SECURITY OF WESTERN BALKAN COUNTRIES, A CONDITION FOR JOINING THE EUROPEAN UNION

Dragan Bataveljić[*]

Abstract

In the paper, the author indicates the key achievements and weaknesses of the security sector in Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Macedonia, Montenegro and Serbia, and also what kind of effect so called democratic transition had on systems of those countries. The European security and defense policy represents a component part of common commercial and security policy. For the European Union it should ensure the development of its own civil and military capacities for managing crises and preventing conflicts on international level. In that way, this security policy should assist to maintain peace and international security. It is stressed in the paper that official cooperation and exchange among the Western Balkan countries are significantly improved in the last several years, but that this transparency of managing security business is still insufficient in the entire region. Development of mutual trust and enabling national monitoring of security sector are necessary for regional cooperation in this sector, which is however quite delayed, for the reason of transparency, just mentioned above.

Also, the author pays significant attention to the problem of Kosovo and Metohija, as to a significant factor of maintaining peace and stability in the Balkans. The security in the Western Balkan countries and their preparation for joining the European Union can only be ensured by applying the unique policy and by avoiding double standards for the same problem. Special reforms of the security sector directed towards citizens will especially contribute to this and will enable participation of citizens and organizations of civil societies in monitoring security policies, which will contribute to legitimization of the security institutions.

Key words: the Western Balkan, the European Union, Feasibility study, reform, transition, regional cooperation.

INTRODUCTION

A Feasibility Study was the first step on the way to joining the European Union. Actually, that was only a symbolic beginning of a long-lasting and not a bit easy process. Namely, with this study, a country that wants to become a member of the big European family, only signs in to stand in the line of candidates for joining the European Union and whether it will enter it depends on whether it will succeed in implementing extensive reforms and standardisation of entire social, economic and political life. On the other hand, by means of this

---

[*]Prof.Dr. at Faculty of Law, University in Kragujevac, Address: Jovana Cvijića 1, 34000 Kragujevac, Serbia, Telephone: 00381 (0)61/187-68-71, Fax: 00381 (0)34/306-540

study, the European Union evaluates if it is practical to begin negotiations with the country, on entering this big European family.

The feasibility study itself, does not mean a lot, basically, because, only after its adoption, the conditions are being set and much more serious ones (which those countries that are interested in, cannot know in advance) in order for the negotiations to be initiated and to reach some kind of a middle step, which is called the Stabilisation and Association Agreement, which is a much more significant step. In this manner, it happens that between obtaining Feasibility Study and signing the Stabilisation Agreement, it can pass more than several years (that was the case, for example, with Bosnia and Herzegovina, Albania and others).

1. THE CONDITIONS FOR JOINING THE EUROPEAN UNION

It is inarguable that entering the European Union represents a strategic interest and a goal as for the Republic of Serbia as well as for all the other countries that belong to the Western Balkan region. Namely, all countries of the European Union, as well as the successful countries in transition at the moment, predicate their success on a clearly defined strategy, that is to say, the vision and goals towards which a society tends for a long time[1]. The main goal of the strategy is to achieve the standard and quality of life in all areas, that is, the heritage of civilisations reached by the current European Union states. That means that access of Serbia and all the other regions of the Western Balkans to the European Union should be a confirmation of achieved results in different areas of economic, political and social life, and also an indication that all of these countries are able to respect and protect high civilisation standards that have come to a realisation in the European Union[2].

This is why, before, when we mentioned the Feasibility study, it should be said that exactly this study is an indicator of whether those countries are ready and how long it will take them in order to reach a minimum national social consensus on key questions considering economic, technology, security and political development of their societies. Having in mind the strategic significance of the Western Balkans and also a mutual interest of those countries in this region and the interest of the European Union to accelerate the process of European integrations of those countries, the European Union has promoted and directly supported the stability of the region by means of its policy through the help programmes, significant investments, numerous projects, direct and indirect investments, development of democracy through a political dialogue and in that context it has been started with the Stabilisation and Association Process since 1999. This Stabilisation and Association Process promotes the European system of values and principles and its main function is to pave the way to the EU membership. All the Western

---

[1] Bataveljic, D. (2002), *"The European Union Constitution"*, Legal Life – Magazine for Legal Theory and Practice, The Lawyer Assosiation of Serbia, Belgrade, 4 (12), 449-455.

[2] Bataveljic, D., Vojvodic, A. (2009), *The European Federalism at the Beginning of the 21st Century*, Andrejevic Endowment, Belgrade, 113-124.

Balkan countries had obtained a positive Feasibility Study, after which they ratified the Stabilization and Association Agreement.

