

RESULTS OF THE "PROSPECTS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF BULGARIAN-MACEDONIAN RELATIONS"

For many years running, the development of Bulgarian-Macedonian relations was hampered by the effects of factors having both historical and political character. The inherited situation, of isolation, constant negative myth perpetuation and lack of contact between the two countries, turned out to be a serious obstacle to bilateral cooperation. For decades on end no practical framework was established for the development of bipartite relations between Bulgaria and Macedonia. For these reasons, the act of recognition of the Republic of Macedonia by Bulgaria at the beginning of the 90s proved not to be enough to overcome the obstacles preventing the development of bilateral relations. Along with those inherited obstacles from the past, a strong effect was felt in the period **1992-1998** from the unwillingness of the Macedonian authorities, dominated by the post-Yugoslavian political elite, to promote the development of bipartite relations. Furthermore, occasions which could hamper the development of such relations were constantly sought after.

On the part of Bulgaria, significant mistakes were also made with regard to the formulation of its policy toward Macedonia. This was embodied in the first place in Bulgaria's internal non-uniformity and conflicting character of its stand on the recognition of the Republic of Macedonia. Recognition of the Macedonian state was accompanied by the imposition of conditions of non-state-political character. The introduction of the language and nation issues into the discourse of bilateral relations was totally unnecessary and made dialogue considerably difficult.

The formation in both Macedonia and Bulgaria of governments that are not bound by the previous stage of the relationship's development led to new opportunities for the development of bipartite relations. The joint declaration signed by the prime ministers of both countries signed in February 1999 practically settled the deteriorated historical and political disputes that had hampered current development of the relations. The decision of Sofia and Skopje to sign treaties on the official languages fixed in the constitutions of the two countries enabled the speeding up of the development of economic, political and cultural relations between the two countries. No less important than the settlement of the so-called language problem was the mutual minority claim waiver. This declaration established the prerequisites for a qualitatively new stage in the development of economic, political and cultural cooperation between the two countries.

The intention of the Bulgarian-Macedonian conference entitled "Prospects for the Development of Bulgarian-Macedonian Relations," organized by the Institute for Regional and International Studies in cooperation with the Forum Centre for Strategic Studies, was to make use of this new dynamic of accelerating bilateral relations. The organizers were led by the conviction that the main purpose of the development of Bulgarian-Macedonian relations at present is to formulate and implement definite, pragmatic initiatives for cooperation in all fields of bilateral interest. The conference did not have the ambitious purpose of overcoming all inherited problems in relations between the two countries, but rather of bringing about the establishment of interest-intersection fields, laying the foundations for positive dialogue and identifying effective mechanisms for the gradual

solution of the problems. The conference was wholly focused on the settlement of practical problems in bilateral relations.

The debate framework was outlined prior to the conference itself. It included the preconditions for the development of bilateral cooperation, as well as the fields in which that cooperation could be carried out. The main preconditions favoring the development of bilateral relations were indicated as follows:

- The establishment of the independent Republic of Macedonia in 1992 as a sovereign act of self-determination of the people of Macedonia and the recognition of the Republic of Macedonia by Bulgaria, the first country to recognize the Republic of Macedonia among all other countries in the international community;
- The development of democratic political processes both in Bulgaria and Macedonia, enabling the citizens of the two countries to, for the first time in decades, show their free will, and freely control their lives, identity and national development direction;
- The orientation of both countries to the system of a free market economy, which requires the protection of individual freedom and enterprise and the elimination of all political, administrative and ideological barriers to the free exchange of people, goods and services between Bulgaria and Macedonia;
- The explicit freely chosen aspiration of Bulgaria and Macedonia for European Union and NATO membership, which would turn the two countries into strategic partners in the fields of security, economic and social development, and civil and political cooperation in the protection and consolidation of the values of human rights, individual freedom and tolerant coexistence of peoples of different ethnic and religious identity;
- The crisis process of the disintegration of former Yugoslavia, whose most severe stage – the Kosovo conflict – we are now going through, brought about a great number of long-term calamities. The isolation and embargo exercised a great depressing and corrupting influence on the economies of Bulgaria and Macedonia. The crisis drove hesitant foreign investors away from our countries and cut off our trade routes to Europe. As a result of the ethnic purge of Kosovo Albanians by the Milosevic regime, Macedonia was faced with the serious threat of economic collapse and social and political instability. At the same time the crisis offers Bulgaria and Macedonia new opportunities for development and cooperation. We are now in a process of dynamic, geostrategic regional change. For the first time in the modern history of Europe, the Balkans may have a chance to become an integral part of the “Old Continent.” In this way they will leave behind their geopolitical burden of being a “sanitary cordon” or a “powder keg” and develop their security systems on the basis of the contemporary European model of mutual commitment and balance, in which the security of one partner is a precondition for the security of all. In this new system there is no room for regional quasi-empires exercising dominance over their neighboring peoples. In this system there is no room for walls of barbed wire and artificially inspired hatred, such as the long-extant wall between Bulgaria and Macedonia. The fall of the Berlin Wall heralded the new unity of Europe. The fall of the wall between Bulgaria and Macedonia is

the herald of the new unity in the Balkans. In this new unity all peoples should be equal participants;

- Bulgaria and Macedonia are geographically located along international trade routes — including, for example, “the silk road” — which are under reconstruction, as well as the coming routes for the transportation of natural resources, the oil and gas of the Caspian Sea and Russia, to the West. This circumstance gives the two countries dynamic opportunities in building a modern infrastructure in the Southeastern European region;
- We are closely related peoples, sharing the cultural heritage of common and sacred intellectual sources for the whole of Europe. The achievements of the brothers Saints Cyril and Methodius serve as irrevocable proof of Bulgaria and Macedonia belonging to the common history of Europe. It is in our own power alone to secure our place in the common future of Europe as well.

The main fields of bilateral interest were systematized according to the following trends:

- Cooperation in the expansion and activation of bilateral trade. Bulgaria and Macedonia have common trade interests regarding the reconstruction of trade routes in the region, reducing administrative and bureaucratic restrictions to crossing their borders, and simplifying and reducing customs tariffs. They also have common interests in providing non-visa or at least alleviated visa status for the business trips of citizens of their two countries in the Schengen zone. The trade restrictions resulting from the Kosovo conflict could be partially compensated by intensively establishing a common trade zone between the two countries and new types of structures of legislative and administrative conformity and integration of their trade policies;
- Joint efforts for speeding the construction of the European transport corridor No. 8, completion of the railway line between the two countries and development of the highway network. Joint initiatives for approaching the potential investors in the transport infrastructure of the two countries: the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the U.S. Trade and Development Agency, the World Bank, private investment projects of the European Union and the United States. Coordinated efforts of the two countries for realization of the AMBO project, by means of intercession for the member-companies of the Caspian oil consortium, the U.S. federal authorities and EU institutions;
- Cooperation in the partial compensation of economic damage resulting from the Kosovo crisis. Compensation of the Macedonian economy for the loss of partner-manufacturers and markets in Yugoslavia. Mutual investments and cooperative productions. Cooperation in the EU and NATO plans for post-war reconstruction of the region;
- Development of common priorities for integration in EU structures. Both countries have a relatively long way to go toward full membership in the EU. Common selective strategic priorities for integration in the EU are necessary and important in the fields of infrastructure development, bringing the legislation of both countries

- closer to that in Europe, and formation of European structures and institutions for trade, economic, political and cultural cooperation;
- Cooperation in the establishment of a common security system in the region. Coordinated strategies for NATO membership. Bilateral strategy on the problems of the so-called *soft security issues*; these are security problems of non-military character, and their importance has grown dramatically in the context of the Kosovo crisis and the post-crisis period. In this strategy it is necessary to include: joint efforts for control over the organized criminal economy, illegal traffic of arms, drugs and people across the borders; control over the ethnic instability factors and the factors causing intercommunity conflicts; and containing and controlling the waves of economic, political or ethnic instability generated by neighboring countries or regions;
 - Cooperation in the exchange of cultural values, educational and scientific programs, media products. The past administrative and legislative barriers restricting and hampering the free exchange of people, ideas and publications between the two countries should be eliminated. A considerable part of the misunderstanding in relations between the two countries is the result of propaganda schemes and disinformation mythology, inherited from the age of total isolation and institutional hostility. Truth can come only out of the liberty of ordinary people to communicate with each other and to choose between alternative information sources to form their own opinions and attitude toward the others. There should be cooperation between state institutions and civil and business circles of both countries toward the establishment of a system of exchange in the fields of science, culture and media. This system would not need special protection but would guarantee full value within the framework of principles, standards and institutions of free communication established in the democratic world. The rest depends on the initiative and interests of the citizens and intellectuals in both countries.

In the text outlined above, the emphasis was on the necessity of giving priority to those pragmatic purposes in Bulgarian-Macedonian relations which directly determine the development of the two countries toward European integration, economic reconstruction and building up a security system and prosperity in the Balkan region. It was stressed that there will inevitably be unsolved problems in relations between Bulgaria and Macedonia, related to the past, history and its ambiguous interpretation. However, it is possible and necessary to place these problems at the far periphery of the dialogue between the two countries, so that they cannot hamper the development of cooperation in the spheres of practical common interest. Both countries and their politicians should refrain from official interpretation of the problems inherited from the past. The citizens and mostly the intellectuals of Bulgaria and Macedonia have to undertake a commitment to interpret those problems in the context of benevolent efforts to eliminate the negative remnants of the past in the name of a common future.

