

Republic of Macedonia Foreign Policy

Republic of Macedonia Foreign Policy:
Diplomacy in the Middle of the Balkans

By

Dejan Marolov

**CAMBRIDGE
SCHOLARS**

P U B L I S H I N G

Republic of Macedonia Foreign Policy: Diplomacy in the Middle of the Balkans,
by Dejan Marolov

This book first published 2013

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2013 by Dejan Marolov

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-5139-6, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-5139-8

CONTENTS

List of Acronyms and Abbreviations.....	vii
Abstract	ix
Introduction	1
Chapter One.....	3
Foreign Policy: A Theoretical Overview	
Part I: The Term “Foreign Policy”	
Part II: The Relationship between Foreign Policy and Diplomacy	
Part III: The Relationship between Foreign and Domestic Policy and the Influence of the Character of the Domestic Political System in the Shaping of Foreign Policy	
Part IV: Theoretical Approaches	
Part V: The Changes in International Relations and Their Impact on Foreign Policy	
Chapter Two	17
The Policy of the EU and the US towards Macedonia during the Yugoslav Crisis	
Part I: The Policy of the EU towards Macedonia during the Yugoslav Crisis	
Part II: The Policy of the US towards Macedonia during the Yugoslav Crisis	
Part III: Concluding Observations on the Foreign Policy of the US and the EU towards Macedonia during the Yugoslav Crisis	
Chapter Three	37
The Process of Independence of Macedonia and Its Foreign Policy Priorities	
Part I: Consolidation of the Independence and Sovereignty of the State	
Part II: Security Issues and Dealing with the Danger of Possible Spillover of the Yugoslav Crisis in Macedonia	
Part III: The International Recognition and the UN Accession	

Chapter Four	73
Macedonia's Foreign Policy and Its Special Challenges	
Part I: The Theoretical and Legal Framework of the Foreign Policy of the Republic of Macedonia	
Part II: The Relations between Macedonia and Albania	
Part III: The Relations between Macedonia and Serbia	
Part IV: The Relations between Macedonia and Kosovo	
Part V: The Relations between Macedonia and Bulgaria	
Part VI: The Relations between Macedonia and Greece	
Part VII: Euro-Atlantic Aspirations	
Conclusion	123
References	125
Notes	135
Index	139

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

EU	European Union
EC	European Communities
US	United States
SFRY	Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia
RM	Republic of Macedonia
WEU	Western European Union
UN	United Nations
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
SHS Kingdom	Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes
SR	Socialist Republic
SAP	Socialist Autonomous Province
FRY	Federal Republic of Yugoslavia
B & H	Bosnia and Herzegovina
YNA	<i>Yugoslav</i> National Army
SKY	League of Communists of Yugoslavia
ASNOM	Anti-Fascist Assembly for the People's Liberation of Macedonia
SANU	Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts
UK	United Kingdom
UNPREDEP	United Nations Preventive Deployment Force
AVNOJ	Anti-Fascist Council of the People's Liberation of Yugoslavia
OSCE	Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
USSR	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
CIA	Central Intelligence Agency
CFSP	Common Foreign and Security Policy
UNPROFOR	United Nations Protection Force
IPA	Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance
SOC	Serbian Orthodox Church
MOC	Macedonian Orthodox Church
UÇK/KLA	Kosovo Liberation Army
UÇK/NLA	National Liberation Army
UNMIK	United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo

ABSTRACT

This book deals with the foreign policy of the Republic of Macedonia, from the period of the dissolution of Yugoslavia to the present moment (2012). It makes a connection between the dissolution process of Yugoslavia and the creation of the Macedonian independent state and its foreign policy.

On one hand, this research is a positive step in overcoming the current lack of literature in this field, especially in the English language, and, on the other hand, by combining the three factors of the subject of study (the policy of the EU and the US towards Macedonia during the period of the Yugoslav crisis, Macedonia's independence and its foreign policy priorities, and the specific challenges faced by Macedonian foreign policy) this research brings together all relevant elements of the policy in a single place, something that has not been the case in earlier studies. The analysis of all these factors is necessary in order to present a complete picture of the conditions which impacted and shaped Macedonian foreign policy during this time.

Keywords: Foreign policy, Yugoslavia, EU, US, Macedonia, Independence, Security dilemmas, UN, Recognition, Relations, Minorities, Integration, Diplomacy, Accession, Western Balkans, Yugoslav wars, Sovereignty, Foreign affairs.

INTRODUCTION

This book analyzes the external policies of the US and the EU towards the breakup of Yugoslavia and, mostly through the method of deduction, attempts to define the place of the Republic of Macedonia in these policies. Everything listed above is considered extremely important for the future events and directions in Macedonian foreign policy.