This is why the Stabilisation and Association Process still remains a frame for the European guidance of the Western Balkans countries until their accession to the European Union in closer or further future. The Republic of Serbia, as well as other Western Balkan countries, crossed a rough road in this process (some less, some more). However, the most important is that they had obtained the Feasibility Study and ratified the Stabilisation and Association Agreement which represents a significant stimulation for further economic and social reforms and economic, security and technological development of each country individually.

It is expected from the Western Balkan countries to react to the European partnership by preparing plans with schedules and details considering how they intend to satisfy the priorities of the European partnership. Main priorities of these countries are related to their ability to meet the criteria set by the Copenhagen European Council in 1993 and also the conditions set later and concerning the Stabilisation and Association Process. The priorities in areas that need thorough reforms and which represent a condition to these countries for joining the European Union are:

1. General Citizens and Social Security;

2. Economic Stability;

3. Political Stability;

4. Democracy and the rule of law;

5. Protection of human and minority rights;

6. Regional, international cooperation (for the Republic of Serbia this is full co-operation with the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, to fully respect Resolution 1244 and proceed a dialogue with Pristina on practical issues of common interest);

7. Improvement of economic situation; market economy and structural reforms;

8. Advancing toward the European Union standards, etc.

From all listed above it is concluded that in the first place it is necessary for the Western Balkan countries to be politically safe, economically stable and independent states, because joining the European Union itself should be a motivation for the continuance of the reforms. Hence come the responsibility of ruling circles in those countries to make their states be democratically, economically and technologically developed, European in terms of civilisation, and first of all, a safe place for each citizen, and every other person that resides in those countries

for short or long period of time. Only in this way, the doors of European integrations could be opened for the Western Balkan region, and this implies the European standard and quality of life, because security of people and property is a key factor of survival of the society itself in every state, and in this case it is a key factor of joining the European Union[3].

2. THE SECURITY SECTOR REFORMS

The Security Sector Reform concept itself has a great practical importance since it is used as a success indicator of the Process of Social Transformation. From this reason it is necessary to consider characteristic socio-political context in which this process of Security Sector Reform should be completed, for the mentioned countries. It has been done a lot in that field, but it can be concluded that the Police Reform in those countries is a continual process that was burdened by politisation, or to be more specific, that the ruling regime was taking advantage of the police. Numerous theoreticians were interested in Common Foreign and Security Policy and the European Security and Defence Policy, but there is an interesting book named "The Foreign Policy of the European Union" written by Stephan Keukeleire and Jennifer MacNaughtan. An especially important and interesting book for the Republic of Serbia is a book from Tim Edmunds called "The Security Sector Reform in Transforming Societies – Croatia, Serbia and Montenegro" This book is equally good for theory and practice of the Security Sector Reform.

The Security Sector Reform represents a relatively new and undeveloped concept that has been initiated by an academic community in 1990s. However, this is a too short period of time in order to have some more realistic evaluations of this concept that although still undefined and questioned is used as a success indicator of the wider process of social and political changes (those are for example, the democratisation and society transition processes). Namely, the concept of Security Sector Reform is defined as a wide and universal concept, while there is no consensus on the content of this concept. In this way we discern universal and restrictive definitions of the Security Sector that are very different from each other, but it is a fact that there is a congruity between them considering the basic institutions that belong to the Security Sector[4]. Those are:

1. Military;

2. Police;

3. Security services.

A specific difference between those and other institutions is that those mentioned above have authority to use force in the name of a state and that *differentia specifica* is non-ambiguous

---

[3] Petrovic, N. (2011), *The Roads of Studying Authoritarianism*, Library "Academia", Andrejevic Endowment, Belgrade,   55-69.
[4] Acimovic, Lj. (1978), *The Security and Co-operation Problems in Europe*, Belgrade, 38-41.

and clear. The Security Sector institutions apply and use coercion for the collective purpose, but the concept of the Security Sector Reform represents a process through which participants of the Security Sector adapt to political and organizational changes caused by a transformation. This normative concept, however, is not a value-neutral process of simple adaptation of a country`s Security Sector to changed security and political circumstances. On the contrary, the concept of the Security Sector Reform involves the Armed Forces Reform that is compatible with the liberal democracy standards and as such it represents an important component in "Euro-Atlantic agenda of democratisation", and also a change in the manner of thinking about security. This is exactly the reason why this process of reform should be distinguished from the process of simple reorganization of a country`s security forces.

The European Union as a specific international organization of 27 member states, having available more than 2 million members of armed forces has been intensively developing the Common Security Policy and almost the forth of the global expanses (altogether with the costs of defence) is set aside for this purpose. The European Security and Defence Policy should provide the European Union with a development of civil and military capacities for managing crisis and preventing conflicts on the international level. By that, it should help in maintaining peace, prosperity and international security. The surveillance of activities within the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) is conducted by the European Parliament and for that purpose it has specific mechanisms and instruments – resolutions, recommendations and