, *The Elusive Quest for European Security*, 307-315, for more on Britain's "fourth pillar" approach.

outlook on defense cooperation with the EU is Blair's own reversal on the matter.

France has also shifted its position considerably towards a *rap-prochement* with NATO that, although incomplete, appears to reveal a greater willingness to collaborate with the U.S. in loose coalitions. Indeed, in the case of the Kosovo crisis, the French contribution to the air campaign was larger than that of America's British colleagues. The French, at St. Malo along with the British, adopted the call for "autonomous military capabilities" but it remains to be seen what Paris and London actually understand by autonomy.

Germany too showed signs of truly historic shifts, despite the fact that it was lead by a socialist-green coalition government. Since the Federal Constitutional Court's definitive interpretation on the constitutionality of the use of the *Bundeswehr* for combat operations out of NATO's area in July 1994, German forces have been used for a variety of increasingly important roles. Initially, for example in Somalia and Cambodia, their roles were primarily limited to logistical or support roles while in the Bosnian crisis *Luftwaffe* personnel participated in AWACS operations. In Kosovo, Operation Joint Force saw German forces, admittedly at a modest level, participate in air strikes against targets in Kosovo and Serbia. The *Luftwaffe's* participation in such combat missions was the first of this kind since 1945. Most recently, in October 1999, Germany's General Klaus Reinhardt took over the command of the KFOR peace implementation force (which consists of 49,000 personnel).

In the U.S. itself the desirability of more autonomy for its European allies has been accepted in principle ever since the enunciation of the CJTF concept in 1994. In the June 1996 NATO meeting in Berlin, the U.S. explicitly accepted the idea of a European defense identity within NATO. At that time, it was agreed that when and if America did not want to become militarily involved in a crisis situation, European officers within NATO's command structure could detach themselves and reconfigure (along with staff from the WEU nations not represented in NATO) as a European-only command that could manage European troops. It was also assumed, that the U.S. would not veto the use of NATO assets in such missions. The NATO 50<sup>th</sup> Anniversary

summit in Washington, in April 1999, also appeared to support the idea that the Europeans could use NATO collective assets and capabilities, for operations in which the alliance as a whole is not engaged militarily.<sup>33</sup> However, in spite of President Clinton's public backing for such a role for the United States' allies, it remains unclear how far Washington is willing to go in this direction. Possibly more worrying for the Europeans is the difference between Clinton's public backing and U.S. actual ambivalence; indeed, "declared support is seemingly qualified – if not outright contradicted – in practice."<sup>34</sup> The European's continued reliance on NATO assets will also nevertheless give Washington an effective veto over missions it does not approve. As Schake observes, "The pattern of U.S. interaction with allies in the past several years has been to refuse any participation unless virtually every aspect of a policy suits U.S. preferences." Moreover, "frustration with this approach is apparent in [European] allies' unwillingness to support U.S. policies beyond Europe, as for example, in Iraq."<sup>35</sup>

Despite Washington's unclear or at times prevaricating support, within the institutions themselves there is a new willingness to think more seriously about European security structures. NATO's April 1999 Washington Summit, the WEU Council's acceptance (at its Bremerhaven summit) of the inevitability of its full integration within the EU, and the June 1999 Cologne European Council conclusions<sup>36</sup> are

33 "An Alliance for the 21st Century: Washington Summit Communiqué, 24 April 1999:" [http://www.esteri.it/eng/archives/arch\\_press/miscpapers/do240499e.htm](http://www.esteri.it/eng/archives/arch_press/miscpapers/do240499e.htm)

34 Brenner, Michael. *Terms of Engagement: The United States and the European Security Identity*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 1998, 3.

35 See Schake, "Europe after NATO Expansion," 12.

36 At Cologne, a set of principles that would enable the EU to deploy military forces in Petersberg-type tasks was adopted. A framework that included strategic planners, a crisis-management center and an intelligence-gathering unit was also proposed. Moreover, a Political and Security Committee is to be established in Brussels, which will consist of national representatives who are experts in the military and security fields. The committee will manage CFSP on a daily basis. A new Military Committee will also be created, made up of chiefs of staff or their deputies, which will give military advice to the Political and Security Committee.

all examples of this new thinking. The new *Monsieur PESC*, Javier Solana, may use his experience as NATO's former chief to also improve Europe's voice in foreign and security matters. In general, the post of a High Representative for the EU's CFSP may overcome the institutional impediments to a more coherent European foreign policy. For example, the rotating presidency (every six months) greatly hinders continuity in decision-making. However, it should be pointed out that Solana will have his work cut out for him, as foreign ministers could remain jealous of their own power and could marginalize "Mr. CFSP" to a figure-head.<sup>37</sup>

Romano Prodi, the incoming President of the Commission, has contributed to the serious new thinking about European security structures by eulogizing the benefits of a common EU army. It formed, in his words, the "next logical step" in creating a common defense policy for the EU "after the merging of the national defense industries."<sup>38</sup> Prodi's statement is however problematic for several reasons. First, advocacy of a "European army" will inevitably give rise to the familiar European versus Atlanticist dispute, with the latter claiming that NATO is the indisputable cornerstone of European security. The position of the neutral and non-aligned (NNA) EU members would also immediately become a major issue. How should those EU members who do not want to take part in common defense policies be appropriately excluded or included in the emerging architecture? To an extent this issue will be resolved by the inclusion of "those functions of the WEU which will be necessary for the EU to fulfil its new responsibilities in the area of the Petersberg tasks."<sup>39</sup> However, this in turn raises a number of problems

37 See Grant, *Can Britain Lead in Europe?*, 42-43.

38 Norman, Peter. "Common EU army the 'logical next step.'" *Financial Times*, 10 May 1999.

39 "Presidency Conclusions, Cologne European Council, 3 and 4 June 1999," Annex III: [http://europa.eu.int/council/off/conclu/june99/june99\\_en.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/council/off/conclu/june99/june99_en.pdf). The Cologne Presidency conclusions also state that the WEU "as an organization would have completed its purpose" but that the "different status of Member States with regard to collective defense guarantees will not be affected." Paragraph 5.

about how, in practical terms, security (i.e. Petersberg tasks)<sup>40</sup> can be differentiated from “defense” issues. Finally, the issues of how to build (and afford) an autonomous military capability remain. This, in turn, involves considering the extent to which European defense industries can be merged. The announcement, a matter of weeks after the St. Malo declaration, to merge British Aerospace with UK General Electric’s Marconi Electronic systems effectively dealt a deathblow to any chances for a European Aerospace Industry that is not limited to the continent.<sup>41</sup> Germany was especially angry as the BAe-Marconi merger prevented the first major “euromerger” that had been under discussion between BAe and DASA.<sup>42</sup>

Beyond the difficulties of creating a “European army” or a genuine “European defense industry,” a few other flies in the ointment remain which have the potential to upset the current Euro-enthusiasm. Two sets of issues in particular will need addressing in the near future before progress can be made towards building further European security and defense integration or creating anything that can be deemed “architecture.” The first issue lies in the ability of the Europeans, by which is meant principally the current WEU members, to actually invest in the ability to manage not only a Kosovo crisis but another one or two similar crises as well. At present, European NATO members spend nearly two thirds as much as the U.S. on defense, but with only one tenth of the United States’ operational effectiveness. Additionally,

40 Such tasks are humanitarian and rescue operations, peacekeeping, peacemaking and crisis management. The name “Petersberg tasks” is derived from the WEU ministerial meeting held in Petersberg, Germany, in June 1992.

41 Blair was not altogether pleased by the UK defense industry’s actions. “[Blair] couldn’t resist a thinly veiled gibe, saying that even though the deal was welcome from a commercial point of view, ‘I do want to see European defense restructuring because it is absolutely in the interests of this country.’” Wallace, Charles. “European Shakeout.” *Time*, 1 February 1999.

42 Germany’s DASA (Daimler-Chrysler’s aerospace division) took its revenge in October 1999 with its announcement that it would merge and form a separate entity with France’s Lagardère Matra, which will be called the European Aeronautic, Defense and Space Company (EADS). See “Europe Gets a Defense Giant.” *The Economist*, 16 October 1999.

both France and Britain, for differing reasons, are approaching overstretch in terms of their military capabilities.<sup>43</sup> This is despite the fact that the Kosovo “war was run and largely conducted by Americans.”<sup>44</sup> George Robertson’s role as NATO secretary-general may rectify this weak European capability. As British Defense Minister, Robertson carried out a thorough and successful Strategic Defense Review of the British armed forces. His review emphasized the importance of modernization, coordination between the services and the need for flexible and rapid responses to military crises. Robertson hopes to conduct something similar for Europe as NATO chief.<sup>45</sup>

The second issue is that of leadership.<sup>46</sup> The U.S. provided undisputed leadership and initiative during the Cold War. This would seem to be the case with the first post-Cold War decade as well. As has been indicated by the Clinton administration, as well as by well-publicized policy differences between Washington and its allies, there will be circumstances where there is no compelling or vital U.S. national interest at stake or where the European allies simply wish to act alone. The action taken in the aftermath of the near collapse of Albania in 1997 serves as an example of when the Europeans might want to act without the U.S. Naturally, the question of which European power, or

43 See *House of Commons Debates*, 23 March 1999: <http://www.parliament.the-stationery-office.co.uk/pa/cm199899/cmhansrd/c.../90323-06.html>, 3-4. See also “Thin Red Line: Undermanning is Unmanning the British Army.” *The Times*, 3 August 1999.

44 Daalder/O’Hanlon, “Unlearning the Lessons of Kosovo,” 136. They also point out that “Two-thirds of the strike missions were flown by U.S. aircraft. Virtually all the targets were identified using U.S. intelligence assets and nearly every precision-guided weapon was launched from an American aircraft.”

45 The July 1999 Anglo-Italian initiative for “convergence criteria” for defense readiness of EU states may also go some way in amending the Europeans’ lack of capability. See also “Army Chiefs Call for EU ‘Backbone.’” *The Observer*, 25 July 1999, which writes that “Britain is to press its EU allies to ‘professionalise and restructure’ their armies to make them better equipped to respond rapidly to humanitarian catastrophes similar to Kosovo.”

46 See Duke, Simon. *The New European Security Disorder*. Basingstoke, etc.: Macmillan, 1994, 93-134, for an analysis of leadership issues.

group thereof, should assume prime responsibility for a given crisis will arise. To date, who might take that responsibility is not clear, although it is clear that any crisis that is likely to require a substantial military response would have to involve France and the UK. The close foreign and security policy ties between France and Germany would also tend to suggest at least German approval if not participation. Any action in the Mediterranean would obviously suggest a strong leadership role on the part of Italy. The smaller European powers are quite likely to participate in Petersberg-type tasks but a question mark hangs over the willingness of the NNAs to follow, let alone participate, in any use of force directed by the larger European powers. In short, it is difficult to envision a *European response* and if one was launched, it is difficult to envision what it might look like. This is all the more difficult given the possibility that any NATO-coordinated action involving CJTFs might legitimately involve central and east European countries. The unpredictability of the Russian response and, to a lesser extent that of Belarus, then becomes an issue. Indeed, at the moment the new NATO members are not allowed to have alliance forces stationed in Kosovo because of previous commitments made to Russia.

### Conclusion: an Emerging Architecture or More Gardening?

No European security framework existed to deter Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic from using the Yugoslav army and various paramilitaries to kill some 5,000 Kosovar Albanians and to expel 90 percent of the population of Kosovo from their homes, or some 1.5 million people. It is difficult to calculate in hindsight, whether a strong European architecture would have prevented Milosevic from wrecking his havoc in Kosovo. However, the existence of such an architecture certainly would have played a role in the crisis, most likely for the good.

The Kosovo crisis has spurred new determination by Europeans, most notably, the British, to seriously attempt to build stronger European security and defense institutions and capabilities. It is too early to make

any assessment of new features of the architecture, such as the recently appointed High Representative Javier Solana, or other initiatives adopted at the June 1999 Cologne Summit. These new attempts at strengthening the EU's voice and role in the fields of security and defense may indeed prove to be successful. However, the more likely outcome, as suggested by Sir Michael Howard, is far more akin to gardening – “with all of the uncertainties about what might grow and thrive” – than architecture.<sup>47</sup> Rather than clear structures emerging to address various security concerns, it is more likely that there will be a continuing preference for *ad hoc* responses or “coalitions of the willing,” of the type witnessed in Albania, Bosnia and Kosovo. Who, after all, does the Contact Group represent apart from the most powerful on the block? It does not represent the EU, or NATO or, for that matter, international opinion. The use of coalitions of the willing will probably also continue to be the preferred *modus operandi*. There is also the possibility that security will gravitate to the sub-regional rather than to the regional. Therefore, the Baltic security structures, such as the Baltic Battalion (BALTBAT), or the Balkan Pact, may become the major security actors of tomorrow.

There are, though, distinct disadvantages to muddling through and the sub-regional security variant. More *ad hoc* inevitably places the onus on conflict management and not on conflict prevention. With *ad hoc* the conflict prevention potential of the EU, exercised through economic and political inducements as well as the considerable enticements of membership, will not be connected to the potential to threaten or actually use force. Unfortunately, as Slobodan Milosevic demonstrated, there are some that only understand diplomacy when backed by credible force. A reliance upon sub-regional responses to security threats also tends to place responsibility on the smaller European powers. Who, for instance, poses a direct threat to Britain or France? Unless the larger European powers can be harnessed to act on behalf of Europe, there is little chance that the smaller powers will feel compelled to act unless there is a direct threat to their well being. And

47 See Duke, *The Elusive Quest for European Security*, 294.

then it might already be too late to prevent a conflict and needless loss of life, necessitating instead the implementation of more costly conflict management efforts.

ANASTASIA V. MITROFANOVA

## The Military Operation in Kosovo and the European Security System: Lessons Unlearned

This chapter interprets the military operation in Kosovo not as an accidental and isolated affair but as an event deriving from the very nature of the new European security structure. The analysis, however, is focused not so much on the “security architecture” as it is (institutions, their number and functions) but rather on the deeper principles underlying and shaping the structure of European security. From this point of view the crisis in Kosovo being a result and an implication of the new security system can teach several lessons concerning its weakness and instability.

### The Basic Principles of the Post–Cold War European Security Structure

Defining a security architecture Michael Rühle wrote that it may be more useful instead of focusing on the concept of interlocking institutions “to understand an architecture as a series of key political processes that shape the strategic environment.”<sup>1</sup> From this point of view, even in the absence of trans-European organizations dealing with security issues, there was a European security structure prior to the operation in Kosovo. The point is, however, that it has never been purely European. The world is so interdependent and interconnected,

1 Rühle, Michael. “Taking Another Look at NATO’s Role in European Security.” *NATO Review* 46, no. 4 (1998): 21.

today, that no isolated regional security structure seems possible. European security is tightly connected with transatlantic issues on the one hand, and Russia on the other. A European institution with strictly European participation would be inevitably limited and unable to tackle security problems properly (WEU is an example).

The new European security system based on NATO's leading position has replaced the old one, which emerged during the Cold War. Talking about the previous "European security system" we should remember that no hierarchical security architecture existed before the end of the Cold War. There were no international institutions or organizations to maintain regional stability and security in that period. Instead, the European/Euro-Atlantic security system of the Cold War era was based on mutual deterrence provided by the two social and political entities – one capitalist and the other socialist. This mutual containment is often described as the confrontation of the two "superpowers" (the US and the USSR). But one can face difficulties defining the term "superpower:" the USSR, for instance, being a political and military superpower has never been an economic one, and so on. That is why it would be more correct to describe the Cold War world in terms of the two social systems deterring one another. The confrontation of the two European blocs, the Warsaw Pact and NATO, used to be the military and political manifestations of this mutual deterrence. Since there had been no system of this kind on a global level, the world outside Europe was an arena of endless "proxy wars" between the leading powers (or superpowers), the US and the Soviet Union.

The strategic parity between the blocs had made possible the longest lasting peace in Europe (about 50 years). The Helsinki Final Act of 1975 was the culmination of this peaceful coexistence. It stated that the post-war borders in Europe may not be violated by force. The inviolability principle was backed by united military force of the two blocs and that is why no major war in the region became possible. Although there was a slight possibility of becoming a US-USSR military polygon, Europe (both Western and Eastern) benefited a lot from the mutual deterrence system because it carried no significant burden of military expenditures. Europe could concentrate its efforts on economic development.

The new structure of European security has been constructed for 10 years – from the “velvet revolutions” of 1989 to the military operation in Yugoslavia in 1999. The latter has shown that NATO considers itself the key institution of the new European security architecture. NATO’s transformation from a defensive union concerned mostly with deterrence into the most influential European security organization began at the London NATO Summit in July 1990 and continued in Rome (1991), Brussels (1994) and Madrid (1997).

The period prior to the Rome NATO Summit may be characterized as an unstable one when the old security structure had disappeared but the new structure had not emerged. After the Warsaw Pact had collapsed there were suggestions of disbanding NATO or at least of keeping united Germany out of the Alliance. In this short period (approximately from 1989 to 1991) there was a chance of creating a different security system based on the CSCE/OSCE with the USSR (modernized but in no way torn) as one of the key actors. The USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev was particularly fond of the idea of a single security zone stretching “from the Atlantic to the Urals” or even “from Vladivostok to Vancouver.” Gorbachev’s attempts failed for two main reasons: firstly, his policy was too weak and inflexible (he was always ready to give up and never demanded any guarantees), and secondly, the West was much too frightened by the possibility of the Soviet bloc’s resurrection. Gorbachev’s diplomatic miscalculations were used by NATO and no single security zone was created.

The new European security structure is too vague now to draw up conclusions about its final shape. But, according to various political scientists and international organization officials, the future architecture of European security will no longer be built on mutual deterrence. Instead of bipolar confrontation or a kind of cooperative effort of *all* the European countries (the latter sounds good but hardly realistic), security and stability in Europe are supposed to be provided by a tiny group of European and non-European states (mostly NATO members). This group might be called the Euro-Atlantic core. To enter the core a state must (1) possess adequate political, economic and military assets, and (2) be devoted to democracy, freedom and the rule of law. These characteristics give the core states (at least in their own eyes) a moral

right to play tutor and the role of guardian. The core itself is so integrated and devoted to democracy that it can in no way produce instability or pose a threat. Ira Strauss, an American political scientist, calls this transatlantic core a “unipole” and marks the US as the leading power within this unipole.<sup>2</sup> From this point of view, the world order is being transformed from bipolarity of the Cold War era to monopolarity. Samuel Huntington expresses the same idea when he says: “The West is an entity ... the world ... is divided between a Western one and a non-Western many,”<sup>3</sup> although the core states should not necessarily be Western.

One can conclude that, unlike bipolarity, the super-integrated, democratic and economically high-developed core is unable to produce instability and disorder. At the same time, the core is nearly invulnerable as far as external military invasion is concerned. Hence, in the monopolar world (if one would have emerged) ethnic and religious conflicts inside non-democratic countries with ruined economies (“rogue states,” “terrorist regimes”) would have been the only source of instability and threats to regional security. Against this background *national security* would mean something different. The events in Bosnia, Kosovo, East Timor and other parts of the world demonstrate this changing nature of national security. As far as security threats can take place far beyond the state borders, national security becomes global and the sovereignty concept of the past seems to wither away.

Nowadays many political theorists and state officials agree that so long as the non-democratic and economically underdeveloped countries are unable either to provide political stability or to defend the human rights of their citizens, they lose control over their territory (become “failed states”) and can be intervened either militarily or not. Moreover, according to the “interventionists,” such an intervention is not just

2 Strauss, Ira. “Unipoliarnost: Kontsentrisheskaya Struktura Novogo Mirovogo Poriadka i Pozitsiya Rossii” (“Unipolarity: The Concentric Structure of the New World Order and the Position of Russia”). *Polis* 2 (1997): 27.

3 Huntington, Samuel. *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. N.Y.: Touchstone, 1997, 33, 36.

morally approved but morally obligatory. For example, the former Canadian prime minister Brian Mulroney compared (in 1991) intra-state human rights violations with domestic violence:

Just as it is no longer acceptable for society, the police, or the courts to turn a blind eye to family violence, so it is equally unacceptable for the international community to ignore violence and repression within national borders.<sup>4</sup>

The doctrine of “humanitarian intervention” has been dramatically changed within the last 10 years. In the beginning of the 1990s a “humanitarian intervention” was mostly understood as humanitarian assistance, including establishing division lines and creating safe humanitarian zones.<sup>5</sup> This kind of “intervention” could only be possible under the patronage of some international organization (preferably the UN) and in no way allowed the use of weapons (except for self-defense). The number of restrictions is, probably, the main reason why missions of this kind (for example in Somalia) have never been successful enough.

Since about 1993 the concept of humanitarian *military* intervention or even “humanitarian warfare” gained popularity among some theorists and officials from many European countries and especially from the US. It is not clear enough whether the supporters of the humanitarian warfare doctrine find invasion a proper solution in every case. What goes without saying is that it would be much easier to reach agreement within an integrated group of countries (like NATO) than within the UN Security Council where Russia and China can veto any decision. One of the most well-known proponents of military invasion for humanitarian reasons, Stanley Hoffman, remarks clearly that the UN mandate is required in most, “but not necessarily all cases” of military

4 See Abiew, Francis Kofi. “Assessing Humanitarian Intervention in the Post-Cold War Period: Sources of Consensus.” *International Relations* 14, no. 2 (1998): 66.

5 On the development of the humanitarian intervention doctrine see, for example: *ibid.* 61-64.

intervention.<sup>6</sup> As for “to intervene or not to intervene,” it seems that at least the US is ready to respond to a crisis in any part of the world. For example, just after the military campaign in Kosovo had been successfully completed, US President Bill Clinton told NATO troops in the FYROM that

we can say to the people of the world, “Whether you live in Africa or Central Europe or any other place, if somebody comes after innocent civilians and tries to kill them *en masse* because of their race, their ethnic background or their religion and it is within our power to stop it, we will stop it.”<sup>7</sup>

Michael Mandelbaum calls this optimistic vision of humanitarian military invasion “the Clinton doctrine” and argues, that

besides protecting the Albanian Kosovars, NATO aspired to establish, with its Yugoslav war, a new doctrine governing military operations in the post-Cold War era. This putative doctrine of “humanitarian intervention” had two parts: the use of force on behalf of universal values instead of the narrower national interests for which sovereign states have traditionally fought; and, in defense of these values, military intervention in the internal affairs of sovereign states rather than mere opposition to cross-border aggression, as in the Gulf War of 1991.<sup>8</sup>

It seems, thus, that the Westphalian system is being replaced step by step with the new concept of *restricted sovereignty* deriving from the nature of the new security concept.

This security concept based on the principles of monopolarity and restricted sovereignty spreads far beyond European borders. Some actions of the core or the unipole give an impression that it is going to be a global player. It seems (at least, many non-Western leaders are of

6 Hoffman, Stanley. “The Politics and Ethics of Military Intervention.” *Survival* 37, no. 4 (1995/1996): 29.

7 Hoagland, Jim. “Developing a Doctrine of Humanitarian Intervention.” *International Herald Tribune*, 28 June 1999.

8 Mandelbaum, Michael. “A Perfect Failure. NATO’s War Against Yugoslavia.” *Foreign Affairs* 78, no. 5 (1999): 2-8; 5.

this opinion) that the transatlantic core equates itself with the “international community” and promises, if necessary, to establish peace and security throughout the world. The word “international community,” however, is to be handled with caution. In case “we” are the international community, “they” can easily become the enemies of the humanity who deserve neither sympathy, nor compassion. Moreover, Samuel Huntington makes a cynical remark that, “this phrase [world community] has become the euphemistic collective noun ... to give global legitimacy to actions reflecting the interests of the United States and other Western powers.”<sup>9</sup> His opinion, although polemical, is to be kept in mind too.

According to the newly approved Strategic Concept, NATO considers itself playing a central part in the process of maintaining Euro-Atlantic security. This idea took its shape at the Washington 50<sup>th</sup> Anniversary summit in 1999. The summit has shown to the world that the “new NATO” becomes a military and political instrument in regional conflict management and prevention, including peacekeeping operations (so-called “non-Article 5 crisis response operations”). The new NATO, Michael Rühle says, has overtaken the passive role of a defense union and now plays an active role in deepening European integration by providing “a framework for gradually overcoming Europe’s limits as a strategic power.”<sup>10</sup>

The new Strategic Concept of the Alliance emphasizes that,

Some countries in and around the Euro-Atlantic area face serious economic, social and political difficulties. Ethnic and religious rivalries, territorial disputes, inadequate or failed efforts at reform, the abuse of human rights, and the dissolution of states can lead to local and even regional instability. The resulting tensions could lead to crises affecting Euro-Atlantic stability, to human suffering, and to armed conflicts. Such conflicts could affect the security of the Alliance by spilling over into neighboring countries, including NATO countries, or in other ways, and could also affect the security of other states.