The stand expressed above was used as a basis for discussion during the conference, whose purpose was the formulation of explicit suggestions for bilateral cooperation. The introductory lectures — those of Macedonian Foreign Affairs Minister Boris Traikovski and political scientist Ivan Krustev — elaborated on the situation, in which the two

countries now are, and the problems and prospects for the development of Bulgarian-Macedonian cooperation in the future.

In the course of the discussion, several suggestions regarding general bilateral cooperation were made:

- Dynamic political cooperation and formulation of joint political attitudes of Bulgaria and Macedonia toward the main problems related to challenges in the region;
- Joint planning of participation in international undertakings;
- Working out of joint attitudes of the two countries toward participation with coordinated interests in the EU program for the reconstruction of the region in the post-crisis period;
- Joint strategic planning in relation to the infrastructure initiatives in the Southeastern European region, Corridors No. 8 and No. 4 in particular;
- Promoting public dialogue in both countries, with a view to the achievement of public consensus in favor of the consolidation and development of bipartite relations.

Practical measures and initiatives for the development of bilateral cooperation in the fields of the economy, security, culture, science and media were discussed in both working groups. The discussion in the groups entitled “Economy and Security” and “Culture, Media and Public Opinion” was aimed at seeking specific organizational forms for the implementation of bilateral cooperation in those fields. A series of specific motions were adopted. They were meant for the governments, parliaments and other state institutions, media, economic organizations, business and civil associations of both countries.

In the fields of the economy and security, the following motions were adopted:

- Assimilation and harmonization of the legislation of both countries in these fields. This motion was put forward in terms of the existing difficulties in carrying out economic activity and investment due to a lack of effective legislation in both countries. In this sense, it was stressed that real cooperation could be achieved only after the establishment of an actually working legal framework for the security of economic activity. The harmonization of the legislation of both countries will contribute to the facilitation of economic exchange and mutual investment, as well as the promotion of effectiveness in the campaign against crime. **This motion should be submitted to the legislation committees of the Parliaments of both countries.**
- Setting up a framework for the free transit of people, goods and services between the two countries;
- Working out a program for the protection of bilateral relations and promotion of joint economic projects;
- Formulating conceptions for the establishment of a Bulgarian-Macedonian investment bank;

- Setting up a common mechanism and parallel administrative sections for risk analysis and estimation in the fields of economics, politics and security;
- Working out a program for interaction between the Foreign Affairs and Justice ministries of Bulgaria and Macedonia on internal and regional security issues;
- Setting up a permanent information system for the exchange of operative data on cross-border crime and organization of joint actions for the campaign against drug trafficking and organized crime.

During the discussion in the “Culture, Media and Public Opinion” working group, the attention was focused on the necessity of joint projects under the situation of the new face of the region. Realizing that from now on the existing myths will again create barriers to bilateral relations, irrespective of the good intentions of governments, the discussion participants joined together in the opinion that exchanging the myths for the real is essential. They also realized the necessity of eliminating the remaining institutional barriers and allowing the exchange of cultural products between the two countries. It was pointed out that there should be specific initiatives from specific people and institutions in order to specify and optimize matters.

The main motions framing the specific projects and initiatives for cooperation in the fields of culture, science and media, were the following:

- To start exchanging significant literary pieces, which present and introduce Bulgaria and Macedonia in the modern culture. This motion was backed with the argument that the Great Wall, which was built up between the two peoples for decades, could be surmounted by the opportunity of penetrating beyond it, namely via awareness of the culture of the “other.”
- Relevant to the subject was the idea of spreading Bulgarian and Macedonian literature in Macedonia and Bulgaria respectively, in the original languages of both countries. It was proposed that for poetry, in particular, that a bilingual model be applied, according to which the text is presented in both languages in parallel.
- Related to this matter was the motion to organize circulation of newspapers and magazines on a principle of exchange. Another proposition concerned cooperation between Bulgarian and Macedonian newspapers and magazines covering similar subjects, including the publication of special editions devoted to the other country’s authors, poetry, publicity and so on.

The participants in the Conference pointed out the necessity of eliminating administrative and institutional barriers to the free exchange of publications. On the part of Macedonia it was stressed that the registration regime for foreign (Including Bulgarian) publications at the Macedonian Foreign Affairs Ministry should be repealed.

It was also emphasized that media could play an enormous role in eliminating the remnants standing in the way of true perception of “the other.” The electronic media were pointed out as the most powerful instrument for exercising influence on public opinion. A motion for signing an agreement between the Bulgarian and Macedonian national

television stations was put forward. It envisages:

- Television broadcasting on the principle of exchange without translation or censorship;
- Exchange of television productions, devoted to Bulgaria and Macedonia respectively; making joint productions on common problems;
- Making productions that present the points of view of both countries on controversial issues;
- Television broadcasting of Bulgarian and Macedonian films in Macedonia and Bulgaria, respectively.

This motion should be submitted to the management of the national and private television media of both countries.

A motion for conducting a Bulgarian cinema week in Macedonia and a Macedonian cinema week in Bulgaria was also put forward. **It should be submitted to the Ministries of Culture in Bulgaria and Macedonia and to the national cinema centers in both countries.**

In the field of theater, two specific motions were made:

- Publication of an anthology of Bulgarian plays in the Macedonian language and one of Macedonian plays in the Bulgarian language;
- Project for a joint theater production having a Bulgarian-Macedonian team and its performance in both countries.

Macedonian participants made a motion in favor of publishing a Bulgarian-Macedonian and Macedonian-Bulgarian dictionary, which according to them is necessary for more precise translations of poetry, essays, etc.

Another motion concerned free academic exchange, which would include circulation of scientific literature, mutual visits of lecturers and students, and the organization of public lectures of notable public and political figures from Bulgaria and Macedonia.

The motions for cooperation in the fields of common interest that were put forward during the conference could become a solid foundation for the work of state and private (civil) institutions on the development of bilateral relations.

Within the next four to six months, a second Bulgarian-Macedonian conference will be held as a part of a project called "Cooperation Between Bulgarian and Macedonian Non-Governmental Organizations for Solving Problems in Bilateral Relations." The main purpose of the project will be to evaluate the way in which the motions are put into action, as well as the factors in favor of or against the implementation of these motions.

SECURITY AND RECONSTRUCTION OF SOUTHEASTERN EUROPE:

A POLICY OUTLOOK FROM THE REGION

STRATEGIES FOR DEMOCRATIZATION AND INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT

- *Containment Of Ethnic Conflicts;*
- *Effectiveness Of Public Administration And Public Control;*
- *Civil Security And Civil Participation;*

The reconstruction of the Balkans after the Kosovo crisis cannot be accomplished merely by the “import” of modern institutional mechanisms. Despite numerous past examples of introducing similar up-to-date models that were effectively adapted to the local environment, the current rebuilding of the region should first call for an implementation of whole scale modernization, which, in particular cases, should aim at rebuilding communities. A clear cut modernization process requires on the one hand, maximal mobilization of the existing institutional resources of Balkan societies individually and in collaboration, and on the other hand effective mechanisms for adequate adaptation of the principles and institutions of a European-style democracy.

The current assumption that introduced models of a pluralistic political system, free market economy and civic security really turn the countries of the region into full-fledged democracies is rather formal and imprecise. The existence of these models is devoid of essence and meaning - they are often hollow shells and barren inside.

The situation of complete institutional disintegration in some Balkan countries, the nominal existence or the quality of performance in other countries' institutions necessitates clear definition of problems, common to the region and specific to the different states institutional problems in regard to the formulation of adequate and bringing to positive results initiatives for the Balkans.

Levels of Institutional Development

From the perspectives of the existing public and corporate institutional framework in the Balkan region of today we could distinguish among four basic levels of institutional development.

The first level applies to countries and regions, which have almost no autonomous institutional capacity to assist reconstruction initiatives. The typical examples are the Kosovo region and Bosnia and Herzegovina. Both areas are coming out of intensively destructive military operations, mass scale efforts of ethnic cleansing and other serious human rights abuses. The traditional political and administrative infrastructure of those

territories has been disintegrated, the level of inter-communal communication and cooperation is extremely low, following years of systematic inter-ethnic clashes, and the institutions of communal life have been completely destroyed or suffer full inability to serve the communities in post-war conditions. At this level of institutional destruction and helplessness a full protectorate status, imposed militarily, politically and administratively is the only solution to create the necessary organizational background for a sensible peacekeeping, humanitarian and reconstruction and development program. The protectorate status may be complemented with a step by step development of autonomous democratic process of political representation at municipal and national level under international supervision. The process of democratic re-institutionalization in Bosnia after Dayton proved very slow and painful, especially at the level of interaction among the three entities -- Serb, Muslim and Croat.

The second level of institutional development in the region refers basically to Albania and -- in some respects - to the Republic of Macedonia. Albania suffered a heavy crisis in its institutional development in 1997 and the Albanian state operates to a particular extent in selected regions of the country. The ability of the government and the public administrative system to enforce law and order and to exercise the basic functions of a state are seriously reduced in all basic fields of life. Albania, therefore, needs systemic external -- international efforts to re-structure its public institutional system and reproduce normal environment in the fields of security, law and order, welfare provision. This external effort will amount to a semi-protectorate status, in which an imported administrative system should co-exist with the existing domestic institutions of democratic representation of the Albanian citizens.

Macedonia is a country, which has relatively high standard of public institutions performance compared to many other countries in the region. The point of vulnerability of Macedonia is specifically in the field of maintaining interethnic stability and in resisting the attempts of the present day Belgrade regime to de-stabilize and control the country. For those reasons of security Macedonia will need mass scale international assistance in the field of security and national defense infrastructure.