The greatest attention is placed on the initial period after the declaration of independence of the Republic of Macedonia. The reasons for this are certain events and circumstances in this period that required bold decisions and moves in Macedonian foreign policy. In this context, the book deals with the process of gaining independence, international recognition and membership of Macedonia in the UN. The manner in which these processes were handled by the main representatives of Macedonian foreign policy is still a controversy in Macedonia.

The bilateral relations of Macedonia with its neighbors, which were especially complicated due to the specific historical events, are also dealt with in this book, along with the Euro-Atlantic aspirations as a top priority of Macedonian foreign policy that has not yet been reached. Furthermore, there are attempts to find a connection between the bilateral relations of Macedonia with its neighbors and the Euro-Atlantic integration of the country.

Overall, the goal of the book is to give a general picture of the events and processes that have shaped Macedonian foreign policy and the reasons behind them. This can help in creating a better perception of the current foreign policy of Macedonia and its possible future directions.

CHAPTER ONE

FOREIGN POLICY: A THEORETICAL OVERVIEW

Part I: The Term “Foreign Policy”

International relations and the international scene are constantly subjected to various events and changes. These developments have been studied in disciplines such as sociology, history, economics, and so on. However, the events that occurred in the international arena during the twentieth century created such disruptions that, for their better understanding and explanation, there was a pressing need to create a new discipline that examines and explains them scientifically. A response to this need was the appearance of the science of international relations. In this context, foreign policy is an essential part of international relations. Though, it must be noted that sometimes foreign policy can be studied through other scientific disciplines and other aspects. Also, within the science of international relations, there are multiple perspectives of foreign policy and its objectives, and the deciding factors for the behavior of states. For example, looking through the realist perspective, foreign policy is a process of constantly attempting to influence others, or knowing how to force others to behave in a way that is beneficial to your own interests. At the same time, the liberal perspective is that foreign policy is shaped according to the international system, political system, and domestic politics. Furthermore, it can be noted that the main goals of foreign policy, according to the realist perspective, are the direct military - security objectives of the state. On the other hand, the liberal perspective sees the long-term economic and social welfare of the society as the main goal of foreign policy. When it comes to the question about which factors have a decisive impact on the behavior of states, again, there are a variety of answers. From the perspective of the realists, the decisive factors are the interests of power, and according to it, all leaders are alike in their behavior when it comes to foreign policy. The liberal perspective points to

the fact that democracies and their governments are limited not only by the needs of the state, but also by social requirements and needs.

The word “foreign” comes from the Latin word “foris”, which means “out”. However, the term “foreign policy” is not always used by all authors. Some authors use the term “international policy” as a synonym. Their argument is that international policy is basically the same with foreign policy. This claim is supported by the argument that the same internal and external factors determine the formation and direction of both policies. Yet, even these authors acknowledge the apparent difference in the range they cover. Namely, international policy is a very broad category, defined as the sum of foreign policies of different states.

Hence, some logical questions arise: What is foreign policy? How can foreign policy be understood? How can foreign policy be defined? The understanding of foreign policy is generally along the following lines - everything that the state does towards other states or with other states is called foreign policy. Yet, this concept of foreign policy is not entirely correct. The previous notion has obvious misleading statements and it reduces foreign policy to being only policy among states. However, it neglects the fact that foreign policy also includes the policy of the state towards international organizations and NGOs. The previous understanding of foreign policy can be considered problematic, especially in today's world of globalization. This is because there are still some processes of interdependence that aren't fully explained. Therefore, globalization casts a shadow on the above understanding of foreign policy, since it assumes that the state (government) can alone decide on its foreign policy towards other countries, or establish its own authentic and independent position. This, in today's world of globalization and mutual interdependence of states, is a naive view. The process of globalization is, in good part, still an enigma. Various authors have tried to find a definition to explain this new international system. According to Friedman (2006), after the end of the Cold War it becomes obvious that the world is no longer a bi-polar international system. However, at the same time, during the first few years after the Cold War it was difficult to determine what the new frame was and what the new system, in which the world had entered after the fall of the Berlin Wall, was like.