9 Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations*, 184.

10 Rühle, “Taking Another Look at NATO’s Role in European Security,” 21.

That is why,

Alliance security must also take account of the global context. Alliance security interests can be affected by other risks of a wider nature, including acts of terrorism, sabotage and organized crime, and by the disruption of the flow of vital resources. The uncontrolled movement of large numbers of people, particularly as a consequence of armed conflicts, can also pose problems for security and stability affecting the Alliance.<sup>11</sup>

Although previously NATO had planned to carry out non-Article 5 operations only after UN or OSCE approval, the new Strategic Concept did not include such mandate requirements.

The new Strategic Concept gives an impression that NATO expands in two senses. On the one hand, the Alliance increases the number of reasons to interfere in domestic conflicts. On the other hand, NATO penetrates its own spatial borders maintaining such program as PFP (which involves most of the former Soviet bloc countries), Mediterranean Dialogue (with Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Mauritania, Morocco, and Tunisia), and bilateral relationships with Japan and Argentina. As Argentinian Defense Minister Jorge Dominguez recently said,

NATO and its partners are successfully building a cooperative security structure that covers a space greater than the transatlantic area historically associated with the Atlantic Alliance. It forms a connective tissue that stretches from North America to the depths of Central Asia, from continental Europe to its neighbors around the Mediterranean basin, and even as far as Japan through biannual conferences.<sup>12</sup>

The “new NATO” becomes more and more concerned about non-

11 See *The Alliance's Strategic Concept*. Approved by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Washington, D.C., 23-24 April 1999. Part 2: <http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/1999/p99-065e.html>

12 Dominguez, Jorge. “Argentina, NATO's South Atlantic Partner.” *NATO Review* 47, no. 1 (1999). 27 October 1999: <http://www.nato.int/docu/review/1999/9901-02.html>

military security issues like environmental protection, migration, nuclear proliferation, fighting organized crime and terrorism. NATO defines not just common defense but the spreading of democracy, freedom and peace as its goals. This virtually means that the Alliance is being (or, at least, wants to be) transformed into the core element of European and even global security. As for common defense, the new Strategic Concept creates the impression that the NATO of the future will interpret defense more broadly than mere protection against military attacks. Since there is no more need to react on the united power of all the Warsaw Pact countries NATO has changed the structure of its military forces dramatically. It has been modified to include “non-defense” operations including the appearance of the CJTF concept and “arrangements to permit the rapid deployment of forces for the *full range of the Alliance’s missions*”<sup>13</sup> (emphasis added).

NATO’s actions in Bosnia and now in Kosovo should be understood in this light as two successive steps in the realization of the new security principles. While the Bosnian operation was a transitive stage because NATO’s military involvement was based on the UN mandate and Russia as well as other non-NATO countries played a significant role, the operation in Kosovo seems to be the first practical application of the new European and global security concept. So, if the crisis in Kosovo did not result from the absence of any elaborate security system, how could it happen despite the Strategic Concept stating clearly that “no country would be able to intimidate or coerce any other through the threat or use of force?”<sup>14</sup>

13 *The Alliance’s Strategic Concept*. Part 2.

14 *Ibid.* Part 1.

## Kosovo as an Implication of the New European Security System

It is to be stated clearly that this chapter is based on a supposition that states and international organizations are *not* moral agents and that they are *not* able to act on a basis of compassion (that is why the humanitarian aspects of the operation will not be reflected on here). This chapter seeks to find the reasons for NATO actions only within the field of political realism and only in terms of interests, not values. For the world outside NATO (and for Russia and China particularly) value-based arguments in international relations often mean less than nothing. Many political scientists in Russia consider the accusations against Milosevic an ideological veil covering the real purposes of the war. For example, Mikhail Deliagin of the Institute of the Problems of Globalization says, that “the humanitarian catastrophe itself was one of the goals of the aggressor” and that NATO wanted to make Albania “a terrorist nation” in order to destabilize the European financial system.<sup>15</sup> This opinion is definitely extremist, but it demonstrates how vulnerable moral justifications can be. In fact, no one can prove whether NATO really intended to defend the Albanians or simply used the same argument that the USSR had used as a justification for invading Afghanistan. That is why we need a firmer basis than morality, i.e. the interests of the parties, in order to understand what exactly has happened in Kosovo.

The official position of NATO and its members is that the attack has derived from the brutality and crimes of Slobodan Milosevic’s regime. Former NATO secretary-general Javier Solana wrote:

The Alliance could not stand aside and watch while the Yugoslav Government carried out its deliberate and terrible actions against the Kosovar

15 Deliagin, Mikhail. “Glavnaya Zadacha, Kotoruyu Reshali SShA v Yugoslavii – v Sfere Globalnikh Finansov” (“The Main Task Being Pursued by the USA in Yugoslavia Lay in the Sphere of Global Finance”). *Mezhdunarodnaya Zhizn – International Affairs*, no. 9 (1999): 53. (Translation A.M.).

Albanians – ethnic cleansing, mass killings, eliminating the identity of an entire people.<sup>16</sup>

Nevertheless, the moral arguments in international politics are the most vulnerable ones. Not only do the leaders of non-Western states, but some political scientists from the Western hemisphere also, suspect NATO of using double moral standards, though not deliberately. For example, Mandelbaum argues that

the Serb treatment of Albanians in Kosovo before the NATO bombing was hardly exemplary, but measured by the worst of all human rights violations – murder – neither was it exceptionally bad. Far fewer people had died as a result of fighting in Kosovo before the bombing started than had been killed in civil strife in Sierra Leone, Sudan, or Rwanda – African countries in which NATO showed no interest in intervening. Thus NATO's war did nothing to establish a viable standard for deciding when humanitarian intervention may be undertaken. Instead, it left the unfortunate impression that, in the eyes of the West, an assault terrible enough to justify military intervention is the kind of thing that happens in Europe but not in Africa.<sup>17</sup>

The Yugoslav government could not help noticing that the Alliance stood aside and turned a blind eye while human rights were violated throughout the world, and that NATO in the past had welcomed António de Oliveira Salazar's Portugal and the Greece of the black colonels, where mass murders and tortures had taken place. It seems possible that the ambiguous position of NATO on the rights of Serbian refugees from Croatia may have influenced Yugoslavia's central government and led it to believe that similarly to NATO's stance towards Franjo Tujman, any mistreatment of Albanians would be given slight or no punishment.

Another rationale for the military attack the Alliance puts forward is that "military operations began as a last resort, after the Belgrade

16 Solana, Javier. "A Defining Moment for NATO: The Washington Summit Decisions and the Kosovo Crisis." *NATO Review* 47, no. 2 (1999): <http://www.nato.int/docu/review/1999/9902-01.html>

17 Mandelbaum, "A Perfect Failure," 6.

regime had rejected all proposals for a political settlement.”<sup>18</sup> But, as many observers notice, the terms on which the bombings ended were much more favorable to the central government of Yugoslavia than the terms discussed during the negotiations in Rambouillet in February 1999.<sup>19</sup> In this light those negotiations seem to be probably one of the strangest peace talks in the history of diplomacy. For example, one of the conditions of the peace agreement was that the Serbian<sup>20</sup> army and police should withdraw, NATO should become the “implementation force” of the peacekeeping operation, and up to 30,000 NATO soldiers would enter Kosovo. The Serbian party refused to accept these supplements to the peace proposal. The Yugoslav government considered these supplements an encroachment on sovereignty of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

It looks strange, but despite all the world-recognized rules of diplomacy, NATO made no attempt to ease its demands or to split them to make the submission easier for Milosevic. For example, Milosevic could agree to allow UN peace keepers to be stationed in Kosovo instead of NATO joint military forces. In October 1998 he had already accepted the idea of the OSCE-led “verification forces” in Kosovo. Unfortunately, the cease-fire was broken by both parties and this peace plan failed.

For the Yugoslav delegation, as well as for the Russian mediator, the main obstacle to agreement was the position of NATO, or rather Madeline Albright’s personal position. She kept insisting on demands unacceptable for Serbs. The Yugoslav delegation insisted on its position too. Pedrag Simic, Professor at the Institute for International Politics in Belgrade and a consultant of Vuk Draskovic in Rambouillet, recalls that

18 Solana, “A Defining Moment for NATO.”

19 See, for example, Mandelbaum, “A Perfect Failure,” 4.

20 This word represents an evident mistake. Instead of “Serbs” or “Serbian,” terms like “the federal government of Yugoslavia” or “Yugoslavian” should be used. We continue using these words only because they are widely recognized.

it was not true that the Serbs did not want to sign an agreement. Up to the break of the negotiations we repeated our argument: first of all, let us agree on political contents, then let us talk about implementation. But the Americans did not want to hear it.<sup>21</sup>

It seems that something could be done and it was mostly a lack of good will that prevented the parties from reaching an agreement. Michael Mandelbaum suggests that

NATO's leaders believed that concessions were unnecessary because a few exemplary salvos would quickly bring the Serbs to heel ... Albright ... and her colleagues were said to consider Milosevic a Balkan "schoolyard bully" who would back down when challenged.<sup>22</sup>

Besides the personal characteristics of Albright and Milosevic there must have been some practical reasons why in Rambouillet no peaceful solution was found, and the war started. One of these reasons could be a necessity to influence the anti-Western policy of the Yugoslavian government. NATO's enlargement eastwards might serve as a proof that for Yugoslavia and other countries of Southeastern Europe there are some special positions within the new security architecture. NATO does not conceal the fact that the enlargement has been caused by a need to create an integrated community of democratic states, a zone of stability including all the developed countries of Europe (except Russia and probably Albania), the US, Canada and Turkey. And most of the countries do not object. According to the Italian political scientist Nicoletta Mosconi,

in the power vacuum created by the disappearance of the old world order ... it comes as no surprise that, as regards the question of security, NATO has become the magnet which continues to attract new states looking for something to cling on to in their bid to escape the drift towards chaos.<sup>23</sup>

21 Simic, Pedrag. "Die Amerikaner wollten nicht hören." *Die Zeit*, 12 Mai 1999. (Translation A.M.)

22 Mandelbaum, "A Perfect Failure," 4.

23 Mosconi, Nicoletta. "NATO-Russia Pact and Enlargement of NATO." *Federalist*, no. 3 (1997): 187.

Moreover, the admission of the former Soviet bloc countries to NATO would guarantee that the USSR could not be restored.

“Kosovo demonstrates,” Solana writes,

that this continent still suffers from divisions that must be overcome. We remain determined to erase any remaining dividing lines, as was demonstrated by the admission of the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland into the Alliance. This process will continue and the door to NATO will remain open for future members.<sup>24</sup>

Most of the former Warsaw Pact countries or the Soviet republics (Ukraine, Moldova) demonstrate, for the above-mentioned reasons, their passionate desire, as Romania’s Ambassador to the EU writes, “to join an organization based on the shared values of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law, as well as to be part of a region of stability and security which only NATO can guarantee.”<sup>25</sup>

Until now there have been only two exceptions: Lukashenko’s Belarus and Milosevic’s Yugoslavia. One can find many parallels between the two regimes. Both of them are now internationally more or less isolated. In 1997 the US proclaimed the “new politics” towards Belarus: reducing official contacts and developing the relationship on the level of democratic elements, independent mass media and non-governmental organizations. The US and the EU do not conceal the fact that they consider Belarus an authoritarian regime which violates human rights.<sup>26</sup> At the same time, both Belarus (until Lukashenko came to power) and Yugoslavia have always been considered inseparable parts of Europe. This contradiction between their European legacy and anti-European more or less isolationist regimes will only be resolved with the dismantling of these regimes.

24 Solana, “A Defining Moment for NATO.”

25 Ene, Constantin. “Romania Sets its Sights on NATO Membership.” *NATO Review* 45, no. 6 (1997): 8.

26 See Rozanov, Anatoly. “Vneshnyaya Politika Belarusi – Predstavleniya i Realnosti” (“Belarus’s Foreign Policy: Images and Reality”). *Pro et Contra* 3, no. 2 (1998): 77-78.

That in no way means that the West has organized a plot to dismiss Lukashenko and Milosevic. But it seems that the policy of the US and NATO towards the two outsiders is a clear message: “we do not want you here.” The point is that the dividing lines in Europe will stay as long as Milosevic and Lukashenko, or their upholders are in power. It looks like the leaders of NATO understand this very well. For example, on 11 May 1999, British prime minister Tony Blair in an interview with the German weekly *Die Zeit* said: “We have never said that to get rid of Milosevic is one of our war goals ... [But] ... Serbia has no chance to play any role in the international community again until Milosevic is off.”<sup>27</sup> This statement sounds like a very direct message for Serbs and Milosevic himself.

As for the future of Serbia after Milosevic, Blair said in the same interview:

I am for holding out the possibility that the states around Serbia, and a democratic Serbia too can become EU and NATO members and therefore join the Alliance which unites us ... However, I do not want to give an impression that we are going to offer NATO membership to Serbia right away. I say: we must work out some vision of the future for the countries of South Eastern Europe. At least for some of them this means EU and NATO membership.<sup>28</sup>

From the words of Blair one can conclude that NATO, of course, is not ready to embrace anyone else but the Visegrad countries *right now*. But there may be another interpretation of his words: the admission of Eastern Europe and some of the former Soviet republics is a part of NATO’s strategy for the first decades of the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

The goals of the military attack on Yugoslavia in this light are not as clear for non-NATO analysts as they seem to be for NATO officials. The most contradictory is the fact that for the crimes of Milosevic

27 “Eine Vision für den Balkan. Ein *Zeit*-Gespräch mit Tony Blair über die Nato-Strategie und die Zeit nach dem Krieg.” *Die Zeit*, 12 Mai 1999. (Translation A.M.)

28 *Ibid.*

innocent civilians have been punished. As Michael Mandelbaum wrote:

The bombing of Serbia ... continued an ugly pattern that the Clinton administration had followed in Haiti and Iraq, a pattern born of a combination of objection to particular leaders and reluctance to risk American casualties ... As in the case of Yugoslavia, invading those two countries to remove the offending leadership was militarily feasible but politically unattractive for the Clinton administration. In all three countries, the administration therefore took steps short of invasion that inflicted suffering on the civilian population – the crushing embargoes of Haiti and Iraq were the equivalents of the bombing of the Serb infrastructure – without (until October 1994 in Haiti, and to the present in Iraq) removing the leaders from power.<sup>29</sup>

This statement sounds too bitter and is concentrated too much on *American* participation in the conflict. Nevertheless, it demonstrates that not only for Russian or Chinese observers but for some Western political scientists too one of the most important objectives of the war was to dismiss Milosevic. His actions undertaken against Kosovars had helped to create a situation in which external invasion looked not only justified but morally approved. However, it is doubtful whether this invasion was able to help the Albanians in Kosovo.

Mandelbaum even blames NATO for the violation of Article 14 of the 1977 Protocol to the 1949 Geneva Convention, which forbids attacks on objects indispensable to the survival of the civilian population.

The basic procedure for the conduct of a “just war” is to spare noncombatants. NATO was scrupulous about trying to avoid direct attacks on civilians. But by striking infrastructure in Serbia, including electrical grids and water facilities, the alliance did considerable indirect damage to the civilian population there.<sup>30</sup>

Some articles published by NATO officials may create the impression that this damage has been done on purpose. For example, General Wesley Clark proudly wrote that, “our campaign aims to cause the

29 Mandelbaum, “A Perfect Failure,” 6.

30 *Ibid.*

minimum civilian casualties by precise targeting” but in the same article he refutes himself by stating that,

we have destroyed ... critical lines of communication including bridges, road and rail routes, re-supply chains and military manufacturing capability ... We have also targeted the command and control points critical to the Yugoslav force’s ability to conduct operations in Kosovo, as well as the petroleum production and reserves used to fuel Milosevic’s war machine ... All but one bridge across the Danube is down; the four major road and rail routes into Kosovo are closed ...<sup>31</sup>

From his words one can conclude that actual damage of civilian infrastructure is much greater than the number of deaths. The people of Kosovo, of both ethnic origins, were left without electricity and drinkable water, they lost their homes and jobs. At the same time, the withdrawal of the Serbian troops from Kosovo showed that the army was camouflaged very well and had not suffered too many casualties.

NATO’s policy in the period before and during the conflict leaves an impression that besides overthrowing Milosevic’s regime the Alliance had some other goals to achieve. The fact that NATO did not wait for the UN mandate and that Russia was refused to have a separate occupation zone in Kosovo makes one suspect that the military operation is a message not just for Milosevic, but for some other actors too. It looks like the bombing of Kosovo and Serbia was to prove that NATO (and the US) is the only actor having the capability and political will to manage the crisis. Kosovo, thus, was to become a lesson for the others who pretended to play significant roles in the process of maintaining European security. Russia definitely is one of the pretenders.

Many political scientists (Russian and Western) today agree that a new division line has appeared in Europe after the end of the Cold War. For example, Samuel Huntington in his famous *Clash of Civilizations* stresses the civilizational differences between Western Christianity and

31 Clark Wesley K. “Effectiveness and Determination.” 2 June 1999. *Articles Published in the International Press*: <http://www.nato.int/kosovo/articles/a990602a.htm>

Orthodox Christianity and predicts that the borders of Russia, Belarus, and the Orthodox part of Ukraine will become the fault line where the civilizations will clash. While his argument seems to be too idealistic there is a great deal of truth in it. Another well-known thinker, French philosopher André Glucksmann (one of the leaders of the so-called “New Philosophers”) calls the new division line a “mentality border” between those who do and those who do not care about the suffering of Kosovars (he names Russia and Greece).<sup>32</sup> The actions undertaken in Kosovo speak for the conclusion that the new NATO-led European security structure is based on a supposition that after one of the confronting blocs has disappeared the other becomes a “winner.” The winner, as it should be, gets everything.

Despite the Soviet bloc and the USSR dissolution, in the eyes of NATO analysts the new European security concept is still grounded on the presumptions of the Cold War period, as if the USSR had disappeared “for a while” and could emerge at any moment as powerful as ever. There is a significant gap between NATO’s official position (“Russia plays a unique role in Euro-Atlantic security”)<sup>33</sup> and the non-official vision of Russia as a potential aggressor threatening the security and independence of the former USSR republics. While NATO representatives are usually very careful about hurting Russia’s feelings, some political scientists and East European officials call on NATO to avoid overemphasizing the NATO-Russian relationship because Russia is no more a “superpower.” For example, Henryk Szlaifer, a Polish diplomat, wrote that giving Russia a “special place” in European security “could lead to ... a temptation to thrust upon the European security architecture the logic and consequences of competition (cooperation) between the superpowers.”<sup>34</sup>

32 Glucksmann, André. “Edinaya Evropa Roditsya v Prishtine” (“The United Europe Will Be Born in Pristina”). *Nezavisimaya gazeta*, 6 October 1999.

33 *The Alliance’s Strategic Concept*. Part 3.

34 Quoted in: Balmaceda, Margarita. “Ukraine, Russia, and European Security.” *Problems of Post-Communism* 45, no. 1 (1998): 21, internet-version can be found at <http://www.epnet.com/ehost/login.html>

This statement demonstrates that, at least for some East European countries, Russia, the Cold War loser, is suspected of striking back and of resurrecting the “Soviet empire” at any moment if left to her own devices. It is not surprising then that the majority of Russian governmental officials and analysts think that the new concept of European security, as well as the previous one, are still grounded on deterrence and that Russia’s suggested “imperial ambitions” should be deterred. NATO’s enlargement eastwards and developing partnership with the CIS countries of Central Asia and the Caucasus provides evidence to Russians that the Alliance aspires to lay its hands on the Soviet inheritance as soon as possible.

Bruce Russett and Allan C. Stam agree that the process of NATO enlargement proves that Russia is still suspected of being able at any moment to revive the USSR “imperial politics.” “Whatever Westerners may say,” they wrote, “that kind of expansion is directed against at least a hypothetical danger from Russia. It has no compelling purpose otherwise.”<sup>35</sup> Many Western experts (like Steven Blank<sup>36</sup>) think that Russia either already has imperial ambitions which should be contained or will bring them forward in the future. This is why, probably, NATO thinks it necessary to acquire “the Soviet inheritance” quickly, from admitting the former USSR allies and members (the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland, and in the near future even Ukraine, Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia) into the Alliance, to involving the CIS members (the republics of Central Asia and Caucasus) into military and political partnership.

As for the NATO-Russia partnership, even before the military operation in Kosovo it was relatively weak to compare with the closest relationship between NATO and Ukraine. While Solana said that one of the most important lessons of the conflict resolution in Bosnia is,

35 Russett, Bruce and Allan C. Stam. “Courting Disaster: An Expanded NATO vs. Russia and China.” *Political Science Quarterly* 113, no. 3 (1998): 362.

36 See Blank, Stephen. “Russia, NATO Enlargement, and the Baltic States.” *World Affairs* 160, no. 3 (1998): 115-126.

“that Russia must be engaged,”<sup>37</sup> Russia’s involvement in the process of maintaining stability and security of the Euro-Atlantic region had been insufficient even before her participation in the PfP-program was frozen in March 1999. At the same time, Ukraine, which shares with Russia the same burden of the Soviet past is subject to overwhelming integration into the European structures, including NATO. “We believe,” the US Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott said addressing the Workshop on Ukraine-NATO Relations in April 1998, that “should Ukraine one day decide to seek entry into the Alliance, the door will remain open.”<sup>38</sup>

Many political scientists agree that this open door policy is to say the least unwise because it annoys Russia and even, as Russett and Stam suggest, can strengthen a partnership between Russia and China.<sup>39</sup> Robert Art finds the open-door policy “unnecessary and risky.” He thinks that

NATO expansion must be limited and, preferably, stopped, if Russia’s cooperation is to be secured. No European-wide structure will succeed if in the process of creating it, Russia is estranged or, worse yet, made an implacable enemy. Yet that is exactly what the US and its allies risk if they next induct the Baltic states of Ukraine into NATO ... The larger NATO grows without Russia, the more apparent it becomes that Russia is discriminated against.<sup>40</sup>

This position correlates with the position of Russia feeling betrayed and isolated after she had declined voluntarily all the advantages of being a superpower.

37 Solana, Javier. “Lessons Learned from Bosnia. Speech at the Instituto de Defesa Nacional. Portugal.” 12 March 1999: <http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/1999/s990312a.html>

38 Talbott, Strobe. “The New Ukraine in the New Europe.” *US Department of State Dispatch* 9, no. 4 (1998): 15.

39 Russett/Stam, “Courting Disaster,” esp. 363.

40 Art, Robert J. “Creating a Disaster: NATO’s Open Door Policy.” *Political Science Quarterly* 113, no. 3 (1998): 399.

While Russia played a relatively significant part in Bosnia, she was totally excluded from the crisis management in Kosovo. Russia got the impression that all her peace plans were rejected out of hand not because of their insufficiencies but because, according to Huntington's theory, Russia was considered a "kin country" of Serbia, which means that she must necessarily be blind and biased. "In the Yugoslav conflicts," Huntington wrote in 1997, "Russia provided diplomatic support to Serbia ... not for reasons of ideology, or power politics, or economic interest, but because of cultural kinship."<sup>41</sup> Although many Western observers do not share this argument, it is well known and often used despite the fact that it has very little to do with reality. There are, of course, some political forces in Russia who support Orthodox Serbs against Muslim Albanians, but most Russians (including government officials) were terribly shocked by the idea of NATO (and particularly Germany) bombing a European country which had not attacked any of the allies. The reason why Russia was "defending Milosevic" was not kinship (exaggerated by all the sides of the conflict, by the way) but rather the dubious position Russia occupies being somewhere between the transatlantic core and the outside world of chaos. Because of the risk of slipping into this chaos and being economically weak Russia wants peace, not conflict, and is able to reach beyond the Western "arrogance of power." Russia, however, would not have been allowed to contribute to KFOR without seizing first the airport in Pristina. "Kosovo has become a public symbol of Russia's loss of influence and public degradation by the West," Henry Kissinger wrote.<sup>42</sup>

It is to be emphasized, however, that Russia herself has no clear vision of her role within the new European and Euro-Atlantic structures. Russia's official approach to partnership with NATO is based on a statement that "Russia is still a great power" determined to play a decisive role in the European security system and to have a veto right over any NATO action. This approach definitely does not correspond

41 Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations*, 28.

42 Kissinger, Henry A. "As the Cheers Fade." *Newsweek*, 21 June 1999: 36.

with the reality of modern Europe. The “two pillars” (OSCE and NATO, with the latter being a kind of peacekeeping force for the former) security system in Europe could have been constructed only within a very short period of history, from 1989 to 1991. Today neither the regional balance of power nor Russia’s capabilities speak for this project. Russia’s great power rhetoric looks ridiculous against the background of her decreasing power and the compromises with NATO she makes immediately after the loudest and most militant official statements. This rhetoric is nothing but an additional argument in support of the deterrence and isolation approach.