Third, Bulgaria, Romania and Macedonia (apart from its security dilemma) represent the **highest level** of institutional development. These countries have the autonomous ability to implement their political decision making in a public administrative process. Nonetheless, the efficiency level of their public administrative systems is remarkably low compared to the standards of the developed world. A system of direct assistance, and indirect stimuli should be developed to motivate these national governments to perform a large scale administrative reform, to reduce the skyrocketing levels of corruption, to promote a more effective system of public control over the executive and legal systems, to de-centralize the decision making process, and strengthen the municipal powers authority. Romania's level of economic transformation is low and the country remains economically vulnerable. Bulgaria needs to improve its internal administrative conditions in order to attract private investment and register economic growth.

The fourth level - Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) - represents an institutional dilemma. The country has a relatively well developed institutional system inherited from the former Yugoslav communist state. Following the recent military defeat, however, the growing political unrest will start Yugoslavia on its process of uneasy political

transformation from authoritarian rule to democracy. This process is very likely to be accompanied by weakening of public institutions, disintegration of the system of law and order, and decline of the state's ability to serve the basic needs of the community. This case represents the most difficult scenario, and a minimum of political and institutional transformation should be carried out by Yugoslav citizens before the international community prove capable of providing help.

Montenegro shows a better ability to adapt while a process of transforming its institutions than Serbia. However, this may accelerate the disintegration process of the Yugoslav federation.

In Croatia, serious political change is expected to take place this year, which may lead to institutional change. By no means will it be even close to the dramatic institutional disintegration threatening Yugoslavia.

Areas of Institutional Transformation

Poor modernization of countries in the region and loss of early modern traditions in political democracy and private business, as well as the extreme crisis potential for ethnic conflict, underlay general institutional problems. Their concrete manifestation imposes a differentiated approach when elaborating concrete policies and initiatives in the followings areas:

- containment of ethnic conflict;
- effectiveness of public administration and public control;
- civil security and civil participation.

The above mentioned areas represent the main sources of institutional instability and weakness observed throughout the region with various intensity. Each attempt to provide general solutions must be based upon an understanding of the specific shortcomings in each area.

Containment of Ethnic Conflicts

The Balkans are an excellent example of a multiethnic environment. Every attempt - of the last 150 years and of the present - to create ethnically clean (and cleansed) nation states has had little to no chance of success. From this perspective, changing the national borders to improve a country's ethnic balance may have a short term effect, but will be dangerous in the long term. Major institutional change in the Balkans requires a new definition of the Balkan national community. The ethnic definition of the Balkan nations is the product of delayed national development of all its communities, resulting from disintegrating Ottoman and Habsburg empires. Thus, the new definition of nations should be based on civic solidarity and citizens' integration - irrespective of their ethnic group - into the common whole of a democratic and tolerant national community. Cooperation with other communities in the region in the framework of the European unity is the next step. Undoubtedly this process will be painful and sometimes - dramatic. Nonetheless, there is no alternative, because it is the only way to de-legitimize interethnic conflict as an instrument of defending national integrity and national sovereignty against "alien communities".

There has been a major miscalculation on the part of influential international institutions, human rights groups and local reformist movements that “multiculturalism”, defined as a system of institutionalizing collective political rights for diverse ethnic groups leads to inter-communal peace and understanding. The Balkans represent a predominantly paternalist type of communal culture, and the improvement of collective political rights has been directly stimulating a process of fragmentation and separatism. The absence of strong liberal-democratic institutions, capable of integrating citizens into national economic, civic and political life, and the presence of adverse corporate interethnic competition has made it possible for authoritarian ethnic-communal leaders and elites to enforce militant separatism as the only way of defending the ethnic or national interest. Bosnia Herzegovina and Kosovo are key examples of this point.

It is essential to the ethnic peace and tolerance in the region to improve the institutional background and effective implementation of individual human rights and opportunities within a liberal-democratic system of citizens' equality and integration. The efforts of civic integration must be concentrated in the following areas of communal life:

- Integration achieved by creating new economic opportunities and a cross-communal market experience;
- Integration achieved by a balanced system of equal participation in developing the educational system, access to the media, and freedom of cultural expression;
- Integration achieved by developing cross-border cultural and economic regions, bringing together representatives from an ethnic community living in two or more neighboring countries;
- Integration achieved by developing a culture of public tolerance, which makes discrimination unacceptable;
- Integration achieved by improving the selective strategies of governments to assist underprivileged communities in the socioeconomic field;
- The right of self-determination is not a right to secession: separatist movements should not be encouraged on either a regional or an international level;
- The introduction of effective institutions to safe guard (and enforce) civil rights;
- Inclusion of all citizens of a state in the political process on the basis of citizenship, given that all human and political rights on an individual basis are secured. The latter keeps to the principle of traditional liberal democracy for granting and respecting rights on an individual, not a collective basis, including the representatives of ethnic minorities. In the still parochial and kinship based societies of the Balkans, collective rights would further fragment the societies by encapsulating ethnic groups under the rule of authoritarian or patrimonial elites;

Effectiveness of Public Administration and Public Control

The effectiveness of public administration in the countries in South Eastern Europe raises the issue of establishing and consolidating political, economic and public institutions by means of rational structure and effective mechanisms for action as a clear-cut modernization process. The experience of these countries gained after the initiated transition from totalitarian rule to democracy shows that the administrative and technical introduction of institutions of modern liberal democracy is not enough to give meaning or

content to the process of democratization. The ineffectiveness of public administration is a result of the following key assumptions of post-totalitarian societies:

- lack of clear perception of public representation of interests;
- weakly organized public control of public administration;
- shortage of qualified people for political and corporate roles;

A necessary requirement for the successful application of institutions of modern public administration is the stimulation of efficient pressure of legitimate organized group interests from society to the institutions of public administration. This means that public administration should become an intermediary by committing to:

- strict implementation of norms and principles of modern public administration;
- providing transparency and accountability (including access for regular citizens);
- impartial attitude to enhance effectiveness and exclude corrupt practices;
- objective and public mechanisms for recruiting executives at all levels;

Potential results and expectations of the transformation of public administration in the region depend upon developing specific policies targeted at increasing its public accountability. One of the key issues in this field that needs to be addressed is the process of recruitment of candidates for public administrative positions.

Civil Security and Civil Participation

The weakness of public institutions poses serious challenges not only to the existing order but also to civic security in general. Organized crime, clan based illegal economy and traffic, large scale corruption and violation of citizens' rights is a direct consequence of both state institutions' inability to enforce law and order and of authoritarian attempts to compensate for institutional weakness with a greater (but not effective) government expansion towards society. A general improvement of the quality of civil life and guarantees of civic security should be based on the following priorities:

- stimulation of effective civil equality and guarantees of equal opportunity for civil participation in public life;
- independent and impartial legal system;
- stimulation of the emergence of a corporate environment by increased foreign investment (predominantly private) in the region that would create a new social stratum of approximately 10-15% of the population, representing the most dynamic entrepreneurial and proactive citizens in society. In this way the criminal clan economy would be marginalized, and corporate group interests would be consolidated against further expansion of the state. Foreign investment must be encouraged by the international community, primarily by EU and US institutions;

Developing Corporate Representation of Interests. It is impossible to directly implement the Western model of corporate competition of diverse organized (including ethnic) interests, exercising pressure on the state in their favor. The western corporate model has

developed in the 20 century - after 200 years of successful liberal-democratic development. The stable western institutions of citizens' equality and democratic representation can easily host the new corporate structure of representation in all major Western societies. Countries in the Balkan region share a fragile institutional system of democracy, which is yet to be filled with real substance.

This is why, initially the Balkans need selective strategies to support two types of corporate group representation, which stimulate the integrative process in society (business, NGOs, advocacy groups, etc.) and discourage the effects of corporate ethnic separatism, provided that all basic human rights of citizens and the communities are effectively guaranteed by the democratic institutions in the region.

Expectations for the Region

A collection of controversial historical, psychological, cultural and geopolitical factors has turned the Balkan region into one of the most amorphous places in Europe in terms of organized interests, potential for cooperative action, and ability to compromise and search for alternative options to promote one's national, communal or even personal interest. The mentality and culture of regional cooperation should be developed, even if the process takes decades. This makes it strategically more important to create and stimulate the development of an institutional system of regional cooperation in all major fields of the region's transformation - economy, security, conflict prevention, education and media, and civic cooperation.

The Balkans have suffered a series of unsuccessful attempts of top-down regional integration: artificial federations, serving as a disguise for 'grand national' and quasi-imperial projects. All efforts to bypass the real divisions by hiding them have failed. An adequate strategy for regional integration should be based on the real situation and should try to change it by developing alternative "bottom-up" grass roots models of cooperative activities. The basic purpose of such a strategy is to create and develop communities of people, sharing interest in growing cross-border cooperation in the fields of trade, education, culture, media, civic initiatives, technological and industrial development, and infrastructure development. Once developed, such communities would serve as powerful 'lobbyists' for the regional dimensions of political, economic and civic cooperation.

THE PROCESS OF REGIONAL ECONOMIC RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

- *Foreign Investment;*
- *CEPS - European Integration and Development;*
- *Transport, Telecommunications and Energy Infrastructure.*

Specifics of the Balkan Economic Environment

The economic problems of the Balkans resemble a combination of negative tendencies, multiplying the region's inability to autonomously cope with the priorities of its development and modernization. The region represents a reality of amorphous, isolated and poorly organized economic interests. This reality is a consequence of half a century communist rule and controversial economic strategies of post-communist transformation.