We knew some new system was aborning that constituted a different framework for international relations, but we couldn't define what it was, so we defined it by what it wasn't. It wasn't the Cold War. So, we called it the post-Cold-War world. (Friedman 2006, p. 11)

This illustrates the problems one faces when trying to define a new system. Still, Friedman continues:

The more I traveled, though, the more it became apparent to me that we were not just in some messy, incoherent, indefinable post-Cold War world. Rather, we were in a new international system. This new system had its own unique logic, rules, pressures and incentives and it deserved its own name: "globalization." Globalization is not just some economic fad, and it is not just a passing trend. It is an international system—the dominant international system that replaced the Cold War system after the fall of the Berlin Wall. (Friedman 2006, p.11)

He argues that within globalization, unlike in the previous system of the Cold War, there are three systems of balance which overlap and affect one another. The first system is the traditional balance between states. In the new system the balance is set between the US on one side and all other countries on the other side. The second is the balance between states and global markets. The third is the balance between states and individuals. Globalization has pushed many of the obstacles for movement of wealthy people, divided the world in networks and, for the first time in history, enabled tremendous power of individuals so that they could influence states and markets. For the first time, there are, as Friedman calls them, super-powerful individuals. One such example is Osama bin Laden, a powerful individual with his own network, an individual who declared war on the most powerful country in the world - the United States. For the first time in history, we have a declaration of war by a super powerful individual on a super powerful country. For the first time in history, the power of the state as a single powerful entity in international relations has been shattered. Therefore, the claim that foreign policy is how the state interacts with other states, in today's modern world and today's international system of globalization, can be called naive for the simple reason that the decisions of the state are not and cannot be as independent as they were in the past.

How can foreign policy be defined then? There are several authors who have given their own definitions of foreign policy.

One of them is Janev, and the following is how he defines foreign policy:

Foreign policy is the policy of the state towards the subjects of international relations. It is a combination of elements and processes, conducted with the aim of achieving social changes, where these changes and processes are conducted in relation to an international subject. (Janev 2002, p.67) (Translation by D.M.)

Without making a profound analysis of Janev's definition, it can be easily seen that the main element and the main role is given to the state, on one hand, and international entities, on the other hand.

Tonovski (2005), in turn, defines foreign policy as specific, conscious and organized activities, which, with the help of certain methods and tools (specialized bodies, groups and individuals), are implemented by a state with pre-defined goals and interests whose importance transcends national borders.

In Tonovski's definition the element "state" is essential again. Namely, in his definition it is the state that implements a specific, conscious and organized activity beyond its borders. This is done with the help of certain methods and tools and because of pre-defined purposes.

A similar definition is given by Smith, Hadfield & Dunne (2008), who claim that foreign policy is a given strategy of approach chosen by the national government to achieve its objectives in its relations with external entities. According to them, this includes the decision to not do anything. Even though this definition reduced foreign policy to a strategy of approach chosen by the national government, yet again the element of "state" (national government) is present. Namely, the national government determines the strategy of approach in its relations with external entities, and with the purpose of achieving certain goals.

Hill gives a rather different view and definition of foreign policy.

Foreign policy is the sum of official external relations conducted by an independent actor (usually a state) in international relations. (Hill 2003, p.3)

In the last definition, the phrase "independent actor" is used, although it is put in parentheses that this actor is usually, but not always, the state. The term "independent actor" enables us to understand that the definition includes not only states, but also other entities such as the EU. So, in this definition, the word "state" is avoided, which in today's world of globalization is especially true.

Further listing of other definitions of foreign policy would be unproductive. Despite the abundant definitions, they do not contradict (or not significantly, at least in the basic elements) one another. Almost all of them accept that foreign policy is a specific, conscious and organized activity or a strategy of approach, or what a state (the term "independent actor" would be better suited) does or does not do beyond its borders with the purpose of achieving some pre-defined goals.

Part II: The Relationship between Foreign Policy and Diplomacy

Many people don't make a difference between the terms "foreign policy" and "diplomacy". Despite their similarities, however, these two terms don't have the same meaning, even though there is a high degree of overlap between them. Thus, to a country striving to have successful foreign policy it makes perfect sense to invest in creating its own large and experienced diplomatic corps. However, the opposite is also true. If a country has a strong diplomatic corps and many experienced diplomats, then it tends to have an active foreign policy.

If we take a look from a historical perspective, we can see diplomatic activities have been a part of international relations from the very beginning. Although the beginning of "modern" diplomacy is associated with 13th century Northern Italy, there have been some kinds of diplomacy since ancient times. In ancient Greece, for example, the city-states had their own "diplomats" who were sent to other city-states to discuss and resolve certain specific issues without having permanent diplomatic missions in those city-states. Something similar to today's modern diplomats in ancient Greece were the citizens entitled as "proxenos". This title was awarded to men who lived in one city state, but maintained close ties with the city-state that had awarded them the title. Perhaps the first permanent diplomats of one country to another were the so-called "apocrisarii", who were permanent representatives of the Roman Pope in Constantinople. Over time, having its own "eyes and ears" in other states that will inform it first-hand became necessary for every serious state.