It seems that Russia is not the only addressee of the Kosovo message. There are numerous European regional organizations wishing to deal with security issues on their own – an idea NATO does not support. The Strategic Concept states that “the Alliance fully supports the development of the European Security and Defense Identity” but only “within the Alliance” and in order to enhance “the security environment of the Alliance.”<sup>43</sup> As for the OSCE, NATO up to now has no elaborate plan of OSCE participation in maintaining peace and stability in Europe. The absence of a clear concept creates an impression that in NATO’s eyes the OSCE is nothing but a relic of the previous security architecture, which does not fit the new vision of Euro-Atlantic security.

The other intra-European institutions (the EU and even the WEU) can supplement NATO or work together with the Alliance (especially when the case has no global implications), but NATO leaves no room for them in case European security as a whole is concerned. The European Union had made several attempts to contribute to regional security and particularly to a solution to the Kosovo crisis but in the end a non-European organization prevailed.

The Franco-British declaration at the St. Malo summit in December 1998 could make the US and Turkey anxious by stating that the European Union, “must have the capacity for autonomous action, backed up

43 *The Alliance’s Strategic Concept. Part 2.*

by credible military forces, the means to decide to use them, and a readiness to do so, in response to international crises.”<sup>44</sup> Probably, NATO did not want purely European organizations to be too independent. European integration and the creation of the Euro also could influence the US decision to force the events and to present NATO as the only alternative to chaos and distraction.

There are several statements in the Strategic Concept, which let us know that the NATO of the new millennium will not be restricted by the borders of the Euro-Atlantic area. NATO is ready to meet the risks and threats “in and around the Euro-Atlantic area,” as well as “at the periphery of the Alliance.”<sup>45</sup> These statements demonstrate that NATO intends to become not just the main pillar of the new European security architecture, but an actor of global significance. And here the Alliance faces a dilemma. On the one side, NATO shows respect to the UN. On the other side, Russia or China can block any NATO-inspired resolution of the Security Council, and vice versa. This makes the UN unable to influence security issues at least when the interests of the permanent members are at stake.

Many analysts, like Thomas Graham of the Carnegie Endowment, connect “the UN problem” with “the Russian problem.” He points out, that

As the recent conflict in Kosovo has shown, the US try to override the UN in order to avoid Russia’s veto ... The growing mismatch between Russia’s having a power of veto and no force behind it, will undermine the UN in the long run ... Thus, weakness of Russia poses a threat for UN integrity.<sup>46</sup>

It seems that either the UN is to be totally reformed or it is doomed to become a remnant of the Cold War period. Anyhow, NATO will have to meet the above-mentioned dilemma in the nearest future. The

44 “NATO survey.” *The Economist*. 24-30 April 1999: 10.

45 *Ibid.*

46 Graham, Thomas. “Mir bez Rossii?” (“A World without Russia?”). *NG-Stsenarii*, 8 December 1999. (Translation A.M.)

absence of the UN mandate to justify NATO's actions in Yugoslavia has already produced many pessimistic forecasts about the Alliance's future developments. For example, Mandelbaum makes a remark that the fact that NATO acted without UN authorization implies

either that the Atlantic alliance can disregard international law when it chooses – a precept unacceptable to nonmembers of the alliance – or that any regional grouping may do so (giving, for example, the Russian-dominated Commonwealth of Independent States the right to intervene in Ukraine if it believes ethnic Russians there are being mistreated) – which is unacceptable to NATO.<sup>47</sup>

Taking into consideration all the arguments listed above one can make several conclusions about the goals of the military operation in Kosovo. Considering interests only and not moral values, the war goals were set by the demands of the new European security system, which made the military solution nearly inevitable. What this new security system required was to replace Milosevic with a more comprehensive leader and to patch the Yugoslavian hole on the map of Southeastern Europe (keeping at the same time the territorial integrity of Yugoslavia). Simultaneously, a quick and bloodless military operation was to mark clearly NATO's leading role in the new European security framework and to stress the inability of the other institutions (UN, EU, OSCE) or countries (Russia) to react decisively. However, one mistake was made: Milosevic did not give up quickly, and the operation turned out to be long, not-so-bloodless and contradictory.

### The Painful Lessons of the Operation in Kosovo

The most contradictory fact is that none of the NATO goals has been reached. Milosevic is still in power. Although the opposition to him is now stronger it is virtually not strong enough to overthrow him.

<sup>47</sup> Mandelbaum, "A Perfect Failure," 6.

Moreover, despite the widely published NATO statements about mass desertions and decay of the Yugoslavian army it does not seem to be very damaged by the air strikes. In the eyes of the world outside NATO Milosevic's well being undermines the very idea of humanitarian intervention. Many observers are now convinced that NATO has been unable to prove that it can manage the crisis successfully. *The Economist* wrote:

If the strength of a military alliance is measured by the precise application of explosive power, NATO's performance in the Balkan skies has been a ... success. But the organization's moral authority and diplomatic prowess has been badly shaken.<sup>48</sup>

Michael Mandelbaum considers the whole operation "a gross error in political judgment." He puts forward the following arguments: firstly, the people of the Balkans emerged from the war considerably worse off than they had been before; secondly, the war set precedents that the new principle for governing the use of force in a post-Cold War world would be neither feasible nor desirable to follow; and finally, relations with Russia and China were set back.<sup>49</sup> His position is not the final truth, of course, but it deserves some attention. According to the reports of the world mass media, violence in Kosovo has not been stopped and the UN idea of the KLA disarmament has failed. While the moderates (like Ibrahim Rugova) are losing control over the Kosovar Albanians, the most brutal Albanian leaders (like Hashim Thaci) gain more influence.

NATO's position becomes in this light more and more ambiguous. Thaci (just recently he has been called a "gunman" and a "narcotraf-ficker") is negotiated with. Every day Kosovo is getting rid of more and more ethnic minorities like Serbs, Roma and non-Muslim Albanians who mostly do not support the KLA. The concept of "multiethnic Kosovo" is weakening with every hour as well as the idea of Kosovo being an integral part of the FRY.

48 "NATO survey," 10.

49 Mandelbaum, "A Perfect Failure," 2.

Against this painful background NATO feels much worse than before the air strikes began. The campaign was to be finished by the 50<sup>th</sup> Anniversary summit in order to show to the world the role NATO was going to play in the next century. But something went wrong and no triumph was celebrated. Although NATO always spoke on behalf of the “international community” the major countries of the world where 40 percent of the world population lives (Russia, China and India) opposed “American hegemonism” loudly. Moreover, the term “international community” has been discredited at least in the eyes of Russia and China.

The military operation in Kosovo highlights the problem the new concept of European security constantly generates. These problems will grow along with the “restricted sovereignty” and “humanitarian warfare” doctrines’ application and can have a painful impact on security and peace. The consequences of the Kosovo crisis are not of narrowly European significance. They can affect (and will affect) global security and their true meaning will be revealed not earlier than in 2025-2030. Nevertheless, even now we can draw the following lessons from this crisis:

(1) Kosovo has dramatically lowered the “war threshold” in Europe. For 50 years Europeans lived with the conviction that “war is impossible here.” Europe was widely recognized as a peace zone surrounded by numerous zones of turmoil but nevertheless prosperous. Civil wars in the former Soviet Moldova (between Moldova and the self-proclaimed Transdnestrian Republic) and in the former Yugoslavia started the process that one of the Russian political scientists<sup>50</sup> calls a “thirdworldization” of Europe. Any war between European countries immediately affects global security. The bombing of Kosovo touched Bulgaria and Macedonia directly and Greece, Italy and Albania indirectly, and it caused anxiety in China and Russia.

*Newsweek* states, reflecting the American point of view: “War may be necessary; but modern Europe isn’t ready for it.”<sup>51</sup> Europeans are not

50 Professor Alexander Panarin, Moscow State University.

51 Elliott, Michael. “What We Owe to Them.” *Newsweek*, 25 June 1999: 24.

ready mainly because some of them still remember the devastating consequences of the previous wars (what Americans did not experience, because although the US participated in many wars and local conflicts, their consequences since the Civil War did not touch non-combatants: there were no bombings, starvation or even food coupons, and no forceful migrations). Now this obstacle seems to be overcome. Europeans are getting used to war, and it does not frighten them any more. The bombing of Yugoslavia has not caused any major anti-war protests unlike in the 1970s after the US had decided to base American nuclear missiles in Europe. What looks even more surprising – none of the numerous ecological organizations have been able to mobilize any opposition to the ecological disaster caused by the air strikes.

(2) Kosovo had a very negative impact on the regime of nuclear non-proliferation. Many countries (including India, Pakistan, Iran and Russia) have learned from the Gulf operation, Bosnia and Kosovo that, in the former Indian defense minister's words, "you should never fight the US [NATO] ... unless you have a nuclear bomb."<sup>52</sup> The non-proliferation regime looks, against the Kosovo background, like a trap for the developing countries. Many countries feel that nuclear weapons are the only means of defending their territorial integrity and sovereignty. Kissinger warns that,

During the cold war the democracies relied on nuclear weapons to balance an assumed Soviet conventional superiority. In the post-Kosovo period it is the smaller countries which may turn to weapons of mass destruction in response to America's overwhelming technological edge in conventional weaponry.<sup>53</sup>

It seems that the new concept of European security can divide Europe into fighting blocs once again: a bloc of the core countries and a bloc of the "failed states" defending their sovereignty. However, the Cold War

52 This remark was made by the Indian defense minister after the Gulf War. Quoted in: Huntington, Samuel. "The Clash of Civilizations?" *Foreign Affairs* 72, no. 3 (1993): 46.

53 Kissinger, "As the Cheers Fade," 36.

blocs were more or less equal and deterred one another while the new unequal “blocs” would not help meddling in endless local conflicts. Russia feels anxious about military or non-military intervention of the core states during the domestic conflicts within the “failed countries.” There is no place for Russia in Kosovo-like operations and people are afraid of becoming objects of such invasions one day. These fears were partly justified by the Western mass media campaign against Russia’s actions in Chechnya towards the end of 1999. That is why Russia’s new military doctrine is in fact based on the principle of “nuclear blackmail.” In 1999 Russia removed the obligation of not using nuclear weapons first. This is evidently a step back in the process of nuclear disarmament. As for the Islamic countries they inevitably have accelerated their long-lasting attempts to get a bomb of their own.

(3) The campaign against the Yugoslavian central government, though not deliberately, encourages ethnic terrorism and separatism not just in Europe but worldwide. Although NATO stressed that multi-ethnic and democratic Kosovo remains an inseparable part of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, Kosovo is apparently lost for the FRY. The death of UN employee Krumov who tried to speak Serbian publicly and was shot by an Albanian passer-by has become the culmination of the process of “albanization” of Kosovo.

General Henry Shelton said: “We never said that we were going to ‘disarm’ the KLA. We used the term ‘demilitarize.’”<sup>54</sup> His words sound like a recognition of the fact that NATO let the genie of ethnic separatism out of the bottle. Albanian nationalists strictly back the independence of Kosovo. An independent and purely Albanian Kosovo sooner or later will become a part of Albania. But Albanians live in Greece and Italy too and some forces within the Albanian community would not mind seeing the so-called “Greater Albania” created. New territorial claims open a prospect of major war in Europe. Moreover, ethnic or religious separatism exists in many European countries. Basques in Spain, Irish Catholics in the UK, Corsicans in France –

54 Quoted in: Safire, William. “Why Does ‘Religious’ Now Need a Synonym?” *International Herald Tribune*, 28 June 1999.

nearly every European country has its own skeleton in the cupboard. Europe is, in fact, a boiling pot of nations, and the appearance of French Brittan or Scottish separatism does not look too fantastic.

The sore consequences of Kosovo proceed from the fact that the new ideas about European and global security (e.g., restricted sovereignty, non-military security, etc.) conceal great possibilities and great dangers as well. The main danger is that the traditional sovereignty and non-interference concepts are under question now. Questioning sovereignty is all the more contradictory the more we think of security in moral terms. Traditional security meant mostly protection from foreign invasion, which was always “moral.” Now many international organizations and institutions take for granted that, for example, people’s suffering or human rights violations within a sovereign state pose a “humanitarian challenge” for the other states’ security. Very often this concept gives way to double moral standards (for example, how is it possible to distinguish between the terrorists and the freedom-fighters?).

What makes the new concept of security dangerous is that even after the end of the Cold War the “bloc thinking” still dominates in the world. Every bloc (either NATO-led core states or Russia-led European outsiders) only cares about its own interests and does not want to acknowledge that the interests of the others are of no less importance. Politics is still considered a zero sum game and power is still a synonym for violence. These are the characteristics of the Cold War thinking and European as well as the US and Russian decision-makers seem unable to overcome them. The operation in Kosovo has shown that even the new security challenges like humanitarian and human rights issues are still understood by most politicians in terms of military confrontation.

Fortunately, the new understanding of sovereignty raises a possibility for international cooperation as well as for conflicts. Cooperation seems to be even more productive when resolving Kosovo-like conflicts. Firstly, cooperation would avert the devastating side-effects of a military conflict (e.g., the ecological disaster that the Danube region faces now). Secondly, it would enable us to minimize people’s inevitable suffering during a military operation or when economic sanctions

are applied.

The new European and global security architecture must be grounded on principles different from those of the Cold War period. These principles must be (1) respect for the other countries' vital interests; (2) a vision of politics as the means of achieving common interest; (3) understanding power as not dominating the others but providing stability and security for everyone. Conflict response operations in no way should be unilateral and conducted by one state or a group of states (even if they call themselves the "international community"). Any external invasion should be only possible under the patronage of international organizations with broader representation and preferably after the legitimate state leader gives his or her consent (a perfect example is East Timor).

This is much more difficult and expensive than sending troops. Such a way of responding to a crisis demands skillful negotiating, good will and the ability to compromise. That is why security problems should not be tackled by any military unions created for confrontation, not for cooperation. Otherwise the European security system will not be able to perform its basic functions. We can only cope with the new challenges acting together and respecting each other. This is, probably, the main lesson of Kosovo.

JOHANNES VARWICK

## The Kosovo Crisis and the European Union: The Stability Pact and its Consequences for EU Enlargement

### Introduction

There seems to be a consensus in the political and academic world: the pan-European effects of regional conflicts and instability mean that the medium- and long-term stabilization of Southeastern Europe is in Europe's foreign, stability and security policy interests. According to the German Ministry of Foreign Affairs

a medium and long-term policy must aim to prevent violent confrontations emerging in the region, to create lasting conditions for democracy, a market economy and regional cooperation, and to anchor the south-eastern European countries firmly in the Euro-Atlantic structures.<sup>1</sup>

A historic challenge is before us, Andrew Pierre writes,

to work toward creating a stable, secure, and prosperous region in an area which has known far too little of such conditions. In other words, the opportunity is to de-balkanize the Balkans. [...] The European Union is the beacon to which the Balkan nations are drawn. Their desire to join should create the momentum for helping to complete the necessary economic and political reforms.<sup>2</sup>

- 1 German Ministry of Foreign Affairs. "Preparing a Stability Pact for South-Eastern Europe," 9 April 1999: [http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/2\\_aktuel/index.htm](http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/2_aktuel/index.htm)
- 2 Pierre, Andrew J. *De-Balkanizing the Balkans. Security and Stability in South-Eastern Europe*. Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace, 1999, 20.

And Romano Prodi reminds us that “for the first time since the fall of the Roman Empire we have the opportunity to unite Europe.”<sup>3</sup> Such arguments frequently appear with respect to the Balkans. Even if the Western countries and organizations have reaffirmed their attachment to shared security by proposing a widened European security space from which no country would be permanently excluded and to which each would accede in accordance with predetermined criteria,<sup>4</sup> the real chances of the Southeastern European countries to be integrated with the rest of the continent do not seem, for the foreseeable future, encouraging.

In any case, the consequences for the European Union itself have to be considered. This chapter does not treat the consequences for the CFSP or the ESDI, but concentrates on the more general effects on the future development of the EU and the problem of enlargement.

## Europe at a Crossroads

Europe is at a crucial stage in its development. It goes through fundamental transformation processes in Eastern Europe, the association between the EU and Central and East European (CEE) countries<sup>5</sup> as

3 Romano Prodi cited in the *International Herald Tribune*, 14 October 1999.

4 See Clement, Sophia. “South-Eastern Europe – a differentiated approach?” *WEU Institute for Security Studies Newsletter*, no. 22 (1998).

5 The accession process was launched on 30 March 1998 for all ten Central and East European candidates (Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania, Slovenia and Slovakia) and Cyprus. It is an evolutive and inclusive process in the sense that all these countries are destined to join the EU on the basis of the same criteria, regardless of whether or not they have already started negotiations. It includes an enhanced pre-accession strategy, the accession negotiations, a so-called “screening” of EC legislation and a review procedure. The detailed association negotiation started on 10 November 1998 with Poland, Hungary, Czech Republic, Estonia, Slovenia and

well as efforts to secure peace and stability in Southeastern Europe. At the same time the integration process in Western Europe is proceeding and the enlargement of the EU has become an important topic in the discussion of the future of Europe. Europe with the EU at its core is at a crossroads: it will have to decide whether it will transform itself from a powerful economic community (with a single currency) into an equally powerful political actor. All this is closely linked with efforts to establish a CFSP that is worth its name. With the double challenge of external enlargement and internal reform, the EU will have to prove that it can be respectful of the sensitivities and interests of its own members while becoming even more responsive to the needs and expectations of the world outside.<sup>6</sup> As a result, new concepts should be urgently developed which are adequate to emerging realities. One of these new concepts is the stabilization of Southeastern Europe.

Who would not share the opinion that Europe as a whole should be a place of stable democratic freedom accompanied by economic prosperity and ruled by the power of law<sup>7</sup> rather than by the power of the strongest? Already in the spring of 1993 the former French Prime Minister Edouard Balladur suggested a “Pact on Stability in Europe” with this intention. The consolidation of prospective partners for EU-enlargement was the aim of this ambitious project of preventive diplomacy. Another completely different Stability Pact was passed in 1997 and was supposed to ensure the fulfillment of the criteria of convergence in the course of the Economic and Monetary Union (EMU).<sup>8</sup> A lack of pacts on stability does obviously not exist.

Cyprus. It is likely that they are going to join the EU in 2003.

6 See Gasteyger, Curt. *An Ambiguous Power. The European Union in a Changing World*. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann Foundation Publishers, 1996, 11.

7 Which means a legal and political system in which all the actions of the state can only be taken according to prefixed constitutional or statutory rules and where effective legal remedies are provided for in the case of non-compliance of a representative of the state with these prefixed rules.

8 In particular, it specifies how the countries participating in the EMU should conform to the three percent limit on budget deficits set in the Treaty of Maastricht and the sanctions attached to the non-respect of that limit.

However, the different intentions of the pacts just mentioned already show the fundamental problem: on the one hand stability is regarded as a process of external transfer (widening) and on the other stability is regarded as a process of internal discipline (deepening).

### Southeastern Europe: From a “Black Hole” to a Road Map for European Integration?

With the latest “Stability Pact for South-East Europe”<sup>9</sup> the EU offered membership in the European structures to the Balkan states as well, after the region had in this respect been seen as a “black hole” for the last decade. As Carl Bildt put it:

The EU sponsored Stability Pact, aimed at helping the economies of the region, opens up a new perspective. We must do whatever we can to stop the further Balkanization of the Balkans, and try to further the Europeanisation of South-Eastern Europe. We must look not at our exit strategies from the region but at the entry strategies of the region into European groupings. The EU must replace the vicious circle of disintegration in the region as a whole with the healing powers of long-term integration.<sup>10</sup>

The new President of the European Commission, Romano Prodi, recently said:

We have to think creatively about meeting the needs of countries for whom [sic] membership is a more distant prospect. I am thinking of closer co-operation with those countries, perhaps granting them virtual membership in certain areas as a prelude to full membership. They could, for example, be offered the fullest possible participation in economic and monetary union, new forms of security co-operation adapted to their needs, and new

9 “Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe,” Cologne, 10 June 1999: [http://europa.eu.int/comm/dg1a/see/stapact/10\\_june\\_99.htm](http://europa.eu.int/comm/dg1a/see/stapact/10_june_99.htm)

10 Bildt, Carl. “Rebuilding the Balkans.” *Financial Times*, 21 June 1999.

forms of consultative and observer relationships with European institutions.<sup>11</sup>

A senior adviser of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Romania formulates his future anticipation as follows:

Under the current circumstances, whereby concerns for strengthening regional security in South East Europe are on the top of the agenda of the day, one can only expect, reasonably, that in December this year [1999], in Helsinki, all candidates will be included in the negotiation process, and that at the beginning of the year 2000 negotiations will be started with as many Western Balkan countries as possible for the conclusion of Stabilization and Association Agreements.<sup>12</sup>

In contrast to this the new EU commissioner Günther Verheugen recently declared:

The criteria are unchangeable and no discount, not even out of superior political consideration, should be given. In doing so, the EU would put herself in jeopardy. Therefore, we have to admit honestly that the process might take relatively long.<sup>13</sup>

Sharing the premise that the best way to support the process of transformation and democratization in the respective countries is to anchor the Southeastern European countries firmly in European structures means to think about the methods of implementation. Firstly it is possible to have an adjustment to the “acquis communautaire”<sup>14</sup> *inside* the EU (which means early membership and long transition period) and

11 Prodi, Romano. “Remarks on Future Enlargement.” *Europe South-East Monitor*, no. 3 (1999): 4.

12 Galgau, Vasile. “European Integration Prospects for the Countries of South-East Europe.” *Südosteuropa* 48, no. 7-8 (1999): 417-423; 423.

13 Verheugen, Günther. “Wir müssen auf dem Teppich bleiben.” *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 29 September 1999. (Translation J.V.).

14 This means the sum of the European Union’s common assets to settlements and norms (about 80,000 pages of rules and regulations).

secondly an adjustment to the *acquis outside* the EU (which means late membership and fulfillment of adjustment criteria before accession).<sup>15</sup>

The overall strategic direction of the Stability Pact is to secure lasting peace, prosperity and stability for Southeastern Europe, foster effective regional cooperation and give a firm European anchorage to the region, in which the EU will play a leading role. The question is, after all, which consequences are to be expected for the process of European integration. To put it in a nutshell, do we in the long run unintentionally cause the *Balkanization of Europe* by fostering the *Europeanization of the Balkans*?

### Core Functions of the European Integration Process, or “Deepening” Versus “Widening” the EU

In this context it is useful to first remember some of the core functions of the western European process of integration.<sup>16</sup> European governance has embraced a broad agenda of political cooperation. One important item on that agenda has been geopolitical stabilization, meaning both the provision of external security and the embedding of safe democracy. The European Community did not become an accepted arena for the direct provision of security, but it made an indirect contribution in two regards: first, by strengthening the multilateral links and commitments between its members; and, secondly, by encouraging economic stabilization. The second core area of policy cooperation at

15 See Varwick, Johannes. “Systemwechsel/Transformation.” In *Handwörterbuch Internationale Politik*, ed. Wichard Woyke, 368-378. Opladen: Leske und Budrich, 1998.

16 See Wallace, Helen. “Politics and Polity in the EU: The Challenge of Governance.” In *Policy-Making in the European Union*, ed. Helen Wallace and William Wallace, 3-36, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996; and Varwick, Johannes. *Sicherheit und Integration in Europa. Zur Renaissance der Westeuropäischen Union*. Opladen: Leske und Budrich, 1998.

the European level has been that of socio-economic adjustment. The third core function of European integration concerns the political symbolism attached to the EU as a club of west European democracies. This has permeated institution building and the development of law within the EU; it has generated specific common rules and policies and it has had an impact on the definition of external policies. European integration led the participating states to structural freedom and prosperity by means of political, social and economic cooperation. So why not export this successful model as broadly and quickly as possible and extend it to other parts of the continent?

With the launch of the EMU, the process of European integration has acquired a new quality. This has far-reaching consequences both for relations within the EU and for its ties with the outside world. Indeed, European integration is having an ever more powerful impact not only on domestic policy in the member states but also on their internal structures. As a result, the debate on the goal of integration is once again becoming more intense. Ultimately, this debate centers on the question of how the EU and its member states should be constituted, both politically and legally, not least with a view to the strategic goal of enlarging the Union.

The debate between those wishing to give priority to the pursuit of deeper integration between member states and those wishing to give priority to widening the EU's membership intensified following the Kosovo-crisis. A key issue between wideners and deepeners is that of motive. For example, deepeners have accused wideners of pursuing a hidden agenda, aimed at slowing down the processes of deepening and at transforming the Union into a loose confederation. Conversely, wideners have accused deepeners of insularity – that is, of failing to adjust to post-Cold War realities and of perceiving Europe to mean Western Europe. Various strategies for future enlargement have been suggested. For example, prospective members might be admitted in selected groups, the wave approach. Another possibility is that applicants could be asked to join a separate organization, closely linked to the EU, as a necessary prelude or preparation for full entry (the waiting-room approach). Another suggestion is that Southeastern European countries could be encouraged to set up their own union, with

the possibility that the western and south-eastern unions would merge once disparities between them had narrowed (the parallel integration approach or a Europe of concentric circles). Some countries might also be offered partial membership, for example, entailing exclusion from the Structural Funds, the Internal Market or the EMU.