The national wealth of the Balkan countries has been criminally redistributed. The accumulated economic assets have been disintegrated, and - to a great extent – practically lost. The huge de-capitalization process has been amplified by large scale emigration of educated and skilled representatives of the professional middle class, who have lost their jobs and their further chances in a collapsing economic environment. The ethnic conflicts and inter-communal wars in former Yugoslavia have dramatically reduced the relatively high performance of the former Yugoslav economy and living standards of the people. The international community's embargo on Belgrade has greatly contributed to the isolation of the entire economic system of the region from the international markets and has additionally reduced the chances of the Balkans as an emerging market to attract investment and to intensify their participation in international commerce. The embargo had a powerful secondary effect on boosting the local mafia economics and supporting the corruption process among politicians and civil servants. The NATO campaign in Kosovo revived the effects of trade isolation, inaccessible infrastructure corridors and collapsing investment rating of the region. Last, but not least, the international financial crisis of 1997-1998 has substantially hampered the Bulgarian and Romanian privatization process, previously boosted with the election of reformist governments in the both countries in 1996 and 1997.

Goals, Strategic Objectives and Mechanisms for Economic Reconstruction of the Balkans after the Kosovo Crisis

Goals and Strategic Objectives

Development of viable market economy through:

- stimulation of private business and local production;
- intensive privatization in industry and banking;
- development of active stock markets;
- ensuring a favorable environment for foreign investment; and
- reconstruction of infrastructure network as a basis for the economic resurgence of the region.

The accomplishment of these goals will guarantee a lasting economic stabilization and development of the region and will contribute to meeting economic criteria for EU membership.

Mechanisms of the International Organizations for Economic Reconstruction of the Region

- Stimulation of foreign investment;
- E
- tablishment of special funds;
- Financing infrastructure projects
- Know how support in implementing economic reforms;

Necessity of a Differentiated Approach

The region's aspirations to be integrated into European economic structures should be accompanied by the development of *a differentiated approach* when formulating the major issues of European intervention. Each country has a specific level of economic development. An important step to successful implementation of the reconstruction and development plan is to clearly define and distinguish the priorities of each of the Balkan countries:

- The economic development of **Bulgaria and Romania** should be stimulated by:
 - large-scale private investment and special funds for crediting private businesses
 - projects for the development of an independent judicial system and effective administration
 - public and private investment in infrastructure reconstruction. The most important factor for the development of these countries is the existence of a stable environment for foreign investment and fast and effective reforms.
- **Albania and Macedonia** are in need of institutional support and considerable financial assistance from international financial institutions. It is of special importance to Macedonia that public funds be established to balance budget expenditures on refugees. It is also important to incorporate private investment in order to stimulate stable economic processes. In Albania, economic reconstruction will be possible only on the condition that autonomous stable mechanisms of the public authority and administration be adequately developed.
- The large-scale international financial support for **Bosnia** after the Dayton Accord proved to be an insufficient guarantee of economic reform and creation of an transparent functioning market economy. Urgent measures for integrating the economic activity of different communities should be undertaken in order to overcome the corruption and inefficiency of both the banking system and the bureaucratic apparatus. The international community should initiate programs for public institution building, guaranteeing real economic reform and efficient distribution of international financial aid.
- It is of particular importance that **Yugoslavia** not only urgently applies for humanitarian assistance and avoids humanitarian disaster, but also undertakes initiatives for infrastructure reconstruction. Building-up the transport, telecommunications and energy infrastructure is of special importance for Yugoslavia's economic development as well as for that of the region as a whole. The huge damages suffered by Serbia's heavy and light industries, agriculture, and infrastructure as a result of the NATO campaign demand post-war reconstruction of the region with considerable international financial support. The international involvement in **Kosovo** should focus on providing the basis for co-existence of diverse ethnic communities. It should also support the gradual rebuilding of the region's infrastructure.

Principle of Subsidiarity

The assistance of the EU and the entire international community in the economic reconstruction and development of SEE should be based on the principle of subsidiarity.

All measures of economic reconstruction and development have to be properly addressed at local and national level, or at the level of the entire region. This selective approach would guarantee:

- the autonomous ability of local SME businesses and municipal initiatives to speed up economic reforms in their regions even if the national efforts are not effective enough;
- flexible approaches which are needed in order to contain and resolve interethnic disputes and conflicts. They will be secured through local initiatives which would stimulate cross-communal markets and economic projects, involving different communities at local level within particular country or across national borders (bordering regions of two or more countries);
- clear borders between the economic regulative policies of the national governments and the economic initiatives of citizens and regions;
- effective policy decision making at national level, operating within a complexity of local, regional and international economic factors;
- successful strategy of regional – Balkan – economic cooperation, capable of restricting and compensating for the “zero sum game” traditional approach of national governments to each others’ interests;
- positive strategy of regional economic development, integrating diverse communities into an economic process of common benefit and common destiny.

Regional Economic Cooperation as a Factor for Economic Reconstruction of the Region

A Network of Regional Institutions

The establishment of a system of *specialized institutions and funds* on a regional level is of special importance for the implementation of an overall regional economic strategy. These institutions and funds would support the development of potentially profitable sectors of the Balkan economies. It would be wrong to confine the efforts only to the establishment of a Reconstruction and Development Agency, whose basic activity would be focused on reconstructing the damaged Yugoslav infrastructure. The functioning of a well-developed network of regional institutions, which intensively supports the process of economic cooperation, is necessary for the implementation of real and effective regional economic integration. Cooperation among different types of institutions – international agencies for development of different economic sectors, funds for private business crediting in the region, branch industrial and trade associations, consulting agencies, strategic planning organizations – would be beneficial to regional integration. The functioning of a network of such institutions would provide formulation and consistent assertion of common regional economic interests. Such a network would stimulate the dissemination of regional models of economic development, which would clarify the Balkan economic environment’s specific needs and peculiarities.

In this case it would be appropriate to use the experience accumulated by some countries in the region (i.e. Bulgaria and Romania) in adapting European economic development models in conditions of poor modernization and economic backwardness.

These countries would contribute significantly to the voicing and implementation of

common regional interests. Bulgaria would help in the restriction of criminality, establishment of democratic and market economy institutions, and in the integration of ethnic communities.

The Bosnia Experience

Coordination of the efforts of all donors. The efficient coordination of the efforts of all donors is a significant element of the reconstruction and development strategies for Southeastern Europe. The negative experience from Bosnia and Herzegovina reveals two shortcomings of reconstruction programs:

1. insufficient coordination of donors, which resulted in duplication of their efforts in place of creating diverse funds
2. “pouring out” of huge investment solely into infrastructure, which does not produce a direct positive economic result.

Regional Cooperation in Coordinating International Initiatives and Programs. There is a definite necessity for initiating a regional development system. It would be strongly supported by which would coordinate initiatives and programs. International financial institutions would provide the necessary credits, whereas private businesses would find viable investment opportunities. It would be appropriate to consign a certain quota of the offers for reconstruction of post-war Yugoslavia to support the fragile positions of private business in the Balkans. In this regard, there is a potential for cooperation among companies from the region, as well as between Western and local companies as subcontractors or material suppliers.

Inclusion of Yugoslavia in the Process of Economic Reconstruction of the Region

In the process of reconstruction of Southeastern Europe, the countries in the region should not become “hostages” of the isolationist stand of Yugoslavia. Any delay in the reconstruction of the region because of the Milosevic’s regime would have a fatal impact on the economies of the Balkan countries. An overall process of economic reconstruction and development of the region cannot be accomplished without the participation of Yugoslavia. This country has a key geographical location within the infrastructure network in the region and for the regional cooperation development.

Infrastructure Development

The further construction and connection of a united regional network of the existing transport, energy and telecommunications infrastructure is a necessary basis for the economic reconstruction and development of the Balkan countries. Annex 1 to the Declaration of the “Europe South-East” forum on the Stability Pact (Ljubljana, 18-20 July 1999) defines the basic principles of infrastructure development of Southeastern Europe as follows:

- Developing complementary (and not alternative) national infrastructure strategies of the SEE countries as part of an integrated infrastructure for the region;

- Implementing the principle of alternative transport opportunities for each one of the SEE countries in its routes to Central and Western Europe;
- Balanced development of the South-North and East-West axes of the SEE transportation system;
- Diversification of energy resources supplies to the SEE countries (oil and gas);
- Priority linkage of the SEE countries' electricity system to the European electricity network (UCPTE);
- De-monopolization and competitive development of the SEE countries' telecommunications systems;
- Development of a flexible system of project investment into the SEE infrastructure involving EU public funds, private investment, concession options, BOT or BOO methods.

Transport Network

Implementation of transport projects demands considerable funds, which could be paid back over a long period of time. In this case, different models could be introduced using joint financing combining sources from European funds, European financial institutions, and state budgets of SEE countries. The most attractive transport projects could draw the attention of private investors.