The development of new and modern communication devices set a new dilemma. It raised the question whether states still needed diplomatic missions at a time when information became much more accessible and traveling became incomparably faster than before. The answer to this question is - yes they do. Diplomats have many obligations and tasks and getting information is just one of them. Today they are a part of an unbreakable network set up as a part of the foreign policy of any serious state. The importance of diplomacy in today's world can be seen through the huge budgets allocated for diplomatic service and for the achievement of its goals in general.

But, how can we define diplomacy? Just as foreign policy, the term "diplomacy" also has several definitions. For many people, diplomacy refers to the negotiation skills of representatives of states or groups.

Diplomacy can be defined as an appropriately organized social activity, whose main intent is to represent the state in international relations and to work on achieving foreign policy objectives by the use of peaceful tools. (Vukadinovic 1998, p.186) (Translation by D.M.)

Diplomacy is always an expression of the total activities of all the participants in international political life which, according to their abilities and the time needed for action, attempt to realize their optimal international goals. (Tonovski 2005, p.1) (Translation by D.M.)

If the definitions of foreign policy are compared with the definitions of diplomacy, it can be seen that the purpose of both is to realize some goals on the international level. So, what is the difference between foreign policy and diplomacy, and is there a difference between them at all? Although diplomacy has been and for some people still is synonymous to foreign policy, foreign policy is a term that is much broader than the notion of diplomacy. Diplomacy is an inevitable and perhaps the most important foreign policy tool. Diplomacy does not exist just for itself, but its purpose is to achieve the goals of the foreign policy. Simply put, foreign policy is what you want to achieve, and, according to this, it determines the desired goals, while diplomacy is the chosen method through which you seek to achieve these goals.

It would be useful to observe the relations between diplomacy and the creation of a general foreign policy of a country, i.e. the degree of influence of diplomacy in the shaping of foreign policy. Most scholars agree that diplomacy has no monopoly over the formation of foreign policy, but that it participates indirectly through diplomatic negotiations and the representation of the basic foreign policy line of a state in the international arena. Rather, it is institutions such as the Head of State, the President of the Government, the Minister for Foreign Affairs, and so on, that directly create the foreign policy. The diplomat's mission, either as a permanent representative to another country, or as a negotiator on behalf of his own country in diplomatic discussions, is to convey and sometimes interpret the decisions and moves of his country's officials, so that they would be properly understood in the country where he performs the mission. Therefore, the diplomat does not create the foreign policy of his own country, but only explains, interprets and justifies it. However, even indirectly, diplomats can have influence in the shaping of foreign policy. This can be done by sharing their own views, which are supported by their authority and experience.

Part III: The Relationship between Foreign and Domestic Policy and the Influence of the Character of the Domestic Political System in the Shaping of Foreign Policy

It would be useful to take into consideration the relationship that foreign policy has with domestic policy. State borders are the center of this division. State borders are, at the same time, the line where domestic policy stops and foreign policy begins. Therefore, the efforts needed to achieve goals on the international level are carried out through the instruments of foreign policy. Some theorists claim that what the state does on the international level is directly related to its internal needs, or related to domestic politics, even when it is not so obvious. Some even go a step further, arguing that foreign policy is nothing but a simple continuation of the internal politics of a country outside its borders. It is hard to agree with this claim, since it is too much of a simplification. Certainly, there is a connection between foreign and domestic policy. One could even argue that the overall policy of a state is nothing else but the sum of its external and internal policies. However, as Tonovski states:

Both aspects of the public policy have their own autonomy. (Tonovski 2005, p.2) (Translation by D.M.).

This statement is entirely correct. Claiming that foreign policy is purely a continuation of domestic policy is not only too much of a simplification, but it also neglects the principle of autonomy of both policies. Thus, it is fair to consider that domestic politics has its own (large) impact on the creation of foreign policy, but there's no reason why the opposite would not also be the case. Therefore, it is quite legitimate to say that the foreign policy of a country can have an impact on its domestic policy. There are numerous examples of this, such as in the case of the Republic of Macedonia. One of the top foreign policy priorities of Macedonia is obtaining a membership in NATO and the European Union. Both organizations have their own principles and conditions that must be fulfilled in order for a country to become a member. The criteria for entry into the EU are called the Copenhagen criteria¹. The NATO alliance is, above all, an organization of a military nature. Even so, in addition to good military capabilities, NATO membership also requires that the country is a democracy.

All of these criteria have an influence on the domestic policies of the Republic of Macedonia, pushing it to make reforms in order to meet its foreign policy objectives. Once it is accepted that there is interdependence

between the foreign and the domestic policies of a country, it would be desirable to consider the influence that the character of the domestic political system has in the shaping of the foreign policy.