Without further deepening, the EU will, however, have larger difficulties in dealing with the demands of the new members and in trying to remain efficient and effective. Many concepts have been proposed to ease this problem, such as a multi-speed Europe which takes place within an EU framework or a core Europe created by a smaller group of countries which is able and willing to pursue further integration, also outside the EU framework. Finally, it was suggested that a Europe *à la carte* with limited, functional, sectorial and loose agreements among all the interested countries be created.<sup>17</sup>

## Requirements for Enlargement

Firstly, it has to be stressed that there are many requirements to be met for a participation in the “successful community EU.” The difficulties which the first-round candidates for joining the EU (Poland, Hungary, Czech Republic, Estonia, Slovenia and Cyprus) have to face while trying to adopt the *acquis* show this very clearly. This is hardly caused by the EU’s political will for enlargement but rather by the complexity of the “*acquis communautaire*” which has been worked for and

17 See Jones, Robert A. *The Politics and Economics of the European Union*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996, 275-290; Wessels, Wolfgang. “Problems and Perspectives of the EU – Political and Institutional Options.” In *East-Central Europe and the EU: Problems of Integration*, ed. Karl Kaiser and Martin Brüning, 67-83. Bonn: Europa Union Verlag, 1996; Stubb, Alexander. “A Categorization of Differentiated Integration.” *Journal of Common Market Studies* 34, no. 2 (1996): 283-295; and Mayhew, Alan. *Recreating Europe. The European Union’s Policy towards Central and Eastern Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998, 358-385.

acquired in a more than 40-year long history of integration. Furthermore it has to be kept in mind that the institutional constitution of the EU and her predecessors was initially designed for only six states and a remarkably smaller area of responsibilities. To put it differently: a radically enlarged EU can logically neither have the same responsibilities, nor the same institutional design. In the end, political integration is a regionalist concept, which functions only as long as the political limit of a territorially expanding area of integration is respected. This political limit can certainly not be defined objectively but it shows the tension between deepening and widening. Political correctness as well as analytical and strategic clarity demand that this fact be stated overtly.

Already before the latest Pact on Stability the EU had concluded agreements, which offer association and the prospect of participation and which are formal prerequisites for negotiations with 13 states. If we add further countries of Southeastern Europe to this number, an EU with between 25 and 30 member states will be the result. How could this Union be managed? In an EU inflated in such a way it is extremely probable that integration will not only come to a standstill, but will also possibly even regress to a loose association like a free trade area. Is it possible to maintain with this the peace-giving function of the process of European integration? Is this of any help to the Balkan states?

## The Stability Pact and its Predecessors

At first sight the conclusion of the “Stability Pact for South-East Europe” in June 1999 was the most obvious consequence of the Kosovo War for the European Union. It was the major political and institutional response to the Balkan crisis. The Pact, initiated by the EU on the basis of a German proposal, is likely to remain a framework organization. The Stability Pact can look back at previous concepts, which have been developed by the EU: the regional approach and the principle of conditionality. The Stability Pact is neither the first nor the only initiative of this type to attempt to contribute towards resolving the

regions' problems. The "Central European Initiative" (1989), the "Central European Free Trade Area" (1991), the "Black Sea Economic Cooperation" (1992), the so-called "Royaumont Process" (1995), the "South-East Co-operation Initiative" (1996) and the "Multinational Peace Force in South Eastern Europe" (1997), to name the major ones,<sup>18</sup> are all working towards establishing stability, security and prosperity in the region on the basis of enhanced cooperation, good neighborliness, mutual understanding and regional solidarity. As a consequence of the Kosovo War all of these organizations have increased their activities, which are generally aimed at achieving cooperative security and stability.

The European Union's regional approach<sup>19</sup> for the Southeastern European states (the successor states of Yugoslavia without Slovenia, plus Albania) was originally developed after the conclusion of the Dayton Peace Treaty in 1995. The cooperation was determined by the following principles. The EU intended to permit the participating countries access to the EU-internal market to the same degree to which the partners permitted their nearest neighbors access to their own markets. Prospective participation was accompanied by the encouragement of independent regional attempts at cooperation. General, and for all states, obligatory conditions on the one hand and special conditions for individual states on the other were formulated within the concept of conditionality. The principle applies that relations with the EU can be improved to the same degree to which progress in the fulfillment of the set criteria becomes visible. The so-called Royaumont-Process in this

18 See Wohlfeld, Monika. "Implications for Relations Between Western and Central Europe." In *The Implication of the Yugoslav Crisis for Western Europe's Foreign Relations*, ed. Pavel Baev et. al., 50-64; 56-62. Paris: Institute for Security studies, Western European Union, 1994; and Calic, Marie-Janine. "Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik." In *Südosteuropa. Gesellschaft, Politik, Wirtschaft, Kultur. Ein Handbuch*, ed. Magarditsch Hatschikjan and Stefan Troebst, 276-300; 286-289. München: Beck, 1999.

19 See European Commission. "The Stabilisation and Association Process for Countries of South-Eastern Europe: Commission Communication to the Council and European Parliament COM (99) 235," 26 May 1999, [http://europa.eu.int/comm/dg1a/see/com\\_99\\_235/2.htm](http://europa.eu.int/comm/dg1a/see/com_99_235/2.htm)

region occurred mainly without public attention. At least seven follow-up meetings took place, unfortunately without great success. As a consequence of the Kosovo War, no attention was paid to this process for a while.<sup>20</sup>

The Stability Pact itself, caused by the Kosovo War, was developed in at least four stages and during this process went through fundamental changes.<sup>21</sup> During the European Council meeting in Vienna in December 1998 the implementation of a donor conference and the development of a joint strategy for the Balkans in connection with the CFSP were decided. The so-called “Fischer-Plan,” which connected positive incentives with the fulfillment of concrete conditions, was presented at the beginning of April 1999. The EU holds out the prospect of an enhanced contribution to the stabilization of the Balkans. In all cases, in which progress according to the regional or conditional approach has been achieved, the conclusion of “Stabilization and Association Agreements” is planned. On the prospect of the South-eastern European countries to become members of the EU it says specifically:

The EU can, beyond its current instruments, do more for the medium and long term stabilization of South-Eastern Europe:

- Raising the EU’s political visibility and effectiveness in the region: the EU Common Strategy for the Western Balkans (commissioned by the Vienna European Council) involving the neighboring States; nomination of an EU Special Representative for South-Eastern Europe and/or mandating the new CFSP Special Representative; review of current EU mechanisms.
- Clear and repeated commitment on the part of the EU that the countries in the region have a prospect of acceding, even if the time of accession cannot

20 See Ehrhart, Hans-Georg. “Preventive Diplomacy or Neglected Initiative: The Royaumont Process and the Stabilization of Southeastern Europe.” In *The Southeast European Challenge: Ethnic Conflict and International Response*, ed. Hans-Georg Erhart and Albrecht Schnabel, 177-195. Baden-Baden: Nomos, 1999.

21 See Axt, Heinz-Jürgen. “Der Stabilitätspakt für Südosteuropa: politischer Aktio-nismus oder langfristig tragfähiges Konzept?” *Südosteuropa* 48 no. 7-8 (1999): 403-415.

yet be determined. This is not merely based on equality of treatment with the Central and Eastern European States. As developments in the CEE countries have shown, the prospect of EU membership is a key incentive to reform. This is the only way to keep the south-eastern European countries on the stabilization track in the long term. Once conditions are met (full use of the trade and cooperation agreements, resolution of the minority problems) the EU must be ready to hold out the prospect of association to the countries in question.<sup>22</sup>

### “Membership Light” for the Balkan States?

It is remarkable that concrete conditions for future membership have not been named yet (at all events not as clearly as in the negotiations with the states of CEE) and this conveys the impression that there can be something like “quick EU-membership light” for these states. The criteria, which already apply for the other states in CEE, are nowhere described in detail. These are first of all the basic principles of the Treaty of Amsterdam concerning the three basic political conditions of a European identity, democratic status and respect of human rights. Above this the applicants must accept the Union’s political and economic system and have the capacity to implement it. This presupposes the acceptance of the Union’s existing “*acquis communautaire*” including the content, principles and political objectives of the treaties and the acceptance of the more ambitious goals of the Treaty on the European Union. Furthermore, the applicants must be ready to fulfil the so-called Copenhagen-criteria:

- stability of institutions guaranteeing democracy, the rule of law, human rights and respect for and protection of minorities;
- the existence of a functioning market economy, as well as the capacity to cope with competitive pressure and market forces within the Union;

22 German Ministry of Foreign Affairs, “Preparing a Stability Pact for South-Eastern Europe.”

- the ability to take on the obligations of membership, including adherence to the aims of political, economic and monetary union;
- readiness of the European Union to accept the enlargement which means the capacity of the Union to take on new members while maintaining the momentum of European integration.<sup>23</sup>

This shows in detail that the EU defined an extensive and very elaborate (and even growing) set of criteria, which have to be followed before the states may join the EU. After the council of foreign ministers in Luxembourg in April 1999 had still spoken about an unconditional perspective for Southeastern Europeans to join the EU (“The Stability Pact will give all countries in the Balkans region a concrete perspective of stability and integration into Euro-Atlantic-Structures”),<sup>24</sup> the EU foreign ministers finally agreed on a common position on the Stability Pact in Brussels in May 1999. Differing from the “Fischer-Plan,” the EU-foreign ministers hesitated to offer the possibility of joining the EU. More especially, France, Spain, Italy and the European Commission opposed the idea. Accordingly in the common position the Copenhagen criteria are all listed. Furthermore it is stressed that the Southeastern European countries have to put the criteria into practice first, before an accession can be thought of. In the common position it is literally stated:

The EU will draw the region closer to the perspective of full integration of these countries into its structures through a new kind of contractual relationship, taking into account the individual situation of each country, with a perspective of EU-membership on the basis of the Treaty of Amsterdam and once the Copenhagen Criteria have been met.<sup>25</sup>

23 The European Council in Copenhagen in 1993 officially declared that associated countries may become members of the Union if they apply and the criteria are fulfilled. All documents and resolutions concerning enlargement are available at <http://europa.eu.int/comm/enlargement/index.htm>

24 Council General Affairs, Luxembourg, 26 April 1999: <http://ue.eu.int/newsroom/main.cfm?LANG=1>

25 “Common Position Concerning the Launching of the Stability Pact of the EU on South-Eastern Europe, Council Meeting General Affairs, Brussels,” 17 May

The Brussels decisions present a necessary turning point in the conception of the Stability Pact. The expectation of the “quick EU-Membership light” was hereby disappointed. This certainly helps to achieve equal treatment in comparison with the CEE candidates for EU-accession, but at the same time the Brussels decisions caused disillusionment on the part of the Southeastern Europeans. The Stability Pact is after all reduced to the feasible: the reconstruction and recovery of the destroyed Kosovo region and the stabilization of Southeastern Europe.

The Stability Pact reached the next level with the opening conference in Cologne in June 1999. On the role of the EU it was stated at the conference,

We welcome the European Union's initiative in launching the Stability Pact and the leading role the EU is playing, in cooperation with other participating and facilitating States, international Organizations and Institutions. The launching of the Pact will give a firm European anchorage to the region. The ultimate success of the Pact will depend largely on the efforts of the States concerned to fulfil the objectives of the Pact and to develop regional cooperation through multilateral and bilateral agreements. We warmly welcome the European Union's readiness to actively support the countries in the region and to enable them to achieve the objectives of the Stability Pact. We welcome the EU's activity to strengthen democratic and economic institutions in the region through a number of relevant programs. We note progress towards the establishment and development of contractual relations, on an individual basis and within the framework of its Regional Approach, between the EU and countries of the region. We take note that, on the basis of the Vienna European Council Conclusions, the EU will prepare a 'Common Strategy towards the Western Balkans', as a fundamental initiative. The EU will draw the region closer to the perspective of full integration of these countries into its structures. In case of countries which have not yet concluded association agreements with the EU, this will be done through a new kind of contractual relationship taking fully into account the individual situations of each country with the perspective of EU membership, on the basis of the Amsterdam Treaty and once the Copenhagen criteria have been met. We note the European

1999: [http://europa.eu.int/comm/dg1a/see/councils/bxl\\_17\\_may\\_99.htm](http://europa.eu.int/comm/dg1a/see/councils/bxl_17_may_99.htm)

Union's willingness that, while deciding autonomously, it will consider the achievement of the objectives of the Stability Pact, in particular progress in developing regional cooperation, among the important elements in evaluating the merits of such a perspective.<sup>26</sup>

The development of a new kind of contractual cooperation was suggested because the Balkan states do not yet have the status of association that is a precondition for the beginning of negotiations on accession. The new process will be based on the existing Regional Approach and reaffirms the EU's resolve to take up the challenge and responsibility to contribute to stability of the region. The stabilization and association process will focus on Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, the FRY, the FYROM and on regional cooperation in Southeastern Europe. The Stabilization and Association Agreements will include a perspective on full integration into the EU structures, consolidation of democratic and other reforms, a framework for political dialogue, the possibility of a free trade area, justice and home affairs cooperation and association-oriented assistance programs in practically all the fields of EU competence. It was finally stated in the opening meeting on the Stability Pact of July 1999:

Those countries in the region who [sic] seek integration into Euro-Atlantic structures alongside a number of other participants of the Sarajevo Summit, strongly believe that the Pact and implementation of its objectives will facilitate this process. We reaffirm that the EU Member States and other participating countries and international organizations and institutions commit themselves to making every effort to assist them to make speedy and measurable progress along this road.<sup>27</sup>

With the launching of the Stability Pact, new opportunities have been

26 "Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe, Cologne," 10 June 1999: [http://europa.eu.int/comm/dg1a/see/stapact/10\\_june\\_99.htm](http://europa.eu.int/comm/dg1a/see/stapact/10_june_99.htm)

27 "Sarajevo Summit Declaration of the Heads of State and Government of the Participating and Facilitating Countries of the Stability Pact and the Principals of Participating and Facilitating International Organizations and Agencies and Regional Initiatives," 30 July 1999: [http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/2\\_aktuel/index.htm](http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/2_aktuel/index.htm).

created to achieve a more coherent and consistent inter-institutional cooperation, in a synergetic manner which could avoid, at the same time, duplication, waste of resources and unwanted competition.<sup>28</sup> The Pact should now move from conferences and planning papers to concrete results. Whether this aim can be accomplished, remains to be seen.

## Consequences for the European Union

How has the Kosovo war affected the European Union and what are the consequences for the European integration process? The danger of the earlier edition of the Stability Pact was that it might have caused exaggerated expectations in the Southeastern European countries concerning EU-accession. If politicians vow to support early accession talks to the EU and promise Southeastern Europe a quick integration perspective, is it any wonder that expectations have been extremely raised?<sup>29</sup> If the high expectations that have been raised, and which are the result of implied or explicit commitments made by the West, are quashed for lack of sufficient economic assistance and security assurance, “a major geopolitical disaster could ensue.”<sup>30</sup> But if on the

28 The EU has appointed a German, Bodo Hombach, as “Special Coordinator for the Stability Pact.” Within the Pact, a “South Eastern Europe Regional Table” will coordinate the activities of the three so-called “Working tables” on “Democratization and Human Rights,” on “Economic Reconstruction, Development and Cooperation” and on “Security Issues.”

29 See the following statement of a Romanian political scientist as an example: “We believe that the question ‘What could the EU do to stabilize the region?’ is a question without a right answer. The question which we would like to ask is ‘How could the Balkans join the EU by 2010?’ We believe that the Kosovo crisis has become an internal rather than an external affair for the EU. Europe’s new approach presupposes integration, not stabilization of the Balkans:” Krastev, Ivan. “Facing the Political Risk in South-Eastern Europe.” *Südosteuropa Mitteilungen* 39, no. 2 (1999): 99-108; 107.

30 Pierre, *De-Balkanizing the Balkans*, 11.

other hand the Copenhagen criteria and the obligations of the Treaty of Amsterdam are not respected, at least two problems are predictable. Firstly, this would cause understandable displeasure among the CEE candidates, who would get the impression that they have to overcome greater hurdles to achieve EU accession. Secondly, the membership of insufficiently qualified candidates would fundamentally change the character of the EU.

Therefore, every possible measure must be taken prior to enlargement to consolidate today's EU and make it ready for enlargement. Reforms must precede enlargement, but they must not be used to block enlargement. Instead, enlargement must serve as a lever for reforming the EU. These reforms are indispensable in any case, but with enlargement they become crucial to the EU's continued existence as a powerful and international organization which remains capable of acting.<sup>31</sup> The process of EU enlargement will soon primarily highlight the need to find a mechanism to ease the conflict between deepening and widening, and between flexibility and cohesion. The ongoing integration movement will necessarily proceed at "multiple speed" in the real world of European economic and political development.<sup>32</sup>

In this respect the Treaty of Amsterdam serves as an important ap-

31 First of all an enlarged EU needs more "supranationality" (i.e. structures that possess legal authority to make rules that are binding on the nation-states) and less "intergovernmentalism" (i.e. structures that are marked by the member states' dominance in initiating, deciding and executing European policies). Examples are reforming the decision-making process, which was created for the six-member EC (qualified majority voting as a rule for decisions in an enlarged EU, reweighting of member states' voting powers and the future shape of the Commission, more power to the parliament); reforming the agriculture and structural policy; reform of the Council of Ministers to boost efficiency; more powers for the Commission president over choice of commissioners and dismissing them if necessary, reforming the finance system. Furthermore the EU needs increased attention to foreign and security policy issues and less to agriculture issues.

32 See Schäuble, Wolfgang and Karl Lamers. *Reflections on European Policy II – the Future Course of European Integration*. Bonn: CDU/CSU Bundestagsfraktion, 1999.

proach with its new decisions on “Closer Cooperation and Flexibility.”<sup>33</sup> French-German proposals to establish a sophisticated set of arrangements to allow a federal core to go forward could not be put through. The new flexibility in the Treaty of Amsterdam is protected by a range of fail-safe devices designed to safeguard the Community’s objectives and existing achievements, and to prevent a situation where the slow movers can never catch up with the vanguard.

Neither the present level of integration nor the peace-providing function of European integration will survive if the new decisions are not finally applied conceptually. A widening of the EU without a fundamentally new model for integration would not create more stability but would on the contrary cause new Europe-wide instability. This can neither be in the interest of the EU, nor in the interest of any state with the intention of joining the EU. If we, one day, have to deal with an EU enlarged not only by the six (or after the latest suggestions of the Commission now twelve, including Rumania and Bulgaria) states with whom negotiations are going on today, but also enlarged by other CEE states, the Balkans and even Turkey, we will have to face the danger that some mistakes of European history, which we until then thought to have learned from, might repeat themselves. In the course of necessarily declining integration, power struggles, which are now dealt with in the process of EU integration, will come up again. Alliances and counter-alliances would be the probable consequence. The present approach of promising participation in all directions without sufficient EU-internal intention to reform the EU, therefore, causes the concern that the Stability Pact itself might in the long run become the source of new instability. This does not mean that the Stability Pact is the fundamentally wrong concept. Europe-wide stabilization, the constructive support of the political, economic and social development remains one of the main tasks for European policy. Of course, financial help and a European perspective – of whatever kind – are necessary for this area as well. The Kosovo war should, however, most of all lead to

33 See Treaty of Amsterdam, Title Via: “Provisions on closer cooperation:” Duff, Andrew, ed. *The Treaty of Amsterdam: Text and Commentary*. London: Federal Trust, 1997, 181-197.

an increased debate on flexible integration.

Despite the difficulties in developing forms of flexible integration, enlargement demands some form of flexibility for two reasons. Firstly, the combination of increased numbers and increased diversity in political, economic and security interests and approaches means not only that decision-making might become difficult, but that operating procedures might also become highly inefficient (owing to increased numbers of participants in meetings, more languages, an increase in possible coalitions, and so on). An increased qualified majority voting cannot resolve these problems on its own; it will also strain consensual decision-making processes, especially if individual member states are frequently in a minority or outvoted on key developments. Secondly, while enlargement involves countries that are undergoing major economic transitions and are lagging behind, the current EU member states might seem simply to require the standard approach of applying transitional periods and derogation leading to a multi-speed European Union. But very long transitional periods could create tensions that threaten the unity of the Single Market.

## Conclusion

Enlargement after the Kosovo-crisis may thus both demand and contribute to the development of a multi-speed Europe. For the EU and the “European architecture” we must expect and accept an increase in complexity and variety. Alexander Stubb writes,

The main challenge, however, is to make the necessary institutional, procedural and policy changes so as to ensure the effective functioning of the enlarged Union. Since expansion leads to diversity, the Union will have to be flexible enough to embrace varying patterns of integration. Unpalatable though it may seem, the Union might have to accept the inevitability of a differentiated future – without in the process allowing its decision-making processes to become hopelessly cumbersome. Widening and deepening – enlargement and integration – will not prove easily compatible. Hence, in responding to these challenges, differentiated integration, using variants of

multiple-speed and variable geometry, might provide the necessary solution.<sup>34</sup>

As mentioned at the beginning, the real chances of the Southeastern European countries being integrated in the EU do not seem, contrary to the promises, encouraging. But the war in Kosovo has concentrated the EU's thinking on the dangers of continuing to allow a divided Europe. The countries in the Balkans should be given new opportunities for expanded economic and political cooperation with the EU and other important organizations. Without stability in its southeastern part, there can be no sustainable peace in Europe as a whole. But the aim must be to broaden the EU without diluting it. Policy has to strike the right balance between "speed" and "quality." Integrating Southeastern Europe into the EU is a task that will take decades.

The peoples of the Balkans have to resolve their conflicts themselves before they can join the European Union. They should not think that they could import them into the EU, so that the EU can resolve their conflicts for them. However, they certainly need Europe's assistance. Europe and the EU must be prepared to commit themselves to far-reaching political, security and economic reconstruction in Southeastern Europe, apart from the rash promise of letting them pass through their portals, not least because stability is in the interest of all the participating countries and the EU itself.

34 Stubb, "A Categorization of Differentiated Integration," 294.

ANDREW B. DENISON

## The United States and the Lessons of the Kosovo Campaign

### Introduction

The desire to learn lessons is often greater than the ability to do so – this is no less true for the Kosovo campaign than for many other decisive moments in history. The air campaign and its politics have spawned numerous “lessons” – almost as many as there are American commentators on strategic affairs. All the same, the “lessons debate” is important; it will shape future US policy, it will leave its mark on NATO. Military decisions, relations with the other states, and how the U.S. president sells such crisis management to the public will all be affected by the conclusions drawn in the United States and elsewhere about the Kosovo campaign and its implications for cooperative security. Many of the more general conclusions about NATO’s Operation Allied Force and its aftermath will also shape specific U.S. policies because of the large U.S. role in the war. There are, however, also certain “lessons” that only the United States will draw.

Whether for the United States, or the broader international community, not all the lessons are correct. The clearest example of this was President Clinton’s own initial “lesson.” Speaking to US troops in Macedonia, but addressing the world, Clinton pronounced:

Whether you live in Africa, or Central Europe, or any other place, if somebody comes after innocent civilians and tries to kill them *en masse* because

of their race, their ethnic background or their religion, and it's within our power to stop it, we will stop it.<sup>1</sup>

This open-ended commitment provoked sharp criticism from the American strategic community, with some observers speaking of Clinton as “an exultant crusader” who had “virtually severed the link between interventionist impulse and national interest or cost/benefit constraint.”<sup>2</sup>

By September, Clinton had moved back into line with the prevailing winds, tempering his rhetoric and restraining his commitment. Speaking before the United Nations' General Assembly, Clinton warned,

We cannot do everything everywhere. We must approach this challenge with some considerable degree of humility. It is easy to say, never again, but much harder to make it so. Promising too much can be as cruel as caring too little.<sup>3</sup>

Kosovo brought many lessons regarding international cooperative security, but the ultimate one for the United States revolves around the purpose of American power. What is the national interest? How should it be advanced? Answering this question means entering the muddy water of the relationship between interests and values. When is it important to husband American power, whether political, economic or military? When is it important to use American power earlier as opposed to later? Public pressure to address humanitarian crises is a significant part of American political culture, indeed, of most democratic political cultures. The values one holds dear at home cannot

- 1 Clinton, William J. “Remarks by the President to the KFOR Troops,” 22 June 1999, Skopje, Macedonia Airport: <http://www.pub.whitehouse.gov/uri-res/I2R?urn:pdi://oma.eop.gov.us/1999/6/23/6.text.1>
- 2 Rosenfeld, Stephen S. “Exultant Crusader: For Overseas Rescue Missions, Americans Still Prefer Caution and Care.” *Washington Post*, 2 July 1999: <http://www.washingtonpost.com>
- 3 Clinton, William J. “Remarks by the President to the 54<sup>th</sup> Session of the United Nations General Assembly:” <http://www.pub.whitehouse.gov/uri-res/I2R?urn:pdi://oma.eop.gov.us/1999/9/21/10.text>

be entirely ignored abroad. At the same time, there is only so much one can do in the face of tragedy – especially if one wants to make things better instead of worse. What should the standards for humanitarian intervention be? A strategy for making the world a safer place for America and its values might mean saving thousands of lives in Kosovo – or it might mean putting cooperation with Russia above all else, so as to prevent the Russian nuclear arsenal from falling into the hands of rogue nations or fanatical terrorists.