The following projects are of urgent necessity:

- Constructing two new bridges over the Danube: one between Vidin-Kalafat (Bulgaria-Romania) as part of Corridor # 4 (Dresden-Prague-Vienna-Arad (Bucharest-Constanta) - Sofia - Thessalonica; and the second one between Becket-Oriahovo, or Rastu-Lom or Turnu Magurele-Svistov (Romania-Bulgaria);
- Constructing 56 km of railroad between the Macedonian town of Kumanovo and the Bulgarian border (Corridor #8 - also known as "East-West" through Bulgaria, Macedonia and Albania) as part of Macedonia's access to Corridor # 4. This would connect Macedonia to Central and Western Europe and give it access to the Black Sea ports.
- Reconstruction of the main Kosovo highways connecting Mitrovica-Pristina-Skopje; Pristina-Nis; Mitrovica-Podgorica; Pristina-Prizren-Durres;
- Reconstruction of the Yugoslav bridges over the Danube and the destroyed sectors of Corridor #10 (the so-called Trans-European Motorway) in FR Yugoslavia.

Energy

In the area of *energy*, necessary funds can be provided more easily. The transportation of energy resources between countries and regions is a profitable activity. A Western private model of financing by Western private investors can be applied here. The most important regional projects are: projects for transporting oil and gas from Russia and the Caspian region, for reconstruction and construction of linkages between the countries of Southeastern Europe for transmitting electrical energy, and for construction and reconstruction of electric power-stations.

Telecommunications

In the area of telecommunications the most effective formula for financing would also be by attracting private capital. Along with further construction of major international telecommunications projects, the reconstruction of the telecommunication structure in Yugoslavia is gaining momentum.

The CEPS Process - European Integration and Economic Development

The CEPS process is the first clear example of an EU strategic plan to assist the economic development of the Balkan region and to strengthen the opportunities to further accession of the SEE countries to the European Union. The CEPC proposals for a regional customs union, Euroization of the financial systems of the Balkan countries and lifting of the EU tariffs for SEE industrial goods represent a coherent initial basis for the Stability Pact economic activities. The proposed economic assistance of 5 billion Euros per year could substantially contribute to the economic recovery and infrastructure development in the region. The involvement of the policy studies' institutions from the SEE countries into the CEPS process and the support to the process from major Western donor institutions represents an extremely positive experience of cooperation between the EU and the international institutions and the independent policy communities in SEE.

There are some substantive issues of national interest, which must be addressed by the EU and the countries in the region in the CEPS plan context:

- Does the repudiation of these sovereign rights and mechanisms of independent economic policy provide Balkan countries with an opportunity for representation in the EU institutions, making decisions for their development?
- To what extent is the discrepancy between the processes of economic and political integration to EU admissible?
- What is the risk of economic integration when EU requirements have not been fulfilled?
- Why is the zero-tariff regime for agricultural goods completely disbalanced in favor of the EU and at the expense of the SEE countries. This issue is particularly acute provided the restricted opportunities of the SEE industrial goods to compete at the EU market;

A NEW SECURITY SYSTEM FOR THE BALKANS: POLITICAL-MILITARY DIMENSIONS

- *The Balkans In NATO's New Strategy;*
- *Building a Security System In The Region;*
- *Political-Military Cooperation In The Region.*

The Kosovo crisis and its aftermath have brought about significant changes to the security environment in the Balkans. As a result of the crisis many latent tendencies and long existing issues that prevent achieving peace and stability in the region came to the surface and call for the development of a new security system. The process of defining a new

security system for the Balkans is subject to several internal and external factors.

Institutional Development and Security Issues of the Region

Following the developments of the past decade, Balkan countries formed five groups of states in accordance to the level of state institutional development and relationship to NATO:

Turkey and Greece. Both countries are members of the Alliance. They have sustainable institutional infrastructures and their influence on the security environment in the region is significant.

Bulgaria and Romania. Bulgaria and Romania are among the most well-identified candidates for NATO membership. Their institutional infrastructure fails to reach the level of the first group, but it is in much better shape than the rest of the countries.

Macedonia and Albania. Both countries desire NATO membership but are currently subject to intensive assistance on behalf of the Alliance in order to guarantee the minimal basis of their security requirements. NATO's role is critical in both countries: Macedonia does not have the resources to meet internal or external threats to its national security, and Albania needs to build its institutional infrastructure and consolidate its state power. Macedonia and Albania are under the protection of the international community more than any other state in the region.

Kosovo. Kosovo's territory has been divided into five sectors which are under the authority of NATO member states and Russia. The protectorate seems to be the temporary solution to the issue of the province's future. By implementing different forms of coexistence and cooperation between hostile ethnic groups, the international community is testing the ground in order to decide Kosovo's future status -- in or out of Yugoslavia.

NATO and the Balkans after the Kosovo Crisis

The outcome of the crisis was said to have a major impact on NATO's reputation. Since the period of the Cold War the Alliance has been searching for a new identity by adapting to the changing geopolitical situation. NATO's intention of transforming itself from an alliance for collective security into an international security system was successfully tested in Kosovo. Meeting the challenge of the Kosovo was of critical importance to the Alliance, whose 50th anniversary was during the crisis.

The Kosovo crisis tested not only the countries in the region aspiring to NATO membership -- their readiness to support the policies and military operations of the Alliance, but also the support of certain member countries. NATO's involvement in the Balkans may be determined by the fact that after the accession of Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic into the Alliance, NATO's borders are much closer to the region and any instability could easily spread into the Euro-Atlantic area.

All of this will undoubtedly influence the degree of NATO activity in the post-crisis management and reconstruction of the region. NATO's commitment to the future development and reconstruction of the Balkans could be an efficient tool to prevent present and future conflict in the region along with its potential to damage European stability as a whole.

Building a Security System in the Region

Regional Security Factors

External

The Role Of The US. During the Kosovo crisis the US demonstrated its potential to set policy and influence the course of events in the region in its favor. US diplomacy once again proved to be the main generator of initiatives in the military-political field, putting the US in a position of determining and steering cooperative security among Balkan states. For that same reason the United States has the ability to stimulate military-political initiatives in the region. US strategic interest in developing such initiatives comes from the need to build a strategic sphere of security and stability around the eastern flank of NATO which may tap into a potential spread of external instability in the Euro-Atlantic area.

The Role Of Russia. As a result of the Kosovo conflict NATO's relations with Russia became quite tense. The bombing of Serbia led Russia to freeze all cooperative activities with the Alliance. This development in NATO-Russian relations determined the 'negative' behavior of Bulgaria and Romania in regard to Russia.

After the Kosovo crisis Russia, which had been Serbia's traditional supporter, denounced the concept of the allied command in Kosovo and requested its own sector. By taking such a position Russia once again confirmed its strategic interests in the Balkans and posed the question of how much potential it has for retaining its sphere of influence.

Undoubtedly Russia will be one of the main factors in the post crisis situation in the Balkans. It will be up to the diplomatic efforts of the countries in the region to have the role of Russia contribute to their peace and security rather than be an obstacle to the European integration of the region.

The European Defense Identity. The Kosovo crisis also acted as a catalyst for the European allies to reexamine and redefine their own identity in terms of security and defense issues. The US statement that Europe should undertake the reconstruction of the region because Washington contributed two thirds of the military operation in Kosovo has put the European allies in a new position. Building the institutional infrastructure and administration of the conflict area gives the European allies a unique opportunity to be a major factor of influence. This, combined with the recognition of the right to autonomous action on behalf of the EU in solving issues which are now a direct security concern to the Alliance as a whole, will make Europe a guarantor of the stability in the region.

The Role of OSCE. The Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe as a pan European organization has the potential to contribute to the peaceful reconstruction of the region. However, it is still not clear, in terms of responsibilities and commitments, what OSCE's role and participation in the development and reconstruction of the Balkans will be.

Internal

The KLA. The current structure and policies of the Kosovo Liberation Army are a serious challenge to peace and security in the region. In reality the KLA is a military political organization which has the potential of maintaining ethnic conflicts, and for that reason it is a threat to the development of civil society and the peaceful reconstruction of the region. In this regard the disintegration of the KLA and establishment of civil political parties in the province should be one of the first steps in the reconstruction of the region.

Regional Relations. The regional relations between Balkan states in the context of the Kosovo crisis are an important factor for security throughout the region. Mutual efforts in this respect have resulted in a series of successful initiatives, one of them being the South Eastern European Defense Ministerial.

Principles of Building a Security System in South Eastern Europe

NATO and the Framework of International Relations in the Region

The requirements for obtaining NATO membership set the framework of international relations in the region to a great extent. Among the basic criteria are: keeping good relations with neighbor countries, deterring the use of force, reforming the armed forces, and building operative compatibility. This said, military political cooperation of the Balkan countries will play a crucial role in fulfilling the requirements and expediting their integration into NATO. In the past few years the countries in the region have been attempting to strengthen their bilateral and multilateral relations in order to adopt an integrated approach to regional security.

Regional Application of the Subsidiarity Principle

The international community's efforts to sustain peace and security in the region should concentrate more on the specific application of the subsidiary principle, i.e., all local security issues should be solved at every possible level. The countries which have the resources and are able to face their own security challenges should act by themselves, without the direct involvement of NATO or the EU. The involvement of the international community in solving security problems and establishing a security agenda of the region should take place only in countries which are not able to provide their own security. In Kosovo, the international community is involved in guaranteeing the security and existence of almost every single individual. In other countries like Bulgaria, despite the irregularities of domestic life, security of the individual and maintaining of public order are within the authority of the sovereign state power. In Macedonia, the involvement of the international community in security affairs is greater, but should not enlarge its scope to soft security issues, which the Macedonian government is capable to meet effectively. The level of development of the institutional infrastructure of each country in the region determines the level of involvement of the international community in domestic affairs. Hence, it is important for the peace and security in the region that countries like Albania and Macedonia receive significant institutional support from NATO and the EU while the other group of countries - Bulgaria and Romania - should be given a clearer time estimate of eventual NATO membership.