In order to see this influence, a historical overview needs to be done. In monarchies, at the time when countries were considered the personal property of their rulers, the monarch was crucial for the formation of foreign policy. This was the case simply because, officially, only the monarch could make foreign policy decisions, although there were some trustworthy advisers who participated in the process.

Or let's consider an autocratic state and take the example of Nazi Germany and its foreign policy. Nazi Germany based its overall foreign policy on the postulates and the understanding of only one man - Adolf Hitler. If we review the historical documentation for the period of Nazi Germany, we can see that it indisputably shows that all the major decisions in the foreign policy of Nazi Germany were mostly made by the "Führer", or with his blessing. This is the tendency in all contemporary autocracies, though we must not forget the fact that "the supreme leader", regardless of his official title, must rely on some socio-political forces.

Italy during the rule of Benito Mussolini is another interesting example. The existing literature of this period shows that Italy's foreign policy was strongly influenced by the will of one man - Mussolini. However, this is not enough to classify Italy in the time of Mussolini in the group of modern autocracies. This is because of the great influence of the party oligarchy that existed at that time and which cannot be ignored. This can be illustrated through the example of the capitulation of Italy. In fact, the decision to capitulate was not made by Mussolini, but by the party oligarchy. The line between the oligarchy and autocracy is difficult to determine in cases where one person is extremely powerful. This example shows that in the oligarchic systems there isn't only one formal maker of foreign policy decisions. Although, as already mentioned, the Italian political system in the times of Mussolini lies somewhere in between an autocracy and an oligarchy.

The above mentioned examples have shown that there is a strong connection between the way foreign policy is created and the character of the country's political system. Thus, in autocratic states the foreign policy is generally created by the will of one man, and in states primarily ruled by an oligarchy it is created in the small oligarchic circle.

If we continue to analyze the relationship between foreign policy and the political system in terms of who makes the foreign policy decisions, we can make a general division between the countries with democratic and non-democratic systems. Even though this division may seem rough, it can

help us derive some general tendencies. In countries with undemocratic political systems, foreign policy is considered “state business” and very high level politics. Therefore, it should not be decided and sometimes not even discussed by the common people. Rather, it is reserved for only a small, close-knit group. On the other hand, in democracies usually the opposite is true. Foreign policy has an increasing number of participants and stakeholders. Certainly, the creation of foreign policy is dependent on the type of democracy in the country, whether it is a parliamentary or a presidential system. However, whatever the democratic system, the holders of public functions are subject to the democratic control of the citizens through regular or emergency elections, referendums, and the control of parliament.

Although what has been said is to some extent a generalization, the previous examples illustrate that the foreign policy of a particular country is largely dependent on the internal political system. In addition to this statement, the “Democratic Peace Theory” can also be mentioned. The primary argument of this theory is that states with democratic systems do not fight or very rarely fight each other. This theory directly confirms the previous statement, which claimed that the foreign policy of states is dependent on the nature of their internal political system. Thus, the theory of democratic peace suggests a direct link between the domestic political system and foreign policy. It also suggests that the more democracies there are worldwide, the more secure the world will be. This theory has given rise to the term “peace zone” or “zone of peace”. The term is used to refer to the democratic countries of the world, or the countries where peace reigns.

The theory of democratic peace offers three arguments to justify its claim. The first argument consists of the claim that democratic governments are elected and subject to re-election; therefore, they must be accountable to the people, and people generally do not want war. So, the government will not go against the will of the voters². The second argument consists of the fact that democratic states have constitutions which determine exactly when the state can go to war and what conditions must be met for this, what are the responsibilities of the institutions and so on. Therefore, the very existence of a constitution greatly restricts the arbitrariness that might arise from the heads of state. Finally, the democratic countries respect international law and they will always strive to solve their problems under its regulations, thus avoiding war as a means of achieving their goals. However, some studies have shown that while democracies are not likely to wage war against other democracies, they are prone to go to war against non-democratic and totalitarian states. Statistics (Reiter & Stam 2002)

show that three quarters of such wars have ended with the victory of the democratic countries. Furthermore, the number of casualties caused by democratic states at war is significantly lower than the number of casualties caused by undemocratic states.

Certainly, there are some critics of this theory, or some parts of this theory. Even so, any further dwelling on it and its critics would be unproductive, since it was only mentioned in order to confirm the importance of the domestic political system when it comes to the creation of foreign policy.

Part IV: Theoretical Approaches

Let's explore the theoretical approaches and concepts in the study of foreign policy. Three approaches will be presented. Each of these approaches adequately contributes to a better understanding, shaping and implementing of the foreign policies of states.