Kosovo raised these ultimate questions and a host of others. It did not necessarily lead to clear-cut answers. Ivo Daalder and Michael O’Hanlon, in their own study of Kosovo’s lessons, offered a wise bit of humility: “The failure of many to predict the course of the war should give appropriate pause to those who have been quick to draw lessons from NATO’s success.”<sup>4</sup> Nevertheless, Kosovo was a deciding moment in many ways and lessons will inevitably be drawn. For the United States, as this chapter will examine, there were lessons about military force as a coercive instrument, about the role of the Alliance and the United Nations in US foreign policy, and about the way in which America’s domestic politics impinge on foreign policy choices.

Many saw the war carried out with a remarkable degree of unity. Behind the scenes, there was less harmony. As *Washington Post* reporter Dana Priest has exposed in an invaluable three-part series on the war:

There was intricate diplomacy among NATO capitals, frequent argument over highly secure video links, and remarkable last-minute improvisation. There were powerful tensions between military commanders and civilian politicians, and also sharp disputes over tactics among the generals.<sup>5</sup>

Frenchmen have warned of such situations: Napoleon said “give me a coalition to fight.” De Tocqueville said democracy is “a decidedly

4 Daalder, Ivo H. and Michael E. O’Hanlon. “Unlearning the Lessons of Kosovo.” This abstract is adapted from an article appearing in the Fall 1999 issue of *Foreign Policy*, retrieved from <http://www.foreignpolicy.com>

5 Priest, Dana. “The Commanders’ War, Part One: The Plan to Invade Kosovo.” *Washington Post*, 19 September 1999: <http://www.washingtonpost.com>

inferior form” when it comes to foreign policy. Yet in the end, there was sufficient unity within and among the democracies to prevail. Nevertheless, many observers are deeply disturbed about the military compromises that had to be made in the name of political unity, and they are worried that the consensus could have easily broken, leading to NATO defeat and unmitigated disaster for Transatlantic unity. Luck is very much a factor in any military conflict, but many felt too much luck and not enough strategy shaped NATO’s fight with Serbia. The American strategic community now feels the West must be cautious about the promise of casualty-free success in any such future conflict – yet this is in tension with a perception among the general public that military intervention should be used to help to stem humanitarian crises – even if casualties are involved.<sup>6</sup>

## Military Power as a Coercive Instrument

Using military power to achieve political ends is no easy task. It is all the more difficult when the ends (Serbian military and police out of Kosovo, but not the end of Milosevic or sovereignty) as well as the means (only air power and no casualties) are strictly limited. Coercion that leaves the choice between victory and defeat entirely in the hands of the opponent is particularly difficult. Should Milosevic have chosen to, he could have ruled over a pile of rubble and NATO forces still would have had to fight their way into Kosovo. For many in the American military, the lesson of Vietnam, and even of Iraq, was that it is always better to attack the opponent’s ability to fight, not his will to fight. In other words, only by destroying the opponent’s forces and

6 A Gallup Poll taken in June 1999 showed, “Two-thirds ... believe the U.S. should continue to respond to international human rights atrocities with military force.” Saad, Lydia. “Kosovo Intervention Hasn’t Shaken Americans’ Basic World View: Majority Want U.S. to Take Active Role in World Affairs and Defend Human Rights.” Gallup News Service, 24 June 1999: <http://www.gallup.com>

controlling his territory can you really impose your will upon him. Yet NATO was, at least at the onset, not willing to take the ground by force, nor was it able to effectively attack formations in the field. NATO had to hope that the harm it could inflict on things the Yugoslav government valued would be enough to get Belgrade to cease and desist. This situation of dependency moved Adm. James O. Ellis Jr., commander of allied forces in southern Europe, to tersely conclude: "We were lucky."<sup>7</sup>

Yet if military power is so dependent on luck, then it cannot be a very effective instrument, at least in the form used in Kosovo. One of the questions is thus whether Kosovo is the paradigm for future interventions. "Luck," if nothing else, made Kosovo a military success in the final sense. Yet many things went wrong. It was by no means a "text-book" military operation. As Nick Cook of *Jane's Defense Weekly* has observed:

Kosovo was a war of extremes – arguably the first time in history that a conflict has been won using air power alone; and the first time that an overwhelmingly superior allied force was stymied by its inability to bomb through clouds, by its perilously low stocks of smart weaponry and by an enemy whose most effective tactic was to sit tight in the face of intense aerial bombardment and do nothing.<sup>8</sup>

Kosovo showed the possibilities of military power, more importantly, air power, as an instrument of coercion. But Kosovo also showed it would be wrong to think such coercion will ever be easy.

7 Arkin, William. "What's Luck Got to Do With It?" *Washington Post*, 13 September 1999: <http://www.washingtonpost.com>

8 Cook, Nick. "War of Extremes." *Jane's Defense Weekly*, 7 July 1999: <http://www.janes.com/defence/features/kosovo/images/lessons>

### *The efficacy of air power*

When Belgrade rejected the Rambouillet peace plan in March 1999, NATO leaders were able to achieve a limited consensus on the use of limited military means to try to coerce the Belgrade government into accepting its terms. In this case, limited means meant air power alone, no casualties for NATO, and minimal civilian casualties for the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. Despite air power's limitations when it comes to denying the opponent the ability to fight, air power certainly has its temptations. As Eliot Cohen, director of the Gulf War Air Power Survey, has observed: "Air power is an unusually seductive form of military strength, in part because, like modern courtship, it appears to offer gratification without commitment."<sup>9</sup> In Washington, there was no desire to let American troops get caught up in a ground war – even if there was some willingness to field a small fraction of a post-conflict peacekeeping force. By default, that meant air power: gratification without commitment.

But the air power decision was not just arrived at by default. Air power also had its advocates among those in the U.S. strategic community who believed that a Revolution in Military Affairs (RMA) had given the U.S. Air Force (and Navy) a qualitatively new and superior ability to wage war from the sky. For them, an RMA meant that air power – after almost a century of exaggerated expectations – finally could secure victory on its own.

Kosovo certainly did move air power into a different dimension. It was a "first" of sorts. Yet air power failed to secure NATO's primary reason for going to war in the first place: preventing a mass expulsion of Kosovo Albanians. As Daalder and O'Hanlon point out, "The conflict in Kosovo was two wars in one. NATO lost the first, but decisively won the second." NATO lost the war of ethnic cleansing, but it did succeed in achieving the aim President Clinton articulated as: "to demonstrate the seriousness of NATO's purpose so that the Serbian

9 Cohen, Eliot. "The Mystique of U.S. Air Power." *Foreign Affairs* 73, no. 1 (1994): 109.

leaders understand the imperative of reversing course.”<sup>10</sup> In the end, NATO’s air power won. But the price (12,000 Albanians dead) and the time it took (74 days) were more than most had expected.

NATO’s strict rules-of-engagement clearly thwarted the ability of NATO to halt the Serbian ground campaign. Keeping pilots above 15,000 feet meant “tank plinking” would not be very effective. Refraining from arming the KLA left the Serbian forces the luxury of not having to mass – thus no attractive targets. Clearly there were strong political reasons for avoiding casualties and not making too great a commitment to what Clinton’s special envoy to the Balkans, Robert S. Gelbard had once called a “terrorist organization.”

Yet many in the U.S. Air Force argued that going after individual tanks in Kosovo was not striking at Milosevic’s “centers of gravity” and was thus counterproductive in any event.<sup>11</sup> Moreover, there was some question as to whether Serb forces needed either tanks or artillery to empty Kosovo of its inhabitants. It was Serbian militias with machine guns and gasoline cans that did the gruesome job – and it will be some time before such marauding gangs will be vulnerable from the air.

As such, there was a clash of service cultures. NATO’s top military commander, Gen. Wesley Clark, an Army man, with a keen eye for public sentiment, felt NATO needed to demonstrate that it was doing something about the ethnic cleansing on the ground. The Air Force, on the other hand, saw this as a replay of the Scud hunt in Iraq: a colossal

10 Daalder/O’Hanlon, “Unlearning the Lessons of Kosovo.”

11 Yet a sharp debate existed about the value of attacking the armor of forces in the field, as Dana Priest shows in his series on the war: “‘The tank, which was an irrelevant item in the context of ethnic cleansing, became the symbol for Serb ground forces,’ said Air Force Gen. Joseph Ralston, vice chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. ‘How many tanks did you kill today?’ All of a sudden this became the measure of merit that had nothing to do with reality.” Priest, Dana. “United NATO Front Was Divided Within.” *Washington Post*, 21 September 1999. Moreover, there is some question as to whether flying lower would have really helped over the rough terrain of Kosovo. See Ignatieff, Michael. “Der gefesselte Kriegsherr.” *Die Zeit*, no. 33, 1999: <http://www.diezeit.de>, from *The New Yorker*, translated by Meinhard Büning.

waste of resources. Air Force officers did not want to be “slicing off bits of the tail,” they wanted to “cut off the head.” The problem with “cutting off the head,” or going for the “center of gravity,” is that it is very difficult to determine exactly what the “center of gravity” is. As one analyst has put it,

The center of gravity might be the communications network, but it also might be Milosevic’s teddy bear. You just can’t be certain what level of pain is required, or the relative degree of pain caused by various targets.<sup>12</sup>

As such, the jury is still out when it comes to Kosovo and the efficacy of air power. Should you attack forces in the field or go for the center of gravity? What is the cost of caution when it comes to saving pilots’ lives? To answer this question we must first of all understand what it was that made Milosevic “unexpectedly give in.” Few think it was the limited damage his forces were suffering in Kosovo, but no one is sure it was the loss of centers of gravity (bridges, oil refineries, electric power, political and military headquarters, or communications) that did the trick either. Many do, however, point to NATO’s move towards a ground invasion as a decisive factor.

### *The ground option*

The air power debate thus needs to be seen in the context of the debate on a ground option. As will be remembered, NATO initially rejected the use – or even the threat – of ground forces. There was no consensus in the Alliance – above all, because there was no consensus in the United States – on even holding open an “option” of a ground invasion. Defending this stance, Gen. Shelton, Chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff was reported to have testified in the Senate that there is only one thing worse than not having an option, and that is thinking that you have an option that you do not really have.<sup>13</sup> Nevertheless, the United

12 Holger Mey, president of the Institute of Strategic Analyses in Bonn, in discussion with the author.

13 CNN coverage of the hearing before the full Senate Armed Services Committee,

States saw a feverish debate about whether ground forces should have been deployed anyway, even if they were not to be used. And as the campaign dragged on, more and more U.S. observers called for the organization of a ground force capable of fighting its way into Kosovo.<sup>14</sup> The British government also strongly pushed for a ground force to do the job. In the face of this, and with the air campaign dragging into its third month, the White House began to shift its stance and gave its approval to start serious planning for such an invasion.

The argument for simply having the “option,” even if it was not to be used, was that it would complicate Milosevic’s planning. He would have to devote forces to fortifying borders. Forces might even need to mass, which would make them more vulnerable. Above all there were those who said that, one way or another, NATO *had* to take Kosovo on the ground. That meant getting a force in. In the end, it was, of course, far more preferable to be able to pass through the significant fortifications and difficult terrain of the border areas without opposition. But this was, as Adm. James Ellis said, based to a good degree on “luck.” Milosevic chose to let NATO in; he was a long way from being forced to do so.

Many argued that ground forces could do something air power could not: force a decision by occupying the contested territory. Again, Admiral Ellis stated: without a ground force threatening Yugoslavia, “only the enemy could decide the war was over.”<sup>15</sup> General Clark, too, talked of the problem of relying on air power alone: the air campaign

15 April 1999.

14 On 13 May 1999, *The New York Times* published an advertisement calling for a ground campaign sponsored by U.S. foreign policy heavyweights: Morton Abramowitz, Saul Bellow, Zbigniew Brzezinski, Richard Burt, Frank Carlucci, Dennis DeConcini, Paula Dobriansky, Geraldine Ferraro, Robert Hunter, Philip Kaiser, Max M. Kampelman, Lane Kirkland, Jeane Kirkpatrick, Peter Kovler, Ron Lehman, John O’Sullivan, Richard Perle, Eugene Rostow, Donald Rumsfeld, Stephen Solarz, Helmut Sonnenfeldt, William Howard Taft, Elie Wiesel, Paul Wolfowitz, and Elmo Zumwalt. See also their web site: <http://www.balkanaction.org>

15 Cited in Arkin, “What’s Luck Got to Do With It?”

“was an effort to coerce, not to seize,” said Clark.

It only made good sense that at some point, if [Milosevic] continued to lose and we didn't, that he would throw in the towel. But we could never predict how long he would hold on because it wasn't a function of any specific set of losses. It was a function of variables that were beyond our predictions – ultimately, his state of mind.<sup>16</sup>

The strategic arguments for keeping the ground option open – RMA proponents notwithstanding – were solid. But in the end it was a political decision: was NATO willing to make that kind of commitment? Fortunately, NATO did not have to make that final difficult choice to have its soldiers fight their way through Kosovo's heavily fortified borders. Yet in some way, that NATO began planning this option, that more and more ground forces were entering the area, and NATO engineer units were strengthening the road from Albania to Kosovo to handle the weight of heavy armor, played a role in Milosevic's capitulation to NATO demands. NATO was also moving to give the KLA a greater role as a surrogate ground force. The growing frustration with the air campaign among Western leaders, and their consequent move toward a ground invasion, leads Antonio Missiroli, of the WEU Institute in Paris to the wry conclusion that, “Air power works best when it is about to fail.”<sup>17</sup>

At the same time, when looking at the question of ground forces, the military debate cannot be separated from the political debate. In March, NATO's choices were very much constrained to a “limited air operation” or no operation at all. From a military point of view, there were plenty of strategic and operational blunders. From a political

16 Clark as cited in Priest, “United NATO Front Was Divided Within.”

17 Discussion with the author.

view,<sup>18</sup> however, the choice seems more appropriate. For in the end, the need to win, the need to maintain Alliance cohesion, and lots of luck – paradoxically, including the waves of refugees and tales of atrocity that steeled Western resolve – generated the political will that was absent in March.

*The Revolution in Military Affairs in theory and practice*

Kosovo offers a number of insights not only into the question of the relationship between ground and air operations, but also into the question that has dominated American military planning over the past decade: the ostensible RMA. RMA proponents see the information revolution – and its impact on sensors, guidance, and command – as fundamentally changing the nature of warfare. What gunpowder, mass armies, the railway or the tank were to previous wars, information will be to future wars, they say. Yet Kosovo was a mixed message on this front. As Adm. Ellis has observed, information warfare was, “... at once a great success ... and perhaps the greatest failure of the war.”<sup>19</sup>

The ability to carry out precision strikes meant that of 23,000 bombs

18 As Michael Howard says: “To study a war without taking into account the circumstances in which it was fought and the peace to which it led is a kind of historical pornography; like the study of sexual intercourse in isolation from the relationship within which it takes place and the consequences that flow from it.” Howard, Michael. “When Are Wars Decisive?” *Survival* 41, no. 1, (1999): 130.

19 Cited in Arkin, “What’s Luck Got to Do With It?” Nick Cook, writing in *Jane’s Defense Weekly*, even goes so far as to speculate that information warfare was an “invaluable tactic:” “In addition to highly effective jamming provided by US EA-6Bs and other aircraft, it is believed that the USAF [US Air Force] also used its nascent information warfare assets to shut down Serb computers used in the command and control of the air defence network. ‘Hacking’ into computers in this way probably proved an invaluable tactic in the face of Serbia’s reluctance to use its prized air-defence assets (apparently for fear of having them targeted by NATO suppression of enemy air defenses (SEAD) aircraft). Against such tactics, indeed, ‘infowar’ – a highly secretive and new ‘warform’ – may have been the most effective measure available to NATO for neutralising the Serb SAM threat.” Cook, “War of Extremes.”

dropped, only 20 went astray. Collateral damage was minimal, and this was essential to maintaining political support among western publics. At the same time, faulty information sent five bombs into the Chinese Embassy – a colossal blunder that also blew apart Western plans for getting Beijing’s approval for a UN resolution authorizing a force to go into Kosovo. Seeing all does not mean knowing all. The fog and friction of war were very much a part of Allied Force – the dramatic predictions of RMA proponents notwithstanding.

Clearly, there were weapons systems that performed particularly well, and they will receive greater emphasis in the future. NATO did take down, or at least turn off, Yugoslavia’s potent air defense. But it was probably the hugely expensive B-2 and its very inexpensive, but accurate, Joint Direct Attack Munition (JDAM), that won the most praise. The plane could fly non-stop from the United States, needed minimal support aircraft, and could deliver 16 GPS-guided bombs onto target, day or night, no matter what the weather. Of course, the irony is that it was the JDAMs dropped from a B-2 that blew up the Chinese embassy.

While the technology was orders of magnitude superior to that of World War II, the Air Force and Navy were going after targets not all that different from those struck back then: bridges, oil refineries, power generation, political and military command, communications, etc. Moreover, there was also a belief in NATO circles that “the people” of Serbia had in some way to be made to feel the pain. “Turning off the lights in Belgrade,” was one way to do this; first with graphite bombs that allowed for rapid repair, later, with conventional explosives. No power also meant no water, and this was indeed a hardship on many. Achieving consensus was extremely difficult on such questions. As Dana Priest has observed, inflicting “pain on the people,” “... was one of the overarching moral, political and military questions of the war – and a source of dissension among the allies.”<sup>20</sup> Even the information revolution cannot remove one of war’s most fundamental challenges: making the right moral choice.

20 Priest, Dana. “Bombing by Committee.” *Washington Post*, 20 September 1999: <http://www.washingtonpost.com>

Another lesson in the realm of RMA, is that quality is not everything. Quantity does matter – at least when you start to run out of precision munitions. To avoid this problem in the future, as Cook writes,

military officials and industrialists are wrestling over whether to stockpile weapons or nurture an industrial framework that is lean and agile enough to go to rapid production when the need arises. In the case of JDAM, Boeing was able to double its monthly production rate during the Kosovo conflict by adding just four people to the production line.<sup>21</sup>

The rapid pace of technological innovation – and the expense of many systems – is a strong argument against stockpiling. But trusting in the ability of a shrunken industrial base to surge production in times of crisis is also difficult.

In the end, however, it was a shortage of information that was NATO's biggest problem, whether in terms of where targets were or in having the data links to flexibly re-task aircraft that are already in flight – a requirement that grew out of the chaotic target approval process that prevailed among the 19 members of the Alliance – RMA remained more theory than practice.

### *The dynamics of coercion*

War is never easy. In retrospect, it is hard to imagine that so many informed people so readily assumed that a few days of air strikes would be enough to get Milosevic to stand down. In some sense, of course, this was also wishful thinking among NATO's political leaders. There were many military men in the Pentagon who asked: "bomb, then what?"<sup>22</sup> But there was a political imperative to avoid any real contingency planning, either for escalating air strikes or for moving to a ground invasion. There was, at the onset, no consensus for a major military operation. But the failure of the initial very limited strikes to

21 Cook, "War of Extremes."

22 Graham, Bradley. "Joint Chiefs Doubted Air Strategy." *Washington Post*, 5 April 1999: <http://www.washingtonpost.com>

achieve their objective created a new situation. Now NATO credibility was also on the line. So the Alliance gradually escalated the use of force. This also drew fire, particularly from those who recalled the failure of “gradual escalation” in Vietnam. Gradual escalation allows an enemy to adapt. Better to hit him with everything you have at the onset, so as to capitalize on maximum effect.<sup>23</sup> Yet NATO did not have the political will for the sharp blow and its shock value that air power theory calls for. The development of political will was very much a dynamic process. Relationships among key players of the NATO alliance were an essential part of this dynamic.

### Multilateralism as a Motif of U.S. Foreign Policy: NATO, the United Nations and the Lessons of Kosovo

There is no doubt that for the United States, the rhetoric of multilateralism is more pronounced than the reality. But this should come as no surprise – the same holds true for most countries. The difference is that when the United States acts unilaterally or multilaterally, it has a much more profound effect on other countries. Moreover, U.S. views on multilateralism also must always be seen in the context of the U.S. “leadership question.” Many Americans believe that U.S. leadership best facilitates international cooperation: without the United States getting out in front and taking the initiative, there would be no

23 *Jane's Defense Weekly* offers interesting figures on the pattern of gradual escalation, and compares to the Gulf War's greater emphasis on a high sortie rate from the very beginning: “NATO statistics show that a total of 37,465 sorties were flown between 24 March and 10 June, an average sortie-generation rate of 486 missions per day. Of the total, 14,006 were strike and SEAD missions (10,808 of which were dedicated strike sorties). In the early days of the campaign, however, the sortie rate over Yugoslavia was more like 150 missions per day. This compares to 109,876 sorties over the 43-day Gulf War, or an average of 2,555 missions per day. Of the total flown in the Gulf, about half were strike missions, averaging around 1,600 sorties per day:” Cook, “War of Extremes.”

meaningful international cooperation to speak of. Yet taking the initiative also means acting on one's own, in the expectation that others will follow. Recognizing that leadership and multilateralism go hand in hand also explains why NATO as a multilateral body is preferable to the UN. Even though NATO has 19 veto powers and the UN only five, the ability of the United States to shape Alliance policy is much greater – not least because the NATO allies are more like-minded than the Security Council members.

Though currents of isolationism do flow through the American body politic, it is also clear that being able to cooperate with other like-minded nations very much coincides with American democratic principles of accountability, compromise and consensus. There is also a more concrete reason why American leaders seek out the cooperation of other states: opinion polling – and experience – shows that the US public is much more willing to support military interventions if other countries participate.<sup>24</sup> This means sharing not only the cost in blood and treasure, but also in terms of political risk: Chancellor Gerhard Schröder going to Beijing to take the heat for the embassy bombing was an important demonstration of solidarity. The United States needs coalitions, even if there is an underlying ambivalence about the constraints this creates. Cooperative security is less a choice than an imperative.

#### *War by committee*

During the Kosovo campaign, there was pronounced concern – sometimes misplaced – that the European allies were tying the hands of the American military. “War by committee” was the pejorative description of NATO's command arrangements. Indeed, for most, the value of

24 “Seventy-two percent of the public and 48% of leaders think the United States should not take action alone in responding to international crises if it does not have the support of its allies.” Chicago Council on Foreign Relations. “American Public Opinion and U.S. Foreign Policy.” <http://www.cfr.org>, February 1999.

political cohesion in the Alliance is more abstract and elusive than the concrete inability to take on – no holds barred – the military of a third-rate power. The press frequently made allusions to Vietnam, where President Lyndon B. Johnson and his cabinet would choose politically correct bombing targets – while sitting around the breakfast table. The U.S. military was frustrated with “war by committee” as well. This image has been reinforced by Dana Priest’s article, which shows the Europeans, especially the French, dragging their feet on increasing the tempo and scope of the air operation.<sup>25</sup> Clearly, the efficiency of complex air tasking is made easier if politicians “don’t meddle.” All the same, there is no denying that the political leaders of most NATO countries felt very vulnerable during the campaign, fearing that political support for the undertaking could slip through their fingers at any time. Should Germany, France, Italy or even one of the smaller NATO countries have thrown in the towel, this would have been a major strategic blow. The deaths of too many civilians, or even “those of the wrong type” – journalists, doctors, Kosovo Albanians – might result from a tactical detail. But the consequences would be far more profound.<sup>26</sup>

Ironically, one of the sharpest conflicts about military operations came not during the campaign, but after, and it was not between Paris and Washington, but between London and Washington. NATO supreme commander and head of U.S. forces in Europe, Wesley Clark, wanted to prevent the Russians from occupying the Pristina airport by helicoptering in NATO forces first. British General Michael Jackson, commander of the NATO peacekeeping force going in to Kosovo, rejected this, not wanting to so overtly confront the Russians. Jackson used the so-called “red card,” going over Clark’s head to Blair. The British Prime Minister phoned Clinton, who then decided to go the

25 Priest, “Bombing by Committee.”

26 General Wesley Clark on the importance of cohesion: “I was operating with the starting assumption that there was no single target that was more important, if struck, than the principle of alliance consensus and cohesion:” cited in Priest, Dana. “Target Selection Was Long Process. Sites Were Analyzed Again and Again.” *Washington Post*, 20 September 1999: <http://www.washingtonpost.com>

route of caution – and consensus – by overruling Clark.