Reform of the Armed Forces

The reform of the armed forces, especially in Romania and Bulgaria, is important to the future of the new strategic environment of the region. The reform in both countries is focused on downsizing the total standing and enhancing the defense capability of the armed forces.

Transformation from Consumption to Generation of Security

The national security doctrines of some of the countries in the region introduce the idea of transforming the countries from consumers of security into generators of security. The main prerequisites for achieving this goal are active foreign policy and building good relations with neighboring countries. The need of such policy arises from the conclusion

that the successful integration of the countries in EU and NATO depends on the development of the peace process in South Eastern Europe; military conflicts and regional instability being mere obstacles. Generating security also means that the countries in the Balkans will no longer be able to keep formal neutrality or adopt a passive position in regard to solving regional problems.

Regional - National Security

Almost all countries in the Balkans are starting to realize that regional security is the major guarantee for the national security of each individual state. This understanding stimulates mutual initiatives for increasing trust, participation and commitment to solving problems of common concern. Political elites in different Balkan countries see this to be an opportunity for preserving peace and stability in their own countries.

Military-Strategic Environment and Cooperation in the Region

The military-strategic environment of the region consists of local conflicts and crises, disintegration of political establishments, serious migration and refugee flow, arms trafficking, and degradation of the environment. Facing these challenges is possible only through regional cooperation in the common security area.

New National Defense Concepts

Many countries in the region are in a process of building new concepts of national defense. All military doctrines state as one of their major goals of the armed forces the creation of "a favorable environment for national security". In other words, each country's reform of its armed forces is a major factor for integration into NATO and the EU.

Regional Activity and NATO

A recent tendency of regional activities in Balkan countries is to initiate new and different forms of mutual cooperation and cooperation with NATO. Some of these include active participation in peacekeeping and humanitarian operations, providing logistic support to NATO and the continuing commitment to Partnership for Peace.

Collectivism and Individuality as Integration Principles

The countries from the region looking towards NATO membership must combine both principles. On one hand, they should act together in order to attract the interest of the Allies and better their chances for obtaining membership in NATO. On the other hand, each country is interested in building its own identity as an applicant for NATO membership. The Membership Action Plan adopted at the Washington Summit stipulates that each country should develop an individual plan for achieving membership but at the same time each applicant country should remain committed to mutual initiatives like Partnership for Peace.

Regional Military-Political Relations and Cooperation

The South Eastern European Defense Ministerial

One of the most explicit forms of multilateral cooperation has been the meeting of the ministers and deputy ministers of defense of the countries in South Eastern Europe (SEDM). At SEDM decision makers from the region lay the groundwork for real-time policy making.

The main accomplishments of SEDM are: involving Macedonia, announcing mutual interests in harmonizing national military policies, having the US commit to the future of the forum, inviting Slovenia as an observer, and bringing together NATO member

countries and applicants.

SEDM failed to incorporate Russia and Yugoslavia, which is considered to be a major obstacle for the future of this form of multilateral cooperation in South eastern Europe.

Multinational Peace Force in SEE (MPFSEE)

MPFSEE has introduced a new form of regional cooperation by establishing a common military force for protecting security interests of countries in the region. All countries are equal and voluntary participants in MPFSEE. The Force has brought about a new approach to security in the Euro-Atlantic area and beyond - providing regional sources of security is an important step in the concept of security.

MPFSEE is to be used in operations led by NATO or WEU in the region or elsewhere in Europe

The success of this initiative will reduce outside intervention for preserving regional peace and stability and transform Balkan countries from objects into subjects of their own security.

MPFSEE is one of the first attempts to apply NATO's Combined Joint Task Force concept.

Southeastern Europe Construction Brigade (SECONBRIG)

The idea for establishing the Southeastern Europe Construction Brigade was adopted at the second South Eastern European Deputy Defense Ministerial in 1999. The purpose of SECONBRIG is to support the postwar reconstruction and development of the region.

Expectations for Security System for SEE

After the culmination of the Kosovo crisis and the international intervention for preserving peace and stability in South Eastern Europe, the international community as well as the countries from the region will have to consider new concepts and strategies for building a new military strategic environment in the region. This requires a relatively new approach for finding an effective security system.

The main principles of the organization of such a system, already mentioned, are based on enhancing regional military cooperation by developing bilateral and multilateral relations; supporting the transformation of countries in the region from consumers of security to generators of security by developing appropriate military and institutional resources for facing military and non-military threats to national and regional security.

The new military strategic environment in SEE requires a redefinition and specific application of existing security concepts:

- collective security, enforced by NATO member countries, is not a reliable option for the countries in the region, which should first develop their own security resources;
- regional security is seen by local governments as a factor of major importance to national security. At the same time regional security in SEE was recognized by NATO as one of the most important external factors for the security in the Euro-Atlantic area;
- the concept of cooperative security projected by NATO comes as a result of enhancing regional security by turning it into a strategic framework of economic,

political and defense cooperation. National security objectives can be directed towards shared goals of maintaining stability and security in the common area. Countries can develop mutual protection against external threats while supporting stability and development in the common area.

The effectiveness of the new security system for SEE will be based on several pillars:

- further development of military-political cooperation, establishing a network of crisis management and conflict prevention mechanisms and institutions;
- coordination and exchange of information on defense plans and field military activities between the countries from the region;
- development of mutual training of military personnel and officer exchange programs and enhancement of bilateral and multilateral military initiatives.

The successful development of military-political relations between SEE states towards initiating a common security system is also subject to the perceptions and readiness of officers and troops from different countries to work in cooperation with their colleagues towards a common goal - peace and security in the region.

Contributors

Angel Angelov - A New Security System for the Balkans: Political-Military Dimensions

Dessislava Tzekova – Strategies for Democratization and Institutional Development,

Georgi Tsekov – Strategies for Democratization and Institutional Development; A New Security System for the Balkans: Political-Military Dimensions

Marin Lessenski – Strategies for Democratization and Institutional Development

Ognyan Minchev - A New Security System for the Balkans: Political-Military Dimensions; The Process of Economic Reconstruction and Development, Strategies for Democratization and Institutional Development

Vanya Kashukeeva-Nusheva – The Process of Economic Reconstruction and Development

Vassilka Mireva – Strategies for Democratization and Institutional Development, The Process of Economic Reconstruction and Development

Paper, resented at the Annual Convention of the North American International Studies Association

Los Angeles, March 14 – 18, 2000

THE KOSOVO CRISIS AND THE INTERNATIONAL SYSTEM: ISSUES

OF LEGITIMACY AND ACTORS' MOTIVATION

Ognyan Minchev

University of Sofia – Institute for Regional and International Studies

I. The Kosovo crisis – problems of legitimacy.

The crisis in Kosovo opened the door to a completely new type of international involvement and management of local inter-communal clashes. It's already been more than 120 years since the international community (in the format of the "European Concert of Powers") has intervened for the first time into a local crisis, using the arguments of humanity and human rights defense. This happened in 1876 when the Ottoman Empire defeated a rebellion of the Bulgarian population, claiming independence from the Porte. The huge atrocities of the Ottoman troops against the civilian population have actually led to mass scale public opinion condemnation in Europe and in the US and brought the 'Great Powers' on the conference table in Constantinople in resolving the 'Eastern Question'.

Mass-scale violations of human rights have been in the focus of the international public opinion and the community of democratic states throughout the 20C. That stimulated the sophistication of international law in many aspects – limiting the means of legitimate warfare, establishing clear status for refugees, military prisoners of war, civilians in war stricken regions, etc. The League of Nations, established in 1919 as an instrument to preserve the new *status quo* in post war Europe and to contain revisionist attempts on behalf of the defeated nations, has been the first precedent of an international organization (even if very fragile and ineffective one), aimed at mediating among the nations' interests from the position of defined principles, including the principles of human rights observation.

The Holocaust and other immense atrocities of the Nazi machine throughout World War II brought to the international scene the UNO as the first precedent of an international institution, capable of enforcing decisions made. At the same time it was effectively restricted in its instruments to do that in most of the individual cases when the UNO has opposed inhumane practices around the world. The logic of the Cold War has substantively reduced the ability of the UNO to prosecute major cases of human rights violations, even if those cases have been treated by the Assembly resolutions or even by the Security Council decisions.

In all cases of international treatment of human rights' abuse throughout the 20 century one basic principle of the international system has dominated both the logic of international decision making and the practical interventions into conflict stricken areas. This is the principle of national sovereignty and the legitimacy of the sovereign national decision making over the particular process – subject of international concern. If we, for

example, take a look at the so called 'third basket' of the Helsinki Act of 1975, what we'll see formulated is the principle right to monitor human rights status in a nation state. The latter, though, goes together with the obligation of the state not to impede, but to support such an independent monitoring.

The crises of disintegrating Yugoslavia – among other comparable events in the post Cold War world - have caused gradually developing precedents both of undermining the sovereignty of decision making at nation state level (through relativating the very concept of state sovereignty), and of international interference with strong obligatory enforcement. In the case of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the nation state as a sole legitimate agent in the international relations has been to a large extent replaced by the autonomous participation in the international crisis management of the conflicting parties' leaders – the Muslim Bosniaks, the Serbs and the Herzeg Bosnia Croats. The internationally recognized sovereign – the state of Bosnia and Herzegovina – had no practical legitimacy to play a role, larger than the Muslim party representation. The confusion of this semi-legitimate international status of the three conflicting communities has become explicitly obvious at Dayton, where the legitimacy problems have been resolved through involving the presidents of two neighboring states – Serbia and Croatia as parties to the agreement for peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The Bosnian crisis has shown the largest ever involvement of international organizations into a conflict management process. The EU, the OSCE, the UNO, NATO – to enlist only the major ones – have been direct participants in managing the conflict, even if their efforts have been ineffective for years. Only the combination of UNO Security Council resolutions and the willingness of NATO to execute them have finally produced the fragile resolution of the crisis at Dayton. The UNO – NATO partnership combined the legitimacy of the international organization with the executive ability of the military-political union, for the first time acting out of the zone of its principle responsibilities.