One of these approaches is the geopolitical method. This method studies the correlation between the geographical position and the political orientation or strategy of a particular state. The beginnings of this method are commonly associated with Aristotle and his analysis of the geographic factors that affected politics in the city-states of ancient Greece. In the present day, this method is unavoidable. According to Mirchev:

Numerous social thinkers who have considered and contemplated politics, since ancient times to the present day, have had and still have, besides their pads and pencils, geographical maps on their tables. (Mirchev 2006, p.11)

When discussing geopolitics, it should be noted that within the theory there are terms such as "classical geopolitics" and "modern geopolitics". In classical geopolitics, a lot of emphasis is placed on the impact of geographical and spatial factors. Modern geopolitics, however, is much more interested in the human, rather than the geographical factor. Thus, it is more concerned with demographics, population, ethnology, the shaping of political institutions, and so on. According to Parker (1997), the values and character of geopolitics are becoming more and more regional, local, humane and peace loving. This contrasts the general view of geopolitics as a phenomenon among the major powers, which have, in many aspects, developed the ideologies and doctrines with the aim of justifying their own strategic interests, goals, and ambitions. Often, geopolitics was used for the preparation of the public for aggression, and so on.

Geopolitical terms are not something unknown in Macedonian foreign policy, although it must be admitted that many of these terms were

"imported" from different external sources. Thus, the term "Western Balkans" is used in relations with the EU and describes the Balkan countries that are non-EU countries, including Macedonia. This term, when observed through a purely geographical standpoint, is not correct. Macedonia and Serbia, for example, geographically speaking, could be considered central Balkan countries, but not a part of the Western Balkans. However, the term "Western Balkans" is accurate when used in a geopolitical sense, indicating the Balkan countries that are to the west of the two Balkan EU member states³. Another such term is "Adriatic Charter", which is imported from the vocabulary of the NATO alliance. This term encompasses three countries⁴, including the Republic of Macedonia, which has no outlet on the Adriatic Sea. Again, if the term is observed from a purely geographical point of view, it is incorrect. Nevertheless, from a geopolitical point of view, it actually makes great sense. This term was in the service of certain geopolitical goals. It was meant to describe the Balkan states that should join NATO in a "package".

Another approach that has helped the development of the study of foreign policy and which certainly deserves attention is the comparative politics approach. This approach was developed after the end of World War II, and it is considered a sub-discipline of political science. It mainly deals with political systems by comparing them. It examines the way they are built, including their electoral models and systems, political party systems, parliamentary models, political culture, democratic values, political opinion, and so on. Furthermore, it's also interested in questions like who governs, how interests are represented, who gains and who loses, and so on. After the appearance of authors such as Lipset, Eckstein and Satori, this model experienced some changes. These authors mainly dealt with comparing the performance of democratic systems to non-democratic systems. Some of them went even further and tried to offer mechanisms for applying pressure on undemocratic "imperfect societies" in order to democratize them. This certainly had a great influence on the shaping of foreign policy.

A third approach is the so-called approach of "world politics". This approach has a global scope of coverage and is in many aspects interdisciplinary. It sees the world as a system where economic, organizational, political and cultural forces interact. It often deals with issues of development and the problems with the balancing of inequalities attributed to the different levels of development, which it views from the perspective of the mission of the universal political organizations, such as the UN. Additionally, it deals with the respect for universal human rights, avoiding conflicts and wars, and so on. Especially interesting is the work

of Rouke & Boyer (2002). They focus primarily on the evolution of patterns in world politics. This is performed by examining factors such as nationalism and the role of nation states, international organizations, international security and safety, economy, global competition and cooperation, preservation and awareness of human rights and dignity, and so on.

Part V: The Changes in International Relations and Their Impact on Foreign Policy

There have been tectonic disruptions in international relations in the last two decades. The Cold War, which had threatened to turn into a real Third World War, luckily ended without validating the dark predictions. Communism fell apart with dramatic speed like a house of cards. Various thinkers tried to give an answer to what was happening and what the world will look like after the Cold War. There were questions about the future of democracy, such as if it was going to spread throughout the entire world or not. Francis Fukuyama (1992) perceived these changes as “the end of history” because, according to him, liberal democracy is the final form of organization and governance. Thus, the democratization of the whole world is an expected thing. On the other hand, Huntington (1992) saw the democratization process coming in “waves”, but was not so optimistic that democracy will ever prevail in the world. The spread of democracy was not the only issue that was raised after the end of the Cold War. Certain other dilemmas appeared that may have existed previously, but had now gotten a new meaning. The questions about the relationship between democracy and foreign policy, specifically on the question on the effectiveness of foreign policy in democracies, had now gotten a new dimension. Suddenly, there were new topics and terms. As a new theme, the question about the possible loss of the sovereignty of states in the new globalized world was raised. There were also questions about the relationship between foreign policy and human rights. The new term “humanitarian intervention” was used as a justification for the attack on the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in 1999 by the NATO Alliance. Many have seen this as a direct interference of a military alliance in the internal affairs of a sovereign and independent member of the UN. Furthermore, this was done without the approval of the Security Council of the UN. Hence, logical questions followed about how truly sovereign states really are in today's world of international relations.