From a military perspective, this failure of the chain of command was a major breach of discipline. At the same time, it showed that NATO was able to accommodate its various national sovereignties without a major breakdown. Nevertheless, it did move the chairman of the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee to say that an investigation of NATO's command procedures would be an important part of Senate hearings on the Alliance later in the year.<sup>27</sup> U.S. Secretary of Defense William Cohen also pointed to the need for streamlining NATO's decision-making, at least in those cases where interests do coincide, saying that as NATO's first war, it also showed the shortcomings of coalition decision-making and the alliance's need to "retool its existing political machinery to be more effective for the staccato timing of a military contingency."<sup>28</sup>

In terms of the Pristina airport, and certainly on bombing targets, the story was very much that of the Americans wanting to be more aggressive and the Europeans holding back. But on a very major issue, it was the Europeans, or at least Tony Blair and his ministers, who were advocating more forceful action: ground troops. Here, the United States, particularly the military leaders in the Pentagon, were in no mood for a major ground operation – they did not even want Apache helicopters flying low over Kosovo. When it comes to actual combat – at least since Vietnam – the Pentagon has become a wellspring of caution. This contrasts sharply with, for example, the U.S. military's role during the Cuban missile crisis, when the Pentagon was pushing the most aggressive options.

While NATO's "cumbersome multilevel approval process," was inflexible, there are those who have made a virtue out of this necessity.

27 See Graham, Bradley. "NATO Insubordination in Kosovo Is Recalled, General's Orders Disregarded, Shelton Says." *Washington Post*, 10 September 1999: <http://www.washingtonpost.com>

28 Graham, Bradley. "Up in Arms: Department of Defense, War Review Extended a Month." *Washington Post*, 15 September 1999: <http://www.washingtonpost.com>

Lawrence Freedman, of Kings College, has argued: “The very requirement of unanimity that made it difficult for the alliance to move far beyond its original strategy, to a land war, also made it difficult for it to move back.”<sup>29</sup> Once the Alliance had set out on its course, the political dynamics of the Alliance made for no turning back.

*America and Europe: Kosovo and a new balance of power*

Kosovo, coming as it did in 1999, the year of the Euro, has led to many lessons about the role and responsibility of the European allies within NATO. The Europeans’ early and active involvement gave them diplomatic leverage, even if their military contribution was limited. The Kosovo experience is thus much more European than the Bosnian one (Rambouillet, Tony Blair’s forceful role, Joschka Fischer’s G-8 diplomacy, Martti Ahtisaari’s arrival at the Cologne EU summit, Michael Jackson commanding KFOR, and U.S. troops making up only a small fraction of the overall contingent). Kosovo showed Europe’s weakness, particularly in advanced weaponry, but it also showed Europe’s strength in terms of resolve. As Daalder and O’Hanlon observe: “First, America may have run the war, but Europe is running the peace. Second, the Kosovo crisis and war have produced a sea change in European – especially German and British attitudes on things military.”<sup>30</sup> Not only did Europe take a larger role in Kosovo, its action also made Washington more supportive of a greater European defense capability. Many Americans would agree with Charles Grant, of the London Centre for European Reform, in his assertion: “The fact that the Europeans did not ‘let down’ the Americans will help to make the US relatively well disposed to the idea of European defense.”<sup>31</sup>

29 Freedman, Lawrence. “The Future of International Politics in the Wake of Kosovo.” *Jane’s Defense Weekly*, 21 July 1999: <http://www.janes.com/defence/features/kosovo/politics.html>

30 Daalder/O’Hanlon, “Unlearning the Lessons of Kosovo.”

31 Grant, Charles. “European Defense Post-Kosovo.” Working paper, Center for European Reform, June 1999, 3.

Britain's shift to a strong EU defense role, has of course been a central part of this. Meetings in St. Malo, Washington and Cologne all showed Blair's government leading the way in giving the European Union responsibility for European defense – something that was anathema to John Major, not to mention Margaret Thatcher. Britain's Atlantic credentials, its "special relationship," its cooperation with the United States in the Persian Gulf, all these things make a greater EU role – based on British support – more acceptable to the United States than one only led by the French. Blair's strong push for ground forces may have caused some acrimony between London and Washington, but it also left Americans with the impression that Europe was at least willing to put its money where its mouth was.

Germany's active military role also contributed to changed US views about European resolve. Washington was impressed by Schröder, Fischer and Scharping, both on the diplomatic front, and at home, where they kept the young Red-Green coalition together, despite its strong pacifist currents. As a keystone of the European Union and a central US ally in Europe, German willingness to give active support to European defense also counts in Washington. Nor should the nature of French involvement in this NATO operation be overlooked. While France was often the most influential voice of caution, Paris played the biggest European role in terms of aircraft. Paris also showed that it could put its forces under NATO – and American – command. As such, Kosovo did much for US-French military relations. Dana Priest states: "Despite frictions, both Paris and Washington considered the joint effort a quantum leap in their political-military relations."<sup>32</sup> Former junior French health minister, Bernard Kouchner, also won praise from Washington in his function as head of UNMIK. Italy, too, demonstrated resolve, providing the major air bases for NATO aircraft, despite strong domestic opposition.

While Americans were impressed by Europe's new resolve, they are also wary. There is the traditional ambivalence when it comes to sharing not only burdens but also power. Henry Kissinger, infamous

32 Priest, "Target Selection Was Long Process."

for once having asked who he should call if he wanted to call “Europe,” is worried that Europe’s desire for greater independence could take a negative tack. While he supports greater European defense capabilities (and spending), he is concerned that Europe does not have the political will to spend the money needed. He fears that this will lead Europe to a rhetoric of independence, but without the capacity for real autonomy. Such a Europe, he maintains, would be frustrated and thus make transatlantic relations more acrimonious.

If ... Europe fails to make a real defense effort, resentments against American dominance will only increase. And if the quest for independence is driven largely by anti-American motives, it will saddle the Alliance with all the compulsive competitiveness that nearly destroyed Europe before the Atlantic Alliance was founded in 1949.<sup>33</sup>

Kosovo showed a Europe with resolve, if not advanced weaponry. Kosovo, and indeed Bosnia, are now European protectorates in all but name. But these lessons of Kosovo will quickly fade if Europe is not able to enhance its own ability to field hi-tech, expeditionary forces.

### *Russia*

US-Russian relations took a clear turn for the worse during the Kosovo campaign and its immediate aftermath, but they improved almost as quickly as they had soured – before being hit by the next crisis: Chechnya. It was clear in Washington that life would be much easier – *vis-à-vis* Belgrade, the European capitals and the UN in New York – if Russia were “on board.” Active US diplomatic engagement, particularly by the number two at the State Department, Strobe Talbott, testified to this. But Washington was not willing to have Russia on board at any price. As with the NATO-Russia Permanent Joint Council, Russia would have “a voice, but not a veto.” In the end the Russian intermediary Viktor Chernomyrdin did little more than convey

33 Kissinger, Henry. “The End of NATO as We Know It?” Los Angeles Times Syndicate, *Washington Post*, 15 August 1999; <http://www.washingtonpost.com>

the essence of the alliance's demands to Milosevic, although Moscow said it would never play such a role. As Lawrence Freedman observes:

Throughout the crisis, Moscow lacked effective sanctions when it did not get its way. As a result, most of the time it did not get its way. Events during the conflict confirm the limits of Russia's power. Long-term effects will depend on whether Russian policy-makers decide they must learn to operate more effectively within those limits, or carry on pretending to be a great power.<sup>34</sup>

For Washington, the Kosovo experience with the Russians could be described by the old saying about the opposite sex: "Can't live with 'em, can't live without 'em."

### *The United Nations*

In a sense, this was also true of the United Nations. Washington in no way wanted its hands tied by the United Nations. The Bosnian experience remained all too vivid to most American decision-makers. Nevertheless, the UN remained an important source of legitimacy for the United States. That it was an even more important source of legitimacy for Washington's European partners was one more reason why the United States could not afford to ignore the UN. Daalder and O'Hanlon even go so far as to maintain:

... Kosovo ultimately says more about the UN's continued strength than its weakness. The United Nations proved to be a central character in the intricate diplomatic minuet danced by the Americans, the Europeans, and the Russians in the weeks leading up to Belgrade's surrender. Once Belgrade gave in, the UN was given political control over Kosovo.<sup>35</sup>

Indeed, many in the United States argue that the United Nations would have been weakened if a "use-of-force" resolution had been put to a vote in the Security Council in March. A Russian or Chinese veto

34 Freedman, "The Future of International Politics in the Wake of Kosovo."

35 Daalder/O'Hanlon, "Unlearning the Lessons of Kosovo."

would have been a loud confirmation of the widely held American assumption that the UN is too paralyzed by Great Power divergence to play an effective role in crisis management. The lesson may thus be: better a green light after the fact, than a red light before.

#### *Multilateralism and American interests*

Perhaps the most remarkable aspect of the Kosovo campaign was that 19 truculent democracies could agree on anything at all – and that they could even get the Russians, the Chinese and the United Nations to give the outcome their seal-of-approval. Achieving any kind of consensus among this multilateral multitude was a real feat of diplomacy. For Washington, such a diplomatic effort to achieve multilateral consensus, while at the same time maintaining the necessary effectiveness to address the problem at hand, is nothing if not exhausting. Mistakes are made, resentment builds, but in the end, there is little choice but multilateralism, even for the “world’s only superpower.”

Militarily, NATO may have been dysfunctional, but politically, it worked – even if just barely. In many ways, there was no alternative to “war by committee,” and no matter how much grumbling there was in Washington, it seems the future will bring more of the same. Europe’s resolve raised the possibility of a new balance across the Atlantic when it comes to maintaining international peace and security. Washington welcomed this, but remained wary of the fact that deeds would not follow words. Moscow’s sympathies for Belgrade left many in Washington once again disillusioned about the prospects for any kind of real partnership. At the same time, Russia’s unwillingness – and inability – to do much for Belgrade reminded Washington that Moscow had very little maneuvering room when it came to opposing the West. Finally, Kosovo demonstrated that the UN is indeed a very important part of U.S. diplomacy – black helicopters and billion dollar debts notwithstanding. But for Washington, it also underlined the importance of not allowing the pursuit of vital U.S. interests to become hostage to the UN Security Council. Guarded multilateralism will remain the coin of the realm.

## Constraints and Opportunities in Domestic Politics

Coming into office in 1993, Bill Clinton said, “There is no longer division between what is foreign and what is domestic.”<sup>36</sup> This is no less true of military intervention than of free trade areas or financial services agreements. Strategy was not only required to bring Milosevic to his knees without splitting apart the North Atlantic Alliance or totally alienating Russia. Strategy was also required to maintain at least a facade of unity between the White House and Capitol Hill, between the National Security Council and the Pentagon, between the Joint Chiefs of Staff and NATO Commander Wesley Clark. In retrospect, the White House claims to have gotten it “just right.” Congress, the public, the allies – all were on board because the military strategy met the political needs. In private, high level officials are more circumspect. Luck was a very important factor.<sup>37</sup>

The “CNN Effect” is said to be many things: that television news brings international crises into the living room; that “sound bites” have come to replace sound analysis; that television makes for short attention spans and a fickle public. The “CNN Effect” is also a fundamental tension between two contradictory goals. Footage of atrocities in distant lands raises an outcry among the public to “do something;” but when the military means to “do something” are employed, pictures of American soldiers dead or dying invoke the opposite reaction: “Bring the boys home.” Crisis management in the White House means balancing these two contradictory impulses.

### *Presidential power*

36 “Clinton’s Inaugural Speech,” 20 January 1993: <http://www.pub.whitehouse.gov/res/I2R?urn:pdi://oma.eop.gov.us/1993/1/21/1.text.2> uri-

37 Interview with a senior member of the National Security Council.

The Clinton Administration, having just come out of a bruising impeachment battle, was extremely wary about antagonizing the American public any further. Pressure to “do something” was felt, but there was also great fear that public support for the air operation was fragile and could break at any moment. Other commentators have called this “casualty myth” into question – maintaining that as long as military power is achieving results, the public is willing to support it.<sup>38</sup> Indeed, it was only when the air campaign was moving into its third month that public support for what was increasingly appearing to be a fruitless effort began to wane. This decline in support was in turn influential in moving the White House to think more seriously about a ground campaign.<sup>39</sup>

The Clinton Administration has long suffered from the accusation that it bases its policy too heavily on opinion polls. In the case of Kosovo, there were also many commentators, whether in the media or on the Hill, who called on Clinton to exercise greater leadership. They wanted a clear and compelling argument about why the United States was fighting this war and how it intended to win. The Administration did develop a line of argument about the “why and how” that, to be fair, was probably no worse than what most of the commentators would have offered up if they had moved beyond criticism. To satisfy those who thought in terms of geopolitics and national interest, there was the argument that the Balkans were the crossroads of Europe, Asia and the Middle East. Fire burning there would inevitably spread. To satisfy those who came to foreign policy from a more “ethical” perspective, there was the argument that America as a model of multiculturalism could not stand by while one ethnic group slaughtered another. If there is a lesson here, it is that you sometimes have to be all things to all people. Politics is the art of coalition building, and building coalitions

38 See Feaver, Peter D. and Christopher Gelpi. “A LOOK AT ... Casualty Aversion; How Many Deaths Are Acceptable? A Surprising Answer.” *Washington Post*, 7 November 1999: <http://www.washingtonpost.com>

39 Interview with a senior member of the National Security Council. Also see Graham, Bradley and John F. Harris. “Clinton Reassessing Sufficiency of Air War.” *Washington Post*, 3 June 1999: <http://www.washingtonpost.com>

means being able to accommodate different interests.

### *Congressional qualms*

The Administration was also fortunate that the Republican-controlled Senate and House of Representatives could not come up with a common position on the war. Divisions ran across party lines, with some members of both parties calling for a rapid escalation and a move to ground forces, while others argued this was Europe's fight and the United States should get out at the earliest possible moment. As the *Washington Post* reported on 10 April 1999,

Clinton, like many Republican conservatives and some Democrats, remains opposed to deployment of U.S. ground troops, while hawkish GOP internationalists and an increasing number of Democrats insist that the war must be escalated even at the risk of U.S. casualties.<sup>40</sup>

During one of its more schizophrenic weeks, the House of Representatives voted at the end of April 1999 to oppose funding for a ground invasion, to oppose immediate withdrawal of American ground forces, and with a tie-vote of 213 to 213, to reject a Democratic resolution supporting the President's bombing campaign.<sup>41</sup> The Senate also rejected a resolution sponsored by Kosovo hawk and presidential contender, John McCain, authorizing the President to use all means necessary – read ground forces – to evict Serbian forces from Kosovo. Earlier, however, the Senate did give its support to air strikes, voting 58 to 41.<sup>42</sup>

While there was no clear congressional position confronting Clinton, it was apparent that Congress was less patient with the European allies. The President was forced to manage Alliance relations; the Congress

40 See Gugliotta, Guy and Juliet Eilperin. "Hill Delegation Urges Ground War in Kosovo." *Washington Post*, 10 April 1999: <http://www.washingtonpost.com>

41 See "Clinton's War." *Roll Call*, 3 May 1999: <http://www.rollcall.com>

42 Dewar, Helen. "Clinton, Hill Relations Strain Over Kosovo." *Washington Post*, 27 March 1999: <http://www.washingtonpost.com>

could complain about the Europeans not carrying their share of the risk and meddling excessively on targeting questions. But while the allies are important and the President is the Commander in Chief, he cannot afford to ignore Congress, even if there is no common position. This does not, however, mean that the President should bow to Congressional whim. Clinton could have done more to gain Congressional support for a more forceful campaign to evict Serb troops from Kosovo.

### Conclusion: The Lessons of Kosovo and the Purpose of American Power

Kosovo's lessons for the United States and its approach to cooperative security are as many as they are ambiguous. On one level, it is certainly true that the purpose of American power cannot be seen as distinct from the means and effectiveness by which that power is applied. While the West appears to have prevailed over Belgrade in both Bosnia and Kosovo, many wonder whether diplomatic pressure and military force were combined effectively. Many also wonder whether Kosovo will set a troublesome precedent for intervening militarily whenever a humanitarian crisis arises. As Joseph Nye argues in *Foreign Affairs*, even in the information age, it is important to recognize that "moral values are only a part of foreign policy."<sup>43</sup> If the United States fails to address larger, though more long-range threats, like relations with Russia or China, the consequences could be far more dire than the few hundred thousand dead in the former Yugoslavia. Henry Kissinger's warning is even sharper, as he believes that humanitarian intervention, in itself, could upset the global order of national sovereignty in existence since the thirty-years war:

43 Nye, Joseph S., Jr. "Redefining the National Interest." *Foreign Affairs* 78, no. 4 (1999): I.

This abrupt abandonment of the concept of national sovereignty coupled with a truculent diplomacy marked the advent of a new style of foreign policy driven by domestic politics and the invocation of universal moralistic slogans.

The don of American foreign policy warns of a world where “virtue runs amok.”<sup>44</sup>

Kosovo opened a new era of cooperative security by setting the precedent of using force to change the domestic policies of a sovereign state. It did not, however, offer the United States or any other country, a clear guideline for dealing with such situations in the future. Military force was ambiguous in its success as an instrument of coercion. It seems that while technology is allowing for the more precise application of force, this is being outpaced by the belief that force can be used without incurring casualties on one’s own side, or even, perhaps, on the opponent’s side. By the same token, maintaining a multilateral front on such actions is preferred in theory, but it remains difficult in practice. There was much to be praised about NATO’s unity, about the Security Council passing Resolution 1244, but this unity was fragile at best. Finally, the Kosovo crisis demonstrated that the American president is not “the most powerful man in the world.” For the Clinton Administration, domestic distractions undermined more active diplomacy early in the crisis; its desire for strong public support weakened its willingness to use the force necessary to bring the conflict to an early end. The conclusion of this chapter is that on the military, diplomatic and domestic front, Kosovo was anything but easy – and that luck played a decisive role in the final pyrrhic victory. At the same time, the Kosovo campaign has increased the probability that the American public will respond to the next CNN broadcast of humanitarian tragedy with the cry “to do something,” but that a wary American leadership will be reluctant to do anything more than support a tepid campaign of gradual escalation.

44 Kissinger, “The End of NATO as We Know It?”



EKATERINA STEPANOVA

## Russia's Policy on the Kosovo Crisis: The Limits of "Cooperative Peacemaking"

From the outset of the Kosovo crisis, Russia has been actively involved in the conflict regulation process in its capacity as a member of the Contact Group on the Former Yugoslavia, the UN Security Council and the OSCE. Along with the United States and the European Union, Moscow helped to mediate the Rambouillet and Paris talks. After NATO attacked Yugoslavia, Moscow initiated several diplomatic steps to end the war and ended up taking part, although on special terms, in the NATO's KFOR operation in Kosovo.

### Western Perceptions of Russia's Kosovo Policy

Citing primary motives for Russia's involvement in the Kosovo crisis, Western observers first and foremost point out that by struggling to play some role in the conflict regulation process, Russia is trying to preserve its big-power influence pursuing the cause of the so-called "residual imperialism." Russia's constant "dissention" with Western and especially US policies in this and other post-Cold War regional conflicts is most commonly interpreted as a continuation of a "post-imperial syndrome" and an attempt to recover a voice on the world stage. Often cited are Russia's obsession with its "mystic pan-Slavic mission" in the world and its longstanding historical commitments to stand by the Serbs. Also, Moscow's dissention is seen as an attempt by the Kremlin, and personally by President Yeltsin, to appease nationalist/communist domestic opposition by taking on a more active foreign policy course and to reap needed political benefits from such displays of diplomatic independence. Finally, Moscow's position on the

Kosovo crisis – that has tended to accent the right of Belgrade authorities to safeguard Yugoslavia’s territorial integrity – is interpreted as close to the one with which it defended its own bloody conflict in the breakaway region of Chechnya. Most of the above-mentioned motives are emotional, psychological and cultural. It might be easier to dismiss the factors driving Russia’s foreign policy as largely irrational and to explain away everything by Moscow’s retrospective thinking, but it does not help to shed the light on the real nature and direction of Russian foreign policy.

Russia’s “post-imperialist” ambitions and retrospective thinking are gravely exaggerated as a main factor driving Russian foreign policy at the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Russia has suffered a painful erosion of its international prestige since the Soviet collapse. It certainly took the Russian political elite some time to adapt to the loss of a global empire and the sense of mission in the world, as well as to realize that Soviet global ambitions led to an obvious over-stretch of the country’s resources. The absolute maximum of contemporary Russia’s ambitions is reflected by its desire to become an independent power center in a multipolar world. The absolute majority of Russian international affairs experts stick to different versions of multipolarity<sup>1</sup> as the dominant type of the coming post–Cold War world system. This vision is especially widespread among experts working in the field of strategic (Sergei Rogov, Alexei Arbatov) and geopolitical (Eduard Pozdnyakov, Konstantin Sorokin, etc.) analysis studies.<sup>2</sup> The concept of polycentrism/ multipolarity is also widely shared by Russian

1 Interpreted as relative comparability of the aggregate potential of several states when no single state is apparently superior to others.

2 Pozdnyakov, Eduard A., ed. *Geopolitika. Teoriya i praktika*. Moscow: Institute of the World Economy and International Relations (IMEMO), 1993; *Rossiya v poiskakh strategii bezopasnosti. Problemy bezopasnosti, ogranicheniya vooruzhenii i mirotvorchestva*. Moscow: IMEMO, 1996; Gadzhiyev, Kamaludin S. *Geopolitika*. Moscow: “Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya,” 1997; etc.

“civilizationists.”<sup>3</sup> However, the current stage in international relations is widely – and correctly – seen as an interim period and covered by as time passes other theories, such as the views of such a concept of “plural (relative) unipolarity” put forward by Alexei Bogaturov, which is increasingly gaining prominence.<sup>4</sup> According to this concept, in a situation where the U.S. plays a leading role in global politics and economics, but is not quite ready to take sole responsibility for the state of the world and feels the need to pay more attention to domestic priorities, the “plural unipolarity” emerges as the dominant, although interim, type of international system.

As far as “neo-Slavophilism” is concerned, a widespread image of Russia and Serbia as Slavic friends and allies for centuries is oversimplified at best. An important distinction should be made between traditional Russian-Serbian people-to-people ties based on common historic, cultural, and religious backgrounds and government-to-government relations that throughout history have been somewhat complicated. In certain historical periods Russia and Serbia have enjoyed close ties: both the Russian Empire and the Soviet Union, while pursuing their own national interests, helped Belgrade resolve its nation/state-building problems. These periods of rapprochement were, however, followed by years of estrangement and mutual distrust. Soon after 1878 as well as after 1945 Belgrade, having achieved its strategic goals with the help of Russia (including military assistance) refused to go along with it, struggling instead to become a regional power center in the Balkans – a goal that contradicted Russia’s interests in the region aimed at achieving a balance of forces. Although there is no doubt that in the historic memory of the Balkan peoples Russia remains a power that once played a major, if not decisive, role in helping them build their statehood, the present external political behavior of most Balkan

3 See, for instance, Samuilov, Sergei M. *Mezhnatsional’niye crisisy v Yevrope: sodержaniye, rol’ Zapada i politika (tsivilizatsionnyi podkhod)*. Moscow: Russian Science Foundation, 1994; Moiseyev, N.N. *Tsivilizatsii na Perelome. Puti Rossii*. Moscow: Institute for Socio-Political Studies, 1996; etc.

4 Bogaturov, Alexei D. “Pluralisticheskaya odnopolyarnost i interesy Rossii.” *Svobodnaya Mysl*, no. 2 (1996): 25-36.

countries is motivated not by Russia's past merits but by its present inability to help them integrate into the world economy. That is primarily why most Balkan countries have turned to NATO and the European Union. In short, Moscow has no illusions of the possibility of rebuilding its influence in the Balkans through friendly relations with Belgrade. In this situation Slavophile rhetoric is frequently used by Russian leaders (at the June 1998 Moscow talks with Serbian President Slobodan Milosevic, President Yeltsin stressed that "We do not forget that we are Slavic states and friends."<sup>5</sup>) In summary, pan-Slavic rhetoric is used by Moscow primarily as a tool of political/ideological manipulation; Russia's political elite is too rational to share these ideas sincerely.