The Kosovo crisis represented a difficult case of legitimizing an international involvement from its very beginning. First, the crisis took place in the undisputed sovereign territory of the FR Yugoslavia. Unlike Bosnia, where the majority of the population (Serbs and Croats) has disputed the very statehood, Kosovo represents integrative territory of the Republic of Serbia – the bigger partner in the rump-Yugoslav federation. The Albanians – whose position within the territory and the state constitution has been the focus of dispute – represented a significant minority within the state of Serbia. Changing, or improving their status could be a result of sovereign Serb – Yugoslav decision making process. The legitimate body of international intervention – the UNO – could act as a strong mediator, enforcing international peace-keeping mission in the disputed region, but the UNO could have no authority either to control larger territory of the FRY, or to change the status of Kosovo itself. This is the framework, in which all international actors, mediating in the crisis operated until the end of 1998. The first significant point of departure has been Rambouillet.

The draft agreement, proposed to the Serb delegation at Rambouillet contained many

unacceptable elements for the Milosevic regime in Belgrade. Giving up controls over the disputed Kosovo region under a peaceful agreement would present Milosevic as a traitor in the eyes of the nationalist Serb public opinion. The strong man in Belgrade had already once felt the strength of his angry fellow compatriots after having signed the Dayton agreement against the will of the Bosnian Serbs. This time the reaction could be even stronger. That was enough argument to refuse signature at Rambouillet. But the draft agreement, prepared by the leaders of the West for Rambouillet contained one more significant obstacle to an easy surrender on behalf of Belgrade. According to the draft clauses and amendments, the peace keeping units of the NATO (not of the UN) in Kosovo would have free access to the entire territory of the FRY without being subject to the internal Yugoslav law. Obeying to such a clause would mean principle surrender of the FRY sovereignty on behalf of Milosevic regime. Such a precondition appears for the first time in an international effort to monitor and mediate in a crisis region in order to serve the observation of human rights there.

The propagandist legitimization of the NATO campaign against official Belgrade was built around the global character of the human rights principles and the responsibilities of the 'international community' to defend those rights in a global world. The growing integrity of uniting Europe was used as a powerful additional argument. But the split between the positions of the major Western leaders, united around the NATO, and the UNO, where Russia and China hold veto powers at the Security Council, has reduced the legitimacy of the 'international community' further action to the arguments of the major Western powers. The military campaign against Belgrade was carried out as a result of the united will of those Western powers. Only after Milosevic gave up to the military pressure and opened the door to the international peace keepers of KFOR, agreement involving the UNO as a formal agency of control over the international force had been made possible. These developments have outlined a new framework of international action legitimization in the field of conflict management.

First, the national sovereignty is no longer an obstacle to international action, when major violations of human rights are considered to have occurred. That will have major implications upon the entire international system. Viewing international relations in substance, smaller countries in numerous regions of the world have often been considered sovereign only *de jure*. Poverty and economic crises, strong neighbors and traditional imperial masters have often reduced national sovereignty to a nominal existence. The entire Soviet block throughout the Cold War has been constituted of sovereign on paper satellites. Kosovo, though, represents a precedent in which human rights concerns have been considered as a senior and more valuable principle of the international system, than the principle of sovereignty. This has immediately raised the question about the legitimate authority, capable to judge where is the point, in which sovereignty gives up its primacy to the human rights concerns. If sovereignty becomes relative, what will be the institutional basis of the international system from now on?

Second, there is no valid international authority to make decisions and act on behalf of the community of nations in cases of violent crises or major conflicts. The UNO and its

Security Council do not, obviously, reflect the new power structures of the post Cold War world. In the case of Kosovo, the leaders of the West decided to bypass the UNO and act against Belgrade, legitimizing NATO as the new instrument of executing the decisions of the 'international community', thus de-legitimizing the 'great power' status of Russia and China. The NATO summit in Washington D.C., celebrating the 50th anniversary of the Alliance, adopted in effect a new framework of the NATO strategy and territorial range of operation, involving Central and Eastern Europe as parts of the Alliance's legitimate territory of action. Of course, this new strategic framework has been based on the evident will of most Central and Eastern European countries to join NATO and to be part of the Euro Atlantic security system. NATO's obligation to act in favor of human rights defense has additionally been legitimized by the fact that only nations with democratic political systems may constitute the Alliance's membership. But this set of arguments does not resolve the major issue, stemming from the substitution of the UNO – the world international organization – with a military-political alliance with regional scope of its mission. In the case of NATO Kosovo action democratic nations defend a minority, subjected to violent atrocities by an authoritarian regime. What if a regional organization, defending religious or cultural identity with fundamentalist principles interferes into a sovereign nation from the same region, legitimizing its action with the argument that this non-compliant nation does not observe 'the values and the principles of ...' Europe and the Western world could not successfully defend the precedent of a regional scope organization's military action against a sovereign country with the argument that 'our values are humane, and more than that – universal'. In a culturally diverse world international law will be less capable than ever to tell the difference between Western laic values, Christian values, or Islamic and Hindu values, concerning human rights or any other field of value systems definition.

Third, loosing the authority of the single international organization, which builds up a process of consensus on international conflict management action, and reducing the status of national state sovereignty in the international system impairs the legal definitions of the necessary threshold to international intervention. The world becomes much more relative in terms of responsibilities and rights. We live in a multicultural world. We have always lived in a multicultural world. What makes the difference today is that we assess positively the fact of multicultural living. This positive assessment, though, does not make it easier to define the rules of multicultural living. The nation state sovereignty has always been based on the principle of self-determination. A community becomes a sovereign only after proving it is a nation. (Long term struggles and dear victims usually pave the road to national emancipation in an entire epoch of human history – the epoch of the modern world.) A democratic nation has the obligation to observe the rights of all its citizens, including those belonging to minority communities, without being obliged to recognize those minorities' right to self-determination. Turning this principle into a relative one, opens the door to an endless process of communal claims for self-determination, with no possible end up. The endless self-determination process promises an endless chain of inter-communal conflicts and endless interventions of the 'international communities', aimed at human rights defense and at restoring peaceful coexistence. An endless chain of international protectorates, devouring humanitarian aid and preventing hostile clans to sit

at each other's throats may well replace the imperfect, but stable world of sovereign states.

Let's take a look at Bosnia and Kosovo. Enormous amounts of international funds maintain weak protectorate administrations, presiding upon intense corruption and organized crime, tense inter-communal relations and continuous efforts to ethnic cleansing, performed by the currently stronger communities. The structural weakness of the 'international community' to deal with escalating communal claims has been perfectly well demonstrated in the process of ex-Yugoslavia's disintegration. The first step has been to recognize the constituent republics. The next challenge immediately followed – Bosnia, an entity, which had no autonomous chance to survive the internal clash. A second step – semi-recognition of the constituent Bosnian parties, clashing with each other. Step three – uneasy peace, sponsored by the 'international community', and involving as "mediators" the war lords themselves – Milosevic, Tudman and Izetbegovic have been the signatories in the peace, following their own war... Fourth step – Kosovo. The 'international mediator' Milosevic becomes indicted war criminal... Step five ...?

If we come back to the Kosovo case, the challenges of legitimizing an international action do not stop with the successful end of the NATO campaign against Belgrade. The comparison between means and ends and – in particular – between aims and results brings us to an environment of multiplying crises, stemming out of unresolved old dilemmas.

First, the Kosovo action of NATO against Belgrade did not stop mass scale human rights abuse, even if it had successfully prevented a huge massacre of Kosovar Albanians, planned by the Milosevic regime. In the past nine months, systematic abuse of human rights of the now victorious Albanians over the minority Serbs has been taking place under the helpless observation of KFOR units, designed to perform military actions, but helpless in performing policing functions. The ethnic intolerance of Albanians in Kosovo affects not only the Serbs, yet all other ethnic communities – Roma, Turks, Slav Muslims etc.

Second, the protectorate status of Kosovo resembles a contradictory structure. Kosovo is a legal part of Serbia, and Kosovo is practically separated territory with its own currency, border controls, customs, dependent on foreign donors and organized crime economy, aiming at full independence. Thus Kosovo represents an important test case of the unavoidable change of borders as a primary consequence of war. Europe resolved its ethnic clashes after the World War II on the basis of two interconnected principles: inviolability of borders and respect to minority rights. One could say – if Milosevic failed to observe minority rights in Kosovo, he would now face separation. Without going into too much detail – the separation of Kosovo could not remain a single case in the international system in the Balkan region and in Europe. If a minority succeeded once to receive its independence as a gift from the international community, many other minorities are very likely to follow this tempting lead. If Kosovar Albanians could become independent, what obstacle – in terms of reason or international law – could prevent the independence of the Bosnian Serbs and Croats? A potential independence of Kosovo would immediately affect the stability of neighboring Macedonia, opening in this way the entire Pandora's box of old

Balkan ethnic and nationalist strife.

Separatism and international protectorate buffer zones against separatism are hiding one more evidence of long-term legitimacy shortage: the new structure of Kosovo - administrative and economic - does not promise easy recovery. The region is overwhelmed by the organized crime economy and politics, which function on the basis of adverse clan competition. No effective law and order could be installed in this entirely criminal zone, where nobody feels secure for his/her life or property. If the community and its international sponsors could not establish the basics of decent institutions in Kosovo, what could we count at for the future? The restoration of Serb control is impossible and unjust. The capacity for decent self-rule is almost non-existent. How many years of international protectorate administration and how many billions of dollars could rebuild a legitimate order in Kosovo, thus preventing a crisis spill over into the Balkans? How many places like Kosovo do we have on the Balkans...? In Europe...? In the World...? How many cases like Kosovo do we face today...? And tomorrow...? The day after tomorrow...?

Thomas Hobbs argued that no Leviathan (or reasonable order) is possible in the field of international relations. The process of international system's development in the next centuries tried to prove this Hobbs' thesis wrong. The consent of sovereign nations upon particular principles, norms and values, has made it possible to distinguish (within a reasonable risk of relativism) between legitimate and illegitimate behavior at the international scene. How could we establish a legitimate new international system, if the universal rule of normative consent among sovereign nations is being replaced by the flexible qualitative considerations upon the human rights records of different states and regimes, selectively applied after the *real politik* interest of a current 'international community'? (Flexibility is evident in comparing the Kosovo and Chechnya cases, where dealing with a 'Great Power' as Russia makes the only difference to dealing with the little nasty regime in Belgrade.) Human rights represent a value system. We either have to convince the entire world in a quantifiable normative version of our human rights observation standards, or we have to face an international system, built on relative bases.

Legitimacy is a process of consensual empowerment, which makes it particularly difficult to develop international authority, enjoying legitimate influence upon a growing diversity of cultures (that is – diversity of values), intensely communicating in the global world. The motivation of the different actors, involved in the Kosovo crisis represents an illustration of this problem.

II. The Kosovo crisis – the motivation of the actors.

The actors in the Kosovo crisis seem to interact dynamically with each other, but this is only at the level of physical contact. At the level of value motivation to act, the participants often represent parallel universes with no relationship among them. Who are they, the actors?

The Albanian community of Kosovo represents the passionate, emotional nationalism

of a young nation, what Albanians really are. Like all young nationalists, Albanians try to enter the modern world of nation statehood, motivated by pre-modern, primordial perceptions of the world. Albanians fight for land, and rely upon clan solidarity. Their blood tells them the truth about who is a friend or foe. They do not admit alien blood into their community. They live together in a collectivist extended family structure, where membership is subject to a sole criterion – proven origin. This is why Albanians do not live with ‘the others’. The aliens – that is the non-Albanians – have their own, non-intersecting territorial and spiritual realms. This is to explain the ethnic cleansing not only of the Serb foes, but also of all non-Albanians from the territory of Kosovo, once after the Albanian community took over control with the KFOR presence.

Serb nationalism shares most of the above mentioned features of the Albanian community, even if it is much older and on the defensive side. As former masters of the Yugoslav quasi-empire, Serbs have developed the art of assimilating other ethnic groups with violence or cultural sophistication. The myth of the Serb identity, though, is as primordial and organic as the Albanian claim for ethnic communal purity. The legendary prince Lazar, who preferred Heavenly immortal victory for the Serbs to the victory in the real battle against the Ottomans at *Kosovo pole* represents the transcendent legitimacy of the Serb claim of control over Kosovo. The Kosovo defeat in 1399 sanctified the Serbs into a heavenly nation and no authority on Earth could reclaim this holy background of Serb national identity.

The Serb – Albanian dispute on Kosovo has the architecture of a medieval spiritual drama, where no compromise between the alternative parties seems possible. The global world with its new images and rules intervened in this drama in a really dramatic fashion. **The leaders of the West** represent a new international elite, whose perception of warfare has largely been shaped after the CNN imaging of the Desert Storm operation in the Gulf. ‘Human rights war’ has become possible, because it is a bloodless war. The ‘good guys’ are high in the sky and the ‘bad guys’ suffer 45 000 feet below, where only the computer smoke of Star Wars-like explosions makes us guess how severe the punishment is. Those, who got punished for no guilt are isolated into the peripheral category of ‘co-lateral damage’, representing the unavoidable risk of life. This picture substantially reduces the psychological threshold to accept the war as a normal event or fact of life.

In this context of ‘post-modern’ warfare Kosovo represented a low risk opportunity for the US President **Bill Clinton** to reclaim moral authority on the international scene, after having lost a substantial portion of it back home. Of course, we could not question President Clinton’s administration devotion to the human rights cause, which has been very actively manifested by the State Secretary **Madeline Albright**. Raised in a Czech family during the World War II, Ms. Albright’s passionate participation into the Kosovo campaign brought back to the political columns the forgotten notion of the ‘Munich Syndrome’. In 1938 the democratic leaders of France and Britain gave up the road to the still vulnerable Nazi dictator Hitler, permitting him to occupy Czechoslovakia and –later on – the entire Europe. The lesson of history, which Ms. Albright has learned on the

example of her own life, is – ‘beat the dictator while he’s small’.

European political landscape has been – and still is – dominated by leaders of explicit left-wing legacy at the time of the Kosovo crisis. Most of those European politicians have started their conscious political life as pacifist demonstrators or anti-NATO campaigners in the Cold War era, when the successful performance of NATO has been crucial to the survival of the Western world. What has persuaded all those people, raised in the wave of 1968 culture, to support the NATO campaign against a brutal, but small Balkan dictator? How could Tony Blair and Xavier Solana present themselves as bigger ‘hawks’, compared to Jesse Helms or Henry Kissinger? We could offer many answers to those questions, but one of them is for sure true. The new generation **left leaders of Europe** are in search for their place in the history of unification and integration of the Old Continent. Schuman and Monet developed the idea of European unity. De Gaulle and Adenauer gave birth to the European integration as an expanding process. Mitterand and Kohl mastered the Maastricht treaty, transforming the economic community into political, economic and social European Union. Now what is left for Blair, Schroder, Prodi and Solana is to achieve the EU enlargement and extend the values and principles of democratic, united Europe throughout the territory of the continent – even over the dark Balkans, which European legacy might be argued...

This picture would be incomplete, if missing the attitudes of **Russia** and **China**. Suffering from its heavy post-imperial syndrome, Russia expressed authentic ‘geopolitical anger’ at the NATO attack on the ‘Serb brothers’. Pushed back in its borders before Peter the Great, Russia was furious to see the Balkans – the last ‘legitimate sphere of Russian interest’, and Serbia – the faithful Russian *gendarme* – attacked by the ‘wily West’. A defeat for Serbia should certainly mean cutting Russia off the Adriatic and dramatically reducing the remnants of Russian presence into the Mediterranean basin.

China fully cashed the accident with its embassy in Belgrade. The Kosovo crisis was a truly legitimate opportunity to show up as a world power – a status Beijing will not be late to reclaim many times from now on.

This small excursion into the motivation of the key actors of the Kosovo crisis explicitly shows the limits of legitimacy in an integrated international action, based on values with no clear normative consent behind them. If we tend to act on the basis of the purely value systems’ motivation, we have to face the ‘clash of civilizations’ paradigm. This paradigm may seem affordable from the perspective of a resident of Cambridge – Massachusetts, but it is certainly painful for the residents of the Balkans and many other regions of the world, where different cultures intersect and create environment of plural value systems. If the global world has to be a place of law and order, it should be governed by explicit rules of reason, capable to ‘translate’ values and interests into operational norms. Responsibility of observing those norms and rules should be claimed from the legitimate members of the international community. Do we consider it possible to replace national sovereignty with a plurality of actors into an increasingly relative world of global interaction? Can we consider entities as ‘international civil society’ or ‘international community’ as structured

and responsible enough to reclaim sovereignty from the ‘out-fashioned nation states’?

No doubt – a new international system in the global world will represent much of the traditional clash of interest, much of the traditional relative value of international law interpretations, typical for the modern world. But if we stick to the tradition of reasonable translation of diverse interests into easily comprehensible consensual norms, equal for all international actors, then we have bigger chances to reproduce at least a relative law and order in the global village, where consensus upon values is not possible. Human rights respect – as we understand it - should be essential part of this ‘New World Order’, where we have to try to install it into the status of consensual norm. And the global sheriff should treat all violators equally – because this is the law.

Within the upcoming new international system of the global world, the Kosovo crisis opens the door to optional tendencies of development in human rights’ status. This first ‘human rights’ war’ underlines the importance of respect for all human beings. It sends a clear warning to all dictators – present and future – about the end of their immunity to act against the international standards of humanity. At the same time, the Kosovo crisis and its aftermath have clearly shown the relative nature of international human rights concerns, the immature instruments of human rights defense within a controversial situation of tense inter-communal clash. There’s a danger in this immature ability to bring justice for all from the perspective of human rights defense. This is the danger of a growing number of people, believing that the notion of human rights reflects an idealistic value system, which is incorrectly used to disguise illegitimate hidden aims.

Address:

Bulgaria, 1113 Sofia, 15 Frederic Juliot Curie str., bl.# 3, floor 1, apartment. 1

Phone/ Fax: (+359 2) 9711224, 9711227, 9711228, 9711229

e-mail: mail@iris-bg.org

Copyright © 1997-2001 IRIS, Inc. All rights reserved.