Where was the place of foreign policy in all of this? Each of these tectonic disturbances in international relations has left a mark on foreign

policy. The fall of communism, the end of the Cold War, globalization, and so on, left a qualitative change in international relations that had to be taken into account by the foreign policy. The changes that took place opened a series of questions about its future role. Certainly, foreign policy has not been the same after the end of the Cold War. Some authors had extremely pessimistic predictions for the necessity of the further existence of foreign policy in the new globalized world. Namely, some even expected its disappearance, or at least a minimization of the need for conducting foreign policy. However, this has not proven to be the case. According to Hill (2003), in order to make foreign policy disappear, the independent actors (the states) will have to disappear first, but this has not happened. It is obvious that the process of globalization, the loss of sovereignty, the spread of democracy, and other factors have had an impact on foreign policy. However, none of these factors have seriously threatened the need for the further existence of foreign policy, and this is unlikely to happen in the future. Foreign policy remains one of the top priorities of any serious state.

CHAPTER TWO

THE POLICY OF THE EU AND THE US TOWARDS MACEDONIA DURING THE YUGOSLAV CRISIS

This chapter will attempt to examine the policy of the US and the EU towards Macedonia, as one of the six constituent republics of the former Yugoslav Federation, during the period of the Yugoslav crisis. The first question that needs to be answered is what exactly is meant by the term "Yugoslav crisis", or, more precisely, which time period does it refer to? Rather than specifying exact dates, we can define the "Yugoslav crisis" period as the time period starting several months before the declaration of independence of Slovenia and Croatia and ending with the signing of the Dayton Peace Agreement for B & H. This period was followed by stagnation and relatively peaceful conditions in the territory of the former Yugoslavia, until the break out of military conflict in the so-called Southern Front, in Kosovo in 1999 and in Macedonia in 2001. However, the conflicts in Kosovo and Macedonia are not considered part of the term "Yugoslav crisis". The reason for this is that Yugoslavia no longer existed and these military conflicts were (although maybe cause-effect related) different in their character and occurred in two sovereign and mutually recognized states⁵.

Part I: The Policy of the EU towards Macedonia during the Yugoslav Crisis

In order to present the politics and relations of the EU towards Macedonia, let's first make an overview of the behavior of Macedonia during the Yugoslav crisis. Looking back, it can be seen that the Republic of Macedonia was not one of the leading republics in the dissolution process of Yugoslavia. Rather, it can be concluded that exactly the opposite applies. Some Macedonian politicians, together with some politicians from the other republics, made efforts to find a mutually

acceptable solution in order to rescue the common state. One such example was the Izetbegovic – Gligorov platform⁶, which was not accepted by the other republics. So, in a situation where Macedonia couldn't have been qualified as a "secessionist" republic, it couldn't have been a subject of significant diplomatic activities by the EU. This was the case because of the fact that just before the declaration of independence by Slovenia and Croatia, the EU had built a common position which consisted of condemnation and disapproval of any kind of a unilateral declaration of independence by any republic⁷, but also condemnation and disapproval of the eventual use of force to retain the wholeness of Yugoslavia⁸. Simply put, the general position of the EU was to support the survival of Yugoslavia. Therefore, it decided to focus its diplomatic attention on the countries that had the opposite view, i.e. which had opted for the dissolution of Yugoslavia. In accordance with the general tendency of Macedonia to help the federation survive, the main activity of the EU in this initial period was not directed towards Macedonia, but primarily towards the pro-dissolution republics of Slovenia and Croatia, on one hand, and towards the federalist and pro-centralistic positioned Belgrade and the Yugoslav National Army (YNA) which had threatened to use force to preserve the federation, on the other hand.

However, the joint position of the EU did not change the attitude of Slovenia, which still decided to declare independence unilaterally. This event gradually transformed the previous political crisis in Yugoslavia into an open military conflict, which erupted between the Slovenian territorial forces and the YNA. This conflict was a strong signal for the EU to take more concrete steps against the war that was threatening to expand to the wider Yugoslav territory. The Union's answer consisted of sending the so-called "troika of ministers" with a precise mission to Yugoslavia. The specific objective of the mission was to bring about an immediate ceasefire and to prevent further expansion of the conflict. This diplomatic activity of the EU resulted with the "Brijuni Agreement"⁹. This document provided a three month delay of the declarations of independence of Slovenia and Croatia, and the cessation of all military activities by the YNA in Slovenia. Specifically for Slovenia, the EU diplomatic activity meant two things: first of all, getting independence, and second, the withdrawal of the YNA forces from Slovenian territory without any further struggle. However, this did not mean that a complete ceasefire was achieved, since the conflict now moved to Croatian territory and this demanded further involvement of the EU.