Domestically, the crisis in Kosovo has been one of the few international developments that was able to galvanize the attention of the Russian foreign policy elites. It should be noted, however, that the assumption that one of the main driving factors behind Moscow's policies in regional conflicts was an attempt to appease domestic opposition lost much of its sense at least since early 1996, when Andrei Kozyrev was replaced by Yevgeni Primakov as Russia's foreign minister. Under Primakov, Russia's foreign policy became one of the few areas of national politics where a semblance of a nation-wide consensus was emerging and particularly among the foreign policy elites. Prior to NATO air strikes against Yugoslavia, it was within the elites that anti-Western and especially anti-American sentiments were the strongest when projected on the post-Yugoslav situation. These growing anti-Western and anti-American sentiments were increasingly shared by both the left and the right, including many liberals – a situation best demonstrated by a series of almost unanimous votes by the State Duma on a number of documents on the situation in Kosovo.<sup>6</sup>

The only objective factor leading to rapprochement between Russia and

5 "Vstrecha presidenta Rossii Yeltsina i presidenta Yugoslavii Milosevicha v Kremle." *Serbia v mire*, July/August 1998: 6.

6 As of the end of March 1999, the Duma had passed 46 resolutions on the Yugoslav and Kosovo crises.

Serbia on the Kosovo crisis is the fact that both states have encountered an insoluble dilemma in their domestic policies – that of the right of national minorities to self-determination (secession included) versus territorial integrity of a sovereign state. On the Chechnya/ Kosovo parallel, Russia has reaffirmed its support for territorial integrity of the new independent post-Soviet states since 1994-95, when the Chechen conflict came to a head in the Caucasus. There are certain similarities that could be traced between situations in Chechnya and Kosovo, especially as far as respective insurgency movements are concerned. Both separatist movements emerged in the early 1990s following the dissolution of the USSR and the Federal Yugoslavia. Both formed military/ paramilitary units (the “Armed Forces of Ichkeria” and the KLA) that operate not only in Chechnya and Kosovo, respectively, but in the neighboring countries and regions as well, and receive financial and military aid from the outside – both from national diasporas and from foreign organizations, including terrorist groups. However, there are many fundamental historic and geopolitical differences in the way the Kosovo and the Chechen conflicts have developed. After all, Russia is not Serbia. Chechnya never had the same historical, cultural and religious (“mythical”) meaning for Russia as Kosovo has for Serbia. The Chechens have always made up a majority of the territory’s population, there is no Chechen-populated “Albania” bordering Chechnya in the Caucasus, and Russia’s nuclear power status makes any major interference from the outside highly unlikely. Last, but not least, following the 1994-96 war, Russian federal authorities recognized the constitution and sovereignty of the Chechen Republic within the Federation and its legitimately elected president.<sup>7</sup>

This is not to say that all of the above-mentioned factors do not have any impact on Russia’s policy in the Balkans and in Kosovo, but to point out that this impact has been rather marginal as compared to other considerations. The key to understanding Russia’s policy on the ethnic and political conflict in Kosovo is to realize that it was only remotely related to the conflict itself. The only goal pursued by Mos-

7 For more details, see Pain, Emil. “Armed Conflict in Kosovo and Chechnya: A Comparison.” *The Forced Migration Monitor*, no. 25. (September 1998): 1, 4-6.

cow with regard to the Kosovo crisis that is directly related to the situation in the Balkans is to provide regional security and stability – a task that is not specific or unique for Russia, which is shared by most European countries and could be realized only at the European rather than at the national level.

### The Russia-NATO Context

If there were one word to explain Russia's involvement in the Kosovo crisis, that word would be "NATO." Russia's policy on the Kosovo crisis and reaction to what is happening in the Balkans can be understood only through the prism of Moscow's complicated relations with the North Atlantic Alliance, that has become the main irritant in Moscow's relations with the West, at least since the debate on NATO expansion. During that debate NATO tried to assure Russia that it was a purely defensive alliance, legally incapable and politically unwilling to undertake offensive military action. And, ironically, for some time Russia did view NATO's internal transformation as a prospect for positive change in the nature of the Alliance and as a "positive" alternative to its external expansion to the East.

The NATO military action against Yugoslavia, launched immediately after the formal entrance of the three new members into the alliance, has justified all the worst-case fears of Russian opponents of NATO expansion. Moreover, the bombing campaign sent a message to Moscow that it is in fact a changing NATO, but a change in the most undesirable and threatening direction for Russia, now facing a military alliance with an offensive military doctrine (with certain provisions that can be interpreted as a declaration that the European part of Russia is an area of NATO's responsibility) and moving closer to Russian borders while attacking a sovereign non-NATO state on the way.

The lack of clarity in geographic areas in which NATO was ready to deploy its forces coupled with the Alliance's determination to get more actively involved in "out-of-area" missions that were not "artificially" limited by any geographic boundaries, as they did not fall under the

Article 5 collective defense mandate, made a dangerous mix for Russia even before NATO attacked Yugoslavia. Moscow clearly did not want NATO's "out-of-area" missions to be conducted *in the area* of Russia's vital national interests. Russia strongly opposed Central and East European accession to NATO precisely to forestall the Alliance move into the former Soviet territory. Russia fears that NATO expansion to the CIS borders will radicalize and destabilize internal situations in the neighboring countries, such as Ukraine. Under certain circumstances, this could spark internal splits or even civil wars in those countries that would inevitably drag in Russia – a role that Moscow does not want and cannot afford to play. It comes as no surprise then that Russia is trying to do everything to prevent this from happening.

Even in better times, NATO-Russian cooperation was far from intensive and failed to dispel these concerns. In Russian eyes, the PfP program has proved to be nothing more than a route to, or even a basic foundation for, NATO expansion. The Russian military did not participate with any frequency in PfP exercises and the program as a whole did not evolve as a mechanism for developing NATO's relationship with Russia. A week before NATO attacked Yugoslavia, Russia had officially declared that it will limit its participation in the PfP to the role of an observer – apparently in reaction to the formal accession of the three former Warsaw Pact allies to NATO.

Trying to minimize the negative effects of the first round of NATO enlargement, Russia signed a Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security with NATO in Paris on 27 May 1997. That Act was supposed to present an attempt to put NATO-Russian relations on some sort of a contractual foundation and to expand cooperation in many areas, including peacekeeping, anti-terrorism efforts and halting the spread of weapons of mass destruction. Although the Act did not give Russia any right of say – let alone a veto – with respect to NATO's internal adaptation or non-Article 5 operations, by putting issues of mutual concern including the most controversial ones on the agenda of the NATO-Russian Permanent Joint Council, Moscow could supposedly acquire limited political influence within the Alliance that it might not have gained otherwise. However, the extent to which

the NATO-Russian Founding Act has contributed to European security and stability has been minimal. The Founding Act itself contained seeds of many contradictions and misperceptions by allowing for varying or even mutually exclusive interpretations (differing views existed even with regard to the status of the Act – whether it was subject to international law as claimed by the Russian side or a mere political declaration as implied by NATO). Another major problem that Russia had with the Founding Act was that it did not resolve any follow-up problems of the Alliance’s enlargement by not limiting any consequent NATO expansion rounds. The fact that the Act was viewed by the Alliance merely as a short-term political declaration was best demonstrated by NATO air strikes against Yugoslavia. These violated several of the basic principles of Russian-NATO relations envisaged by the Act, such as “refraining from the threat or use of force against each other as well as against any other state, its sovereignty, territorial integrity or political independence,” and “preventing conflicts and settling disputes by peaceful means.”<sup>8</sup>

Apart from these formal arrangements, at the time when it seemed that NATO-Russian relations were improving, certain expectations were expressed by both sides with regard to ad hoc practical cooperation in the field. The relatively smooth operational integration of Russian forces in the Implementation/Stabilization Force (IFOR/SFOR) has prompted some observers to conclude that “clearly, there is potential for combined operations on a larger scale.”<sup>9</sup> However, even prior to the first complete break of NATO-Russian ties that occurred in response to NATO aggression against Yugoslavia, any actual or potential Russian ad hoc participation in NATO peacekeeping/ enforcement operations was bound to:

- be limited to a few geographical areas where cooperation with NATO would not hamper Russia’s national security interests (to

8 *Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security between NATO and the Russian Federation*. Paris, 27 May 1997. Part I.

9 Christman, Daniel W. “NATO’s Military Future.” *Joint Forces Quarterly*, no. 11 (Spring 1996): 78.

put it more bluntly, the closer to the CIS borders NATO intended to operate, the less likely any cooperation between the two organizations was going to occur);

- be of symbolic, rather than substantial significance, similar to Russian participation in IFOR/SFOR (although some notable achievements were made – especially in the area of military-to-military contacts);
- require very specific and detailed command and control arrangements which explicitly diverge from the current procedures in the NATO integrated military structure (nothing could be more illustrative than the incorporation of the Russian forces into the US sector of IFOR/SFOR where the Russian brigade served under the tactical control of the commander of the 1st Armored Division, and received operational instructions from the SACEUR through the Russian military representative at NATO – a command arrangement not to be found in any field manual).

It comes as no surprise then that since the outbreak of the Kosovo crisis in early 1998 Russia's attention was focused almost exclusively on NATO activities in the region. NATO's decision to undertake a direct assault against the territory of a sovereign state, that has not attacked a NATO member, without a UN mandate, was viewed in Russia as a logical progression of NATO's drive to become the dominant security organization in Europe, a dangerous international precedent and a final blow to all that was left from the post-World War II international system. While the first military operation in NATO's history that took place in Bosnia in 1994 was at least based on a free interpretation of a loose UN Security Council resolution, this time even a vague UN mandate was conspicuously absent. These concerns were exacerbated by the fact that at the 50<sup>th</sup> Anniversary summit NATO adopted a New Strategic Concept that extended the alliance's sphere of operations and opened the way for further actions without the UN Security Council mandate. Although the Concept recognizes "the primary responsibility of the UN Security Council for the maintenance

of international peace and security,”<sup>10</sup> it does not require the alliance to obtain an explicit UN mandate for military actions beyond its territory (the call to formally remove the requirement for the UN mandate has stirred not only opposition from Russia and some nations outside NATO, but criticism within the Alliance itself).

It is fear of the expansion of Western power moving closer to Russia’s own borders and perceived as ultimately directed against Russia (or its closest neighbors) at a time when the country has lost much of its own world influence and its economy and military are in shambles, that primarily explains the ferocity of Moscow’s opposition to military action against Yugoslavia. For Russia, trying to resist by all possible means the policy of turning the former Yugoslavia into a series of protectorates that potentially could lead NATO from the Balkans to move further into a Eurasia full of troubled or failing states, is not just a matter of principle but a matter of its own security, if not survival. This concern was best expressed by Nikolai Ryzhkov, leader of the “Narodovlastiye” parliamentary group who asked: “Will we be next? Who can guarantee that, if not Russia, then someone close to Russia will not be punished in the same way?”<sup>11</sup>

### “Counter-measures” and Constraints

Numerous internal and external limitations have so far contributed to Moscow’s foreign policy pragmatism. Turmoil at home, both economic and political, radically limits Russia’s ability to force any major international shift and places strict limitations on its involvement in regional conflicts and on breaking ties with the West. Prior to NATO

10 *The Alliance’s Strategic Concept*. Approved by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Washington, D.C., on 23 and 24 April 1999. Part II, para. 15.

11 Transcript of the Plenary Meeting of the State Duma of the Russian Federation, 3 February 1998.

air strikes against Yugoslavia, Russia repeatedly made it clear that it did not intend to sacrifice relations with the West over Iraq or even Kosovo, and would try to minimize the consequences of both crises in order to escape a long-term confrontation with the West. Even after NATO attacked Yugoslavia, Russia did not appear to be marching deliberately towards a new isolation from the West.<sup>12</sup> This careful stance coupled with a conspicuous lack of Russia's economic resources led most Western observers to conclude that Russia's threats of taking "serious" retaliatory measures in protest to Western actions in Kosovo were hollow and Moscow no longer had effective levers to influence the situation. Indeed, all of Russia's dire warnings of a new confrontation, at least estrangement, in case the West proceeded with NATO expansion regardless of Russia's opposition, had not come true. It seems that in the West it was no longer questioned whether punitive air strikes against Serbia were worth further jeopardizing the already strained relations with Moscow. Russia's ability to take countermeasures in response to Western actions – and its limits – was best demonstrated by Moscow's reaction to the NATO attack on Yugoslavia that led to the worst crisis in Moscow's relations with the West since the end of the Cold War.

At the international level, Russia's first logical reaction to Western actions in Kosovo took the form of using legal instruments in

12 On 25 March 1999 Ivanov noted that "we are not in favour of a breach of diplomatic relations with the U.S." (calling them highly valued) and "clearly realize how important for the world as a whole are relations between Russia and the U.S.:" Ivanov's remarks at a press conference in Moscow. (Translation E.S.). Amid Russia's protests over the bombing, Moscow and Washington reached an agreement on 24 March on the U.S. purchase of \$300 million worth of enriched uranium taken from dismantled nuclear warheads. Russian officials also concluded energy and medical agreements, including cooperation in fighting tuberculosis, and worked out ways to enhance foreign investment in the Russian oil and gas industries. Michel Camdessus, the managing director of the International Monetary Fund, arrived in Moscow for another round of talks over whether the Fund will resume loans from a promised \$22 billion aid package. Primakov also assured German Chancellor Gerhard Schröder that Moscow would continue its cooperation with the European Union.

international organizations in which Moscow still has some leverage, such as the UN Security Council where Russia holds a closely guarded privilege of a veto power. After NATO launched its first air strikes against Yugoslavia, Moscow called for an urgent UN Security Council vote to stop the NATO attacks<sup>13</sup> and introduced a resolution calling for “an immediate cessation of the use of force against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and urgent resumption of negotiations” that was predictably rejected.<sup>14</sup> The setback at the UN Security Council did not come as a surprise to Russia. On the contrary, it underscored once again one of the most serious strategic problems facing Moscow – an almost total lack of allies on the international scene – a logical result of the country’s foreign policy in the early 1990s, when Moscow voluntarily gave up all of its former allies and loyal regimes in Eastern Europe, the Middle East and elsewhere (Russia’s highly limited capacity to find allies and build alliances is a long-term trend that has to be taken into account by Moscow’s strategists and foreign policy planners). However, Russian diplomatic activity at the UN has demonstrated that maybe some of Moscow’s unorthodox strategic initiatives involving other powers, such as the idea of forming a “strategic triangle” involving China, Russia and India to ensure regional stability put forward by Prime Minister Yevgeni Primakov on 21 December 1998,<sup>15</sup> are not as groundless as they may seem at first sight.

At the CIS/regional level, NATO air strikes have helped to create a more favorable atmosphere for developing bilateral political, security and military ties with Russia’s western CIS neighbors, Belarus and Ukraine.<sup>16</sup> In particular, Russian military efforts focus on developing an

13 Other measures included proposals to convene a General Assembly meeting to discuss the aggression and to arrange a meeting of the Contact Group in Moscow.

14 UN Security Council Draft Resolution S/1999/328, 26 March 1999 (not adopted: 3Y – 12N).

15 “Primakov Seeks ‘Strategic Triangle.’” *International Herald Tribune*, 22 December 1998.

16 Russian and Belorussian military experts were reported to be making feasibility

integrated air defense system and military cooperation with Belarus. Russian troops will be returning to Belarus as both countries will create a “regional group of armed forces.” In an effort to accelerate military cooperation within the CIS, more attention will be given to the usefulness of a Russian military presence in the CIS, the importance of better training and emphasis on training exercises. However, the CIS itself is undergoing a period of deep crisis. Any CIS-wide “countermeasures” would be absolutely impossible to agree on, and a view shared by some of NATO’s European members that an expansive/aggressive NATO vision could foster rival regional security blocs (one of them dominated by Russia) does not look realistic at this stage.

Finally, Russia could react by taking unilateral political-military and military steps. After NATO attacked Yugoslavia, some of the “countermeasures” proposed (both officially and unofficially) included:

- political and humanitarian aid to Yugoslavia: Russia has immediately extended humanitarian aid to Yugoslavia and has offered to represent Yugoslav interests in Britain, France, Germany and the United States; also, for the first time, Russia has entered into a full-scale public information war with Brussels and Washington;
- unilaterally lifting economic sanctions imposed on Yugoslavia;
- severing ties with NATO: Russia has withdrawn its NATO ambassadors, cancelled a series of planned military contacts, expelled the Alliance’s envoys from Moscow and for almost four months “totally froze” all cooperation with the alliance;

studies on the redeployment of tactical and strategic nukes and bombers into Belarus. The Ukrainian parliament, apart from making a rather emotional declaration of its refusal to accept the non-nuclear status for Ukraine, at the same time passed all three additional agreements with Russia on the Black Sea Fleet unexpectedly fast. Also, meeting in Moscow on 25 March, the defense ministers of Azerbaijan, Armenia, Belarus, Kyrgyzstan, Russia and Tajikistan adopted a joint statement condemning the NATO air strikes against Yugoslavia as “a threat to peace and security.”

- severing bilateral military cooperation with countries taking part in attacks against Yugoslavia;<sup>17</sup>
- military and technical assistance/arms transfers to Yugoslavia (although the option of unilateral lifting of the international arms embargo against Yugoslavia was seriously considered and widely discussed, arms deliveries to Yugoslavia would have been difficult since most routes of transportation were blocked either by NATO forces or by pro-NATO countries);
- intelligence sharing – perhaps the single most important and realistic countermeasure to be taken;<sup>18</sup>
- stepping up combat readiness of the Russian Armed Forces (although highly resource-constrained)<sup>19</sup> and redefining Russia's military doctrine. Perhaps nowhere will the military impact of Kosovo be studied more thoroughly than in Moscow. NATO's bombing campaign against Yugoslavia made the task of reviewing Russia's defense and military policies more urgent than ever and demonstrated the need for a general strengthening of Russia's military forces, greater reliance on nuclear weapons in Russian military planning and increased defense spending that would not only mean a greater burden on the economy, but would also translate into a greater incentive for increasing arms sales. The current military doctrine, developed in consistence with the 1997 National Security Concept that identified internal and local

17 Moscow had, for instance, cancelled preparations for a joint early-warning command center (that was supposed to open in Colorado in December 1999), cooperation with the US in dealing with the year 2000 computer problem, and several bilateral visits and contacts.

18 Russian officials, including Anatolii Kvashnin, chief of the General Staff, had hinted several times that Russia was prepared to exchange intelligence data with Yugoslavia.

19 Such as ordering 35 Northern Fleet vessels (including the huge guided-missile destroyer, the "Pyotr Veliky", and an aircraft carrier, "Admiral Kuznetsov") and 20 vessels of the Pacific Fleet, to what was described as naval exercises, and sending up to seven vessels (including a military reconnaissance ship) to the Mediterranean "to insure the security of Russia"; etc.

conflicts as the main threats to the state and judged a major ground attack as highly unlikely, is already being reworked;<sup>20</sup>

- halting nuclear disarmament and cooperation (an area that customarily falls the first victim of any deterioration in US-Russian relations). The Strategic Arms Reduction Talks (START)-II Treaty has been pronounced dead by the Duma, and most other US-Russian nuclear disarmament programs were temporarily halted.

Even from this list, which is far from complete, it is clear that only a few of the proposed “counter measures” were in fact implemented. Given the general public moods within the country, Russia’s overall response to the crisis has been very moderate and restrained. While denouncing the NATO strikes against FRY, the Russian government managed to avoid helping Belgrade militarily. In spite of increasing domestic pressure, Russia stopped short of violating the UN arms embargo and sending any combat ships to the Adriatic. On the other hand, despite the largely symbolic nature of some of the above-mentioned steps, it was the first time that a sequence of “counter measures” was proposed, discussed and set to be implemented in a consistent, orderly and gradual manner. Also, no matter how limited, some of the steps actually undertaken are not likely to be short-lived.

## The Domestic Context

However, the main fall-out of NATO military actions against Yugoslavia has been of a deeper and more critical nature. As far as Russia is concerned, the most important consequences of Western policies in Kosovo are to be found on the domestic front. This was best demonstrated by Russia’s public reaction to NATO air strikes against

20 See the new draft of the Russian military doctrine: “Voyennaya Doktrina Rossiiskoi Federatsii.” *Krasnaya Zvezda*, 9 October 1999.

Yugoslavia. A new war in the Balkans has had a profound effect on the entire Russian society. Moreover, public criticism of NATO aggression was characterized by several new trends.

- Even by foreign policy standards, the domestic consensus on NATO aggression against FRY among all the state ministries and agencies, political parties and interest groups was exceptional. All the major political candidates and parties have condemned the bombings and have expressed strong anti-NATO sentiments. The largely polarized political factions of the Russian Duma united solidly behind Primakov's government.
- Russia's criticism of NATO aggression was much harsher than previous disapproval of Western action in regional conflicts (such as in Bosnia or Iraq) that was growing steadily, but slowly.
- If previously anti-Western sentiments were mostly cherished by the Russian political elite, this time they reached all stratas of the Russian society. Never before in the post-Cold War years has NATO action triggered such a sharp response from ordinary Russians: most polls consistently showed nearly 100 percent opposition to NATO's military campaign while up to 70 percent of Russians viewed the NATO military campaign in Yugoslavia as a "direct threat to Russian security." Even the mass media – one of the most pro-Western segments of the Russian society – expressed broad sympathy for Yugoslavia (it is important to note that opposition to NATO's attacks on Yugoslavia was not based on ignorance of Serbia's actions in Kosovo. The Russian public was well informed of Serbia's actions against Kosovo Albanians; the refugee situation and ethnic cleansing were reported by the Russian media).
- For the first time Russia's youth played an active role in most of the protest actions, with university and even high school students composing the bulk of protesters – probably, a single most important long-term trend in domestic moods.

- For the first time, the protests spread from Moscow to almost all the provinces.<sup>21</sup>

Overall, the NATO aggression against Yugoslavia has, more than all the previous Western actions in Kosovo or Iraq and/or NATO enlargement earlier, stimulated anti-Western sentiments and an environment of distrust in Russian/Western relations, which was further transformed to and coupled with the general disappointment with the Western-type liberal economic reforms. These trends in the public mood and political environment will undoubtedly have an effect on the upcoming parliamentary and presidential elections. Subsequent events, such as the war in Dagestan, another round of the Chechen drama and terrorist attacks on the Russian cities, although somewhat diverting immediate public attention from Kosovo, only emphasized how dangerous for Russia, facing numerous ethnic-political conflicts along its periphery and inside the Federation itself, is the precedent of an outside military alliance throwing its might on the side of armed separatists. Thus, the Kosovo crisis or, to be more precise, Russia's (in)ability to adequately respond to NATO's policy on Kosovo, although not likely to be the main issue in the election campaign, will certainly add to the general public feeling of Russia being isolated and side-lined internationally, at least in Europe, and threatened not only internally but also externally from all directions.

21 Apart from demonstrations in front of the U.S. Embassy in Moscow, similar events were held outside U.S. consulates in St. Petersburg, Yekaterinburg, and Vladivostok. In other cities throughout the country, U.S. flags were burnt in protestation. The German consulate in Novosibirsk was set on fire. Legislative assemblies from Primorskii Krai to Karelia as well as interregional associations, such as Bolshaya Volga, adopted statements protesting NATO's aggression, while Khabarovsk Krai Governor Viktor Ishayev announced the formation of an anti-NATO political bloc. Throughout the country, many Russians, especially retired and active military officers and noncommissioned officers, volunteered for duty in Yugoslavia and several national parties opened recruitment offices for volunteers. In Khabarovsk, Colonel-General Viktor Chechevatov, commander of the Far Eastern Military District, announced his willingness to head any military unit dispatched to Yugoslavia.

For the West, these critical changes in Russian domestic moods and attitudes will prove to be far more important in the long term than any immediate “retaliatory” steps undertaken by Moscow in response to NATO’s bombing campaign against Yugoslavia or any subsequent NATO actions in Kosovo.

## Russia in KFOR

It is against this background that Russia’s role in ending the war in the Balkans as well as Russia’s current participation in the international peace effort in Kosovo should be analyzed.

From the beginning of the crisis, Russia has consistently presented itself as the voice of reason, demanding that a solution to the Kosovo conflict can only be reached by peaceful means, under the guidance of the UN and/or OSCE. During NATO’s bombing campaign, Russia, as the only major European power not drawn into the conflict directly (in Yeltsin’s words, “We are not the ones taking part in this war and we did not start it”), was able to present itself as the main party able to play a credible mediating role – primarily through the Kremlin’s chief Balkan envoy, ex-prime minister Viktor Chernomyrdin’s “shuttle diplomacy.” It was Chernomyrdin’s political initiative to form a double team involving himself and a European leader to persuade Milosevic to make a deal that was seized upon by the US and ultimately the G-7.

However, since the agreement was reached and subsequently endorsed by the Yugoslav parliament, the overall Russian position on it remained unclear. While the Kremlin hailed the accord as a success of Russian diplomacy, in the parliament and in the military criticism has prevailed. Likewise, among the wider public there was a widespread feeling that Chernomyrdin had betrayed Russian interests in giving in on two of Moscow’s key demands: an immediate end to the bombing campaign and deployment in Kosovo of a multinational peacekeeping force under the United Nations flag, with the participation of only those NATO countries which did not take part in the bombing campaign. In a situation when any move contributing to the capitulation of Yugoslavia

was close to political suicide in Russia, it came as no surprise that only someone as domestically unpopular, as loyal to the Kremlin and as little prepared to handle foreign policy issues, as Viktor Chernomyrdin, could be found to perform the job. The general dissatisfaction with Chernomyrdin's mission was aggravated by irritation about the way the agreement was interpreted by NATO, especially in a part that concerned Russia's involvement in the peacekeeping operation on the ground.

From the beginning of the crisis Russia's official position has been that in principle Moscow is prepared to send peacekeeping troops to Kosovo (with Belgrade's consent and with sufficient international legitimacy). However, for many Russian security experts it is still not clear why Russia should be involved on the ground as part of KFOR at all. The counter-arguments are numerous and have a wide public appeal. One of the most popular and powerful counter-arguments questions how Russian participation in KFOR helps to advance Russia's national security interests: simply put, this view could be summarized as "Why should Russia help NATO to clear the mess in Kosovo to which the Alliance has contributed?" Much had been said about the need for Moscow to distance itself from Belgrade if it wanted to become a true mediator. But it should be kept in mind that for the same reason it is only logical that Russia should in no way be associated with NATO (one of the parties to the conflict in March-June 1999) either.

Another important consideration is related to obvious financial constraints. While initial training and equipment expenses (approximately 60 million Roubles, i.e. approximately \$2,5 million) were paid by the Ministry of Defense (MOD), all the other expenses (logistics, transportation, personnel, etc.), that comprise \$36,8 million for 1999 and another \$40 million for the first half of 2000, are to be paid by the Ministry of Finance and should come from Russia's federal budget. It seems that the only way for Moscow to pay the cost of its peacekeeping force is from additional budget income, mainly from arms exports, that would otherwise go to the needs of the MOD and military-industrial complex. Coupled with other demands – especially those brought about by hostilities in North Caucasus – the overall burden on the Russian

defense budget has increased dramatically.

It was also argued that from the point of conflict regulation the deployment of Russian troops in Kosovo could make sense only in areas with compact Serb populations or in a separate Russian sector that could serve as a safe haven for the province's Serbs (although there is little dispute between Russia and NATO that this could lead to the division of the province into ethnic cantons, Russia disagrees with NATO in viewing cantonization as perhaps the only way to protect the local Serbs, short of complete partition of the province). Otherwise, it was argued, Russian peacekeepers would be subject to constant and unnecessary risks from the KLA and the generally hostile Albanian majority.

During the very tough talks on Russian participation in KFOR held first in Moscow and then in Helsinki, the military critics of Chernomyrdin's peace plan tried to "limit the damage" by insisting on a separate sector for the Russian forces in Kosovo. As a result of these efforts and of Russia's surprise dash to the Pristina airport, the agreement detailing Russia's role in KFOR was signed in Helsinki on 18 June by US Secretary of Defense William Cohen and Russian Defense Minister Igor Sergeyev. The Helsinki agreement gave Russia an enhanced role in the peace operation, as compared to IFOR/SFOR, and full operational (politico-military) command and control over its forces (with tactical command and control resting with KFOR).<sup>22</sup> This was a departure from the deployment scheme initially offered to the Russian side by the US (according to this plan, Russian troops would be permanently deployed in the US sector only).<sup>23</sup> However, the Helsinki agreement, although designating Russia as the only country to be represented in more than one sector, explicitly stated that Russia would not control a sector of its own and implied that Russian troops are not

22 See both Cohen's and Sergeyev's remarks in: "Transcript: Helsinki Press Briefing on Russia's KFOR Role," 18 June 1999. *USIS Washington File*, 10 June 1999.

23 For more details, see Zavarzin, Viktor. "Ya Veryu v Buduscheye Kosovo" ("I Believe in the Future of Kosovo"). *Trud*, 14 September 1999.

likely to be deployed in Serb-populated enclaves.

Not surprisingly, the only logical answer to why Russia still accepted the Helsinki terms and agreed to the current arrangement is, again, its obsession with the “NATO factor.” According to this logic, Russia, as a weaker side, simply has no alternative but to find some form of cooperation with NATO for tactical, if not for strategic reasons, however much many of its military and civilian officials, let alone the general public, would oppose this. Thus, on the one hand, Russia could not afford to completely ignore NATO while, on the other hand, any formal association with NATO could not be “sold” domestically, especially with both parliamentary and presidential elections in the offing. The way out of this political expediency was found in the form of a compromise solution – Russia’s ad hoc participation in NATO’s KFOR operation on the ground.

Only time will tell whether this was the best choice to be made. Doubts about the viability of Russia’s KFOR involvement persisted from the very beginning of KFOR’s deployment. Several months after the Russian paratroopers’ dash to Pristina it was still, according to Head of Defense Ministry’s Directorate for International Cooperation Col.-Gen. Leonid Ivashov, “premature to speak of a close interaction between the Russian contingent and KFOR.”<sup>24</sup> The situation on the ground in Kosovo remains extremely complicated, and the wedge between NATO and Russia is widening as the United Nations resolution 1244, which authorized KFOR, has been ignored.

It is quite symbolic that while preventing Yugoslav forces from having any control in the province in violation of Yugoslavia’s territorial integrity, NATO has welcomed the transformation of the KLA into an armed civil force for what increasingly seems an independent Kosovo. The new Kosovo Protection Corps has been described by United Nations and KFOR officials as a civilian force to oversee humanitarian and disaster assistance. However, the rebels see this force as a step toward the national army of an “ethnically clean” Kosovo independent

24 Quoted in: “NATO Charged With the KLA Bias.” *Associated Press*, 9 September 1999.

of Yugoslavia. The agreement signed on 20 September 1999 allowed the KLA to remain a unified entity, commanded by the KLA chief of staff, and to keep the same structure under a new name. It is also unlikely that the Corps will lack access to additional weapons and ammunition. The NATO-KLA deal has prompted Serbian leaders to resign from the Kosovo Transition Council, caused more Serbs to flee the province and may herald a new period of tension between the UN and NATO missions and the Kosovo minority communities.

On the one hand, in a situation when the KLA's complete disarmament was simply impossible, the NATO-KLA deal could be interpreted as the Alliance's attempt to use the Kosovo Protection Corps as a key element in trying to return the rebels to civil life. This attitude was best expressed by Major Roland Lavoie, a KFOR spokesman, who stressed that "basically, we don't want to have a conflictual approach" towards the KLA.<sup>25</sup> But on the other hand, Russia suspects NATO of being not totally disinterested in using an organized ethnically Albanian structure that can quickly rearm as an instrument of its own policy in the Balkans. The bottom line here is that, inadvertently or not, NATO helps to create an "ethnically clean" Albanian state in Kosovo by legalizing its wartime ally, the KLA.

In a situation where Russia remains the only European power interested in the full implementation of the UN Security Council Resolution 1244, Moscow has few options in Kosovo. The more likely scenario will be to pull Russian forces out of the province.<sup>26</sup> If Russia's decision to take part in the KFOR operation were a mistake, it would never be too late to correct it. The question is whether Russia and NATO can afford to sever their joint KFOR operation. While for NATO Russian participation has made possible the UN authorization that lent legitimacy to the international occupation of part of a sovereign

25 *KFOR Press Update*. Pristina, 20 September 1999.

26 See, for instance, Eddy, Melissa. "Russia Opposes U.S. Plan for Kosovo Army." *European Stars and Stripes*, 8 September 1999. A Russian description is Gornostaev, Dmitri. "Sozdaetsya 'Korpus Kosovo.'" *Nezavisimaya Gazeta*, 8 September 1999.

country, it also allowed Moscow to play a certain role in protecting Serb interests and to serve as a last fence against Kosovo's de facto independence. Last, but not least, the Kosovo operation has been the only pretext for the Russian government to justify the revival of contacts with NATO. Without this public excuse, Russia will have to limit its contacts with the Alliance to discussing only issues such as disarmament and confidence-building measures, mainly through bilateral ties with some of NATO's member states.

There is also another scenario – less likely, but still hypothetically possible. The KLA's open hostility towards Russian troops that led to the Orahovac deadlock and a series of earlier incidents has not only demonstrated the KLA's ability to control significant developments in Kosovo even when it opposes KFOR, but also tempted some observers to speculate that these developments might encourage Moscow to carve an independent role for its troops in Kosovo – something that Russia insisted on from the very beginning.

The next few months will be decisive for Russia's role in KFOR. In any case, the looming potential for Russia to withdraw support from KFOR will not make NATO's task in Kosovo easier.

## Conclusion

In the pre-Kosovo era, Russia on the one hand, and the United States and its NATO allies on the other, were almost getting used to acting as a “good cop – bad cop” team, with Moscow touting prospects for peace as Washington/Brussels threatened military force – a division of labor that sometimes proved to be mutually beneficial and had a positive impact on the conflict resolution process. By taking a softer line, Russia would in some cases have better chances of resolving regional disputes. Theoretically Moscow was not the only international actor that could play the “good cop” part (a number of neutral states, the UN, OSCE and even the EU are other examples). However, the combination of general reluctance to sanction the unconstrained use of force in settling international disputes with traditional ties to many

“rogue states” and anti-Western regimes, a decades-long first-hand international experience, still substantial representation in major international organizations, and the ability to talk both to the West and to its opponents probably give Russia a unique opportunity to assume this role on a global scale. “Cooperative peacemaking” not only helped Russia to realize some of its own foreign policy interests but also tied it closer to the West – a “good cop” made no sense without a “bad cop.” It is interesting to note in this context that some of Russia’s peace initiatives were best realized when put forward by Russia’s Western partners rather than by Moscow itself: it was largely due to Russia’s efforts that the international involvement on the ground in Kosovo first took the form of a civilian verification mission under the auspices of the OSCE.<sup>27</sup>

Throughout the Kosovo crisis up until the KFOR deployment, Russia remained the only major power in Europe that was not dragged into the war in the Balkans and that has preserved its capacity to act as a mediator, especially in helping to end the conflict between NATO and Yugoslavia. However, the NATO aggression against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia undertaken in violation of the UN Charter, as well as some of NATO’s subsequent actions in Kosovo, have clearly demonstrated the limits of Russia’s cooperation with the West in general and in regulating regional conflicts in particular. The main lesson to be drawn by Russia from the Kosovo crisis has been that from now on any armed separatist/terrorist group, provided that it has the support of an outside force – the US and NATO – can hope to get a semblance of international legitimacy. The implication of such a system is that the only way to object is with military power and with the policy of *fait accompli*.

As the situation in Kosovo/Yugoslavia has demonstrated, Russia on the one hand, increasingly assumes a role of a dissenter with Western

27 This idea was put forward by Russian diplomacy, supported by the Kremlin and raised at the talks with the Yugoslav leadership. Prior to the Holbrooke-Milosevic meeting, the Yugoslav leaders’ initial agreement to the deployment of the OSCE verification mission in Kosovo was given to Russian Foreign and Defense Ministers on 4 and 8 October 1998.

policies and actions in regional conflicts, and on the other starts to behave more like a “rational actor” on the world stage, putting its own national interests above any idealistic dogmas. Russia’s influence in the regions outside of its own borders today is sharply limited by both internal and external factors which makes it all the more pressing to use whatever means and resources Moscow still possesses in a more effective and creative manner.

## **Selected Bibliography**



- Calic, Marie-Janine. *Krieg und Frieden in Bosnien-Herzegovina*. Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp, 1996.
- Daalder, Ivo and Michael E. O'Hanlon. "Unlearning the Lessons of Kosovo." *Foreign Policy* 116 (1999): 128-140.
- Duke, Simon. *The Elusive Quest for European Security: From EPC to CFSP*. Basingstoke: Macmillan/St. Antony's, 1999.
- . "From Amsterdam to Kosovo: Lessons for the Future of CFSP." *Eipascope* 2 (1999): 2-15.
- Ehrhart, Hans-Georg. "Preventive Diplomacy or Neglected Initiative: The Royaumont Process and the Stabilization of Southeastern Europe." In *The Southeast European Challenge: Ethnic Conflict and International Response*, ed. Hans-Georg Erhart and Albrecht Schnabel, 177-195. Baden-Baden: Nomos, 1999.
- Hoagland, Jim. "Developing a Doctrine of Humanitarian Intervention." *International Herald Tribune*, 28 June 1999.
- Hutchison, Kay Bailey. "The Wrong Invasion." *The Washington Post*, 13 September 1999.
- Kissinger, Henry A. "As the Cheers Fade." *Newsweek*, 21 June 1999: 36.
- Krauthammer, Charles. "Multi-Ethnic Folly." *The Washington Post*, 17 September 1999.
- Lauer, Reinhard and Werner Leffeldt, eds. *Das jugoslawische Desaster: Historische, sprachliche und ideologische Hintergründe*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1995.
- Malcolm, Noel. *Kosovo: A Short History*. New York: New York University Press, 1998.
- Mandelbaum, Michael. "A Perfect Failure: NATO's War Against Yugoslavia." *Foreign Affairs* 78, no. 5 (1999): 2-8.

- Pierre, Andrew J. *De-Balkanizing the Balkans. Security and Stability in South-Eastern Europe*. Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace, 1999.
- Priest, Dana. "The Commanders' War, Part One: The Plan to Invade Kosovo." *Washington Post*, 19 September 1999.
- . "Bombing by Committee." *Washington Post*, 20 September 1999.
- . "Target Selection Was Long Process. Sites Were Analyzed Again and Again." *Washington Post*, 20 September 1999.
- . "United NATO Front Was Divided Within." *Washington Post*, 21 September 1999.
- Reiter, Erich, ed. *Der Krieg um den Kosovo 1998/99*. Mainz: v. Hase & Koehler, 2000.
- Roberts, Adam. "NATO's 'Humanitarian War' Over Kosovo." *Survival* 41, no. 3 (1999): 102-123.
- Rodman, Peter W. "The Fallout from Kosovo." *Foreign Affairs* 78, no. 4 (1999): 45-51.
- Saxer, Urs. *Kosovo und das Völkerrecht: Ein Konfliktmanagement im Spannungsfeld von Menschenrechten, kollektive Sicherheit und Unilateralismus*. Basler Schriften zur europäischen Integration, no. 42/43. Basel: Europa Institut der Universität Basel, 1999.
- Schake, Kori, Amaya Bloch-Lainé and Charles Grant. "Building a European Defence Capability." *Survival* 41, no. 1 (1999): 20-40.
- Schnabel, Albrecht and Ramesh Thakur. *Kosovo and the International Community: Selective Indignation, Collective Intervention, and the Changing Contours of World Politics*. Tokyo: UNU Press, forthcoming (2000).
- Silber, Laura and Alan Little. *Yugoslavia: Death of a Nation*. New York: Penguin Books, 1997.

- Solana, Javier. "A Defining Moment for NATO: The Washington Summit Decisions and the Kosovo Crisis." *NATO Review* 47, no. 2 (1999): <http://www.nato.int/docu/review/1999/9902-01.html>
- Thürer, Daniel. "Die Nato-Einsätze in Kosovo und das Völkerrecht: Spannungsfeld zwischen Gewaltverbot und Menschenrechten." *Neue Zürcher Zeitung*, 3 April 1999.
- Troebst, Stefan. "Conflict in Kosovo: Causes and Cures: An Analytical Documentation." In *The Southeast European Challenge: Ethnic Conflict and the International Response*, eds. Hans-Georg Ehrhart and Albrecht Schnabel. Baden-Baden: Nomos, 1999.
- Vickers, Miranda. *Between Serb and Albanian: A History of Kosovo*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1998.
- Zavarzin, Viktor. "Ya Veryu v Buduscheye Kosovo" ("I Believe in the Future of Kosovo"). *Trud*, 14 September 1999.

## About the Authors

**Andrew B. Denison**, Ph.D., is an American living in Bonn, Germany. He serves as an adjunct at the University of Bonn's Department of Political Science and is a research associate with the Institute for Strategic Analyses, also in Bonn. Additionally, Denison works as an independent consultant on issues of transatlantic relations and German security policy. His work on these questions has appeared in both American and German journals and edited volumes.

**Lukas Haynes** is Assistant Professor of Diplomacy and World Affairs at Occidental College in Los Angeles, California. He has published widely as a journalist and analyzed military intervention and humanitarian affairs for OXFAM, the International Crisis Group, and the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

**Roberta N. Haar** has recently completed her doctorate with The Pennsylvania State University. She is currently working on a comparative study entitled *Nation States as Schizophrenics: Germany and Japan as Post-Cold War Actors*. It will be published with Praeger in early 2000.

**Anastasia V. Mitrofanova** is a senior research fellow at the Institute for Contemporary International Studies, Diplomatic Academy of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Russia. Her publications include the articles: "The New Euro-Atlantic and Global Security System: NATO's Role and Status of Russia" (1999) and "Femininity in the Global Political Culture of Postmodernism" (1999).

**Domitilla Sagramoso** is a Research Associate at the Centre for Defence Studies, King's College, University of London. At the Centre she has conducted research on Balkan security, the Kosovo war, the Albanian 1997-98 crisis and the proliferation of light weapons in Central and Eastern Europe. She completed her Ph.D. at the School of Slavonic and East European Studies, University of London, on

Russia's military, economic and diplomatic relations with the former Soviet states during Yeltsin's first term as President of Russia.

**Albrecht Schnabel** works in the Peace and Governance Program of the United Nations University in Tokyo, Japan. He taught international relations and conflict studies in Eastern Europe (1995-1998) and served as OSCE election monitor in Bosnia (1997). His publications include: *The Southeast European Challenge: Ethnic Conflict and the International Response* (1999) and *Kosovo and World Politics* (1999). He is currently working on *Kosovo and the International Community* and *Southeast European Security: Threats, Responses, Challenges*.

**Ekaterina A. Stepanova** is a Research Associate on Foreign and Security Policy at the Carnegie Moscow Center of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. She holds a Ph.D. in History from Moscow State University (1998) and a MacArthur "Regional Security in the Global Context" Fellowship (1998). She is co-editor of *Kosovo: International Aspects of the Crisis* (1999, in Russian).

**Johannes Varwick** is a research fellow at the Research Institute of the German Society for Foreign Affairs (DGAP) in Berlin. His publications include *Sicherheit und Integration in Europa* (1998), *NATO 2000. Transatlantische Sicherheit im Wandel* (1999) and several articles on foreign and security issues of Europe and Germany, the European Union, NATO, the United Nations and Globalization.

**Eric A. Witte** is Program Coordinator at the Washington D.C. office of the International Crisis Group. He studied political science at the University Regensburg in Germany, completing a thesis on US and German foreign policy toward the dissolution of Yugoslavia that is being published by the *Osteuropa Institut* in Munich. He has written numerous opinion articles on Balkan policy and as a board member of Network Bosnia, co-founded and co-edits "Bosnia Daily," an email news digest on Bosnia.

## Agenda of the New Faces Conference 1999

The conference was organized by the Research Institute of the German Society for Foreign Affairs, Berlin, and the Center for Security Studies and Conflict Research of the ETH Zürich, supported by the *Robert Bosch Stiftung* and the German Marshall Fund of the United States.

**New Faces Conference 1999:  
“Kosovo: Lessons Learned for  
International Cooperative Security,”  
14-17 October 1999,  
German Society for Foreign Affairs, Berlin, Germany**

*14 October 1999: Arrival of Participants*

20:00 Welcome dinner at the Hotel Hamburg

*15 October 1999*

9:00 Political Cooperation in Retrospect: paper on *UN, NATO; OSCE, the EU, the Contact Group and the G-8 working toward a Kosovo Settlement* by Albrecht Schnabel; second paper: *Why Did Milosevic Give in?* by Domitilla Sagramoso; commented by Heidi Ullrich and Radek Khol

10:45 Coffee break

11:15 Political Cooperation in Retrospect: paper on *The Humani-*

*tarian Dimension (Management of Aid and Refugees)* by Lucas Haynes; commented by Vera Klauer

- 13:00 Lunch
- 14:00 Rebuilding Kosovo: paper on *The Domestic Security Dimension* by Alexander Tarasov; commented by Balasz Csuday
- 15:45 Coffee break
- 16:15 Rebuilding Kosovo: paper on *The Economic Dimension* by Andrew Wilson and paper on the *Ethnic Dimension* by Eric Witte; commented by Vjekoslav Perica
- 18:00 End of Session
- 20:00 Dinner
- 21:00 Speech by Peter Schmidt on *Political Analyses and the Kosovo Conflict*

***16 October 1999***

- 9:00 Paper on *Kosovo and the Stability Pact for Southeast Europe* by Annegret Klein-Schmeink; commented by Adina Stefan and Pieter Wezeman
- 10:45 Coffee break
- 11:15 Paper on *The Kosovo Crisis and its Consequences for a European Security Architecture* by Roberta Haar-Duke; commented by Elena Jurado and Anastasia Mitrofanova.
- 13:00 Lunch
- 14:00 Paper on *The Kosovo Crisis and its Consequences for the EU* by Johannes Varwick; commented by Szilvia Kardos
- 15:45 Coffee break
- 16:15 Paper on *The Role of the United States in Kosovo* by Andrew

Denison and paper on *The Role of Russia in Kosovo* by Ekaterina Stepanova; commented by Jeronim Perovic and Yoko Iwama

18:00 Concluding Session

19:30 Dinner at the restaurant “Aschinger,” Kurfürstendamm

***17 October 1999: Sight-seeing in Berlin***

10:00 Guided Tour through Berlin

13:00 Lunch at the Restaurant “Aigner,” Gendarmenmarkt

15:00 Visit to the new Parliament Building (Reichstag) – optional.



## List of Participants at the New Faces Conference 1999

### *Conference Organizers*

Dr. habil. Joachim Krause; Deputy Director, Research Institute of the German Society for Foreign Affairs (DGAP), Berlin (Germany)

Dr. Bernhard May; Senior Fellow, Research Institute of the German Society for Foreign Affairs (DGAP), Berlin (Germany)

Prof. Dr. Kurt R. Spillmann; Director, Center for Security Studies and Conflict Research, ETH Zürich (Switzerland)

Claude Nicolet, Research Assistant, Center for Security Studies and Conflict Research, ETH Zürich (Switzerland)

### *List of Participants*

1. Csuday, Balázs; Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Department for Strategic Planning, Budapest (Hungary)
2. Denison, Andrew; (USA), University of Bonn, Department for Political Science, Bonn (Germany)
3. Haar-Duke, Roberta; (USA), Maastricht (Netherlands)
4. Haynes, Lukas; Assistant Professor, Occidental College, Los Angeles (USA)
5. Iwama, Yoko; (Japan), Japanese Embassy, Berlin (Germany)
6. Jurado, Elena; (Spain), Eesti Humanitaarinstituut, Collegium Humaniorum Estoniense, Tallinn (Estonia)

7. Kardos, Szilvia; (Slovakia), Budapest (Hungary)
8. Khol, Radek; Institute for International Relations, Prague (Czech Republic)
9. Klauer, Vera; Institute for Transatlantic Foreign and Security Policy Studies, Free University, Berlin (Germany)
10. Klein-Schmeink, Annegret; University of Osnabrück (Germany)
11. Mitrofanova, Anastasia; Center for World Economy and Global Studies, Institute for Contemporary International Studies, Russian Diplomatic Academy, Moscow (Russia)
12. Perica, Vjekoslav; (Croatia), Research Analyst, Federal Research Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. (USA)
13. Perovic, Jeronim; Research Assistant, Center for Security Studies and Conflict Research, ETH Zürich (Switzerland)
14. Sagramoso, Domitilla; (Italy), Ph.D. candidate, Centre for Defence Studies, King's College, London (United Kingdom)
15. Schnabel, Albrecht; (Germany), Peace and Governance Programme, The United Nations University, Tokyo (Japan)
16. Stefan, Adina; (Romania), University of Groningen (Netherlands)
17. Stepanova, Ekaterina; Carnegie Moscow Center, Moscow (Russia)
18. Tarasov, Alexander; Research Fellow, Center for World Economy and Global Studies, Institute for Contemporary International Studies, Russian Diplomatic Academy, Moscow (Russia)
19. Ullrich, Heidi; (USA), Ph.D. candidate, London School of Economics, London (United Kingdom)
20. Varwick, Johannes; Research Fellow, Research Institute of the German Society for Foreign Affairs (DGAP), Berlin (Germany)
21. Wezeman, Pieter; (Netherlands), Arms Transfers Project, Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), Stockholm (Sweden)
22. Wilson, Andrew; Program Officer, Center for International Private

Enterprise, Washington, D.C. (USA)

23. Witte, Eric; Program Coordinator, International Crisis Group,  
United States Institute of Peace, Washington, D.C. (USA)

Special guest:

Dr. Peter Schmidt, *Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik*, Ebenhausen  
(Germany)