Where was the Republic of Macedonia in all of this? Before the Conference for the Former Yugoslavia in The Hague, the Republic of

Macedonia had already approached the EU as an individual entity (though still part of the Federation) with a memorandum entitled "The International Position of Macedonia and Its Status in the Yugoslav Community." In this memorandum Macedonia expressed its views and support for the survival of Yugoslavia as a union of sovereign states with some federal elements. The memorandum also mentioned the "European processes":

The disintegration of the economic and political system of Yugoslavia in the shape that has existed up until now, faces us with the necessity of a fundamental reconstruction of the state. This process of the reorganization of the relations between the Yugoslav republics should correspond with the European processes. This means respect for the independent and sovereign position of each state as a precondition for higher forms of integration. (Malevski 2006, p.26)

If we analyze the positions of the Republic of Macedonia expressed in the Memorandum, we can notice that they were practically the same solutions that were later offered by the EU at the Hague Conference on the Former Yugoslavia. So, the Macedonian positions were in the line with those of the EU. The Memorandum itself is very significant for Republic of Macedonia, because it had approached the EU as an individual entity, not as a part of the federation; consequently it imposed itself as a participant and as a concerned party that cannot be ignored in future decisions and projections about Yugoslavia.

The success or the failure of the EU diplomacy, which resulted in the signing of the Brijuni Declaration, can be debated. It might have been successful for Slovenia, but it had not fulfilled the main objective of the EU mission in Yugoslavia, which was prevention of the further spread of the conflict. However, at this point we are more specifically interested in the approach the EU chose in dealing with the beginning of the wars in Yugoslavia. The original method chosen by the EU was an ad hoc approach for solving conflicts. Therefore, because at that time there was a specific military problem in Slovenia, according to the selected ad hoc approach, only the situation in Slovenia was discussed.

After the outbreak of the military conflict in Croatia, the EU understood that the problem had not been solved at all and appointed a mediator to work on solving the Yugoslav problem, which had already been defined as a European problem. This was due to at least two facts. First, the US gave the leader role to the EU and, second, the EU was not the same any more after Maastricht. One of the main changes made with this treaty was the introduction of the Union's pillar system. According to

this, one of the three pillars was the European Common Foreign and Security policy - CFSP¹⁰. Unlike the first pillar¹¹, in the second (CFSP) pillar and in the third pillar¹², the principle of supranationalism was replaced with the principle of inter-governmentalism. The reason for this is the fact that the issues treated outside the first pillar were much more sensitive for the member states in terms of their sovereignty. Because of this, in most cases, decisions in the second and third pillar can only be reached through unanimity among the member states. The CFSP was necessary, among others reasons, in order to improve the perception of the EU as an economic giant, but a political pygmy. So, if the EU wanted to be a global player, first it needed to successfully manage its own backyard.

The first special appointed mediators were Lord Carrington and later Lord Owen. The diplomatic activity of the EU lasted much longer than some earlier euphoric statements made just after the Brijuni agreement, regarding the success of the EU in bringing peace to Yugoslavia, had predicted. So, during its dealing with the Yugoslav problem, the EU organized a series of conferences in The Hague¹³ and together with the UN was an organizer of the London Conference¹⁴ and the Geneva Conference¹⁵. Unlike the original ad hoc approach for solving specific conflicts, at the Hague Peace Conference, under the leadership of Lord Carrington, the EU decided to use a different approach to the Yugoslav issues.

The EC Peace Conference was, in theory, exactly what Yugoslavia needed, since it aimed to consider the country as a whole and to develop a coordinated approach to all of the region's conflicts, rather than merely deal with immediate flash-points, such as that in Croatia, in isolation. (...) while the conditions in Bosnia - Herzegovina and Macedonia were supposed to be as much a part of the agenda as those in Slovenia and Croatia. (Bennett 1995, p.176).

The goal of this peace conference was to find a solution for the ongoing war in Croatia and a comprehensive solution for the other conflicts in Yugoslavia. All of the Yugoslav republics were represented. Even the Kosovo Albanians and Vojvodina Hungarians had their representatives. So, thanks to this new EU approach, Macedonia officially became part of the common policy of the EU agenda and the situation in Macedonia rose to the level of equal importance with the situation in Croatia, which was a war field at the time.

Why was this so important for the Republic of Macedonia? It is because through the Hague Conference, for the first time in history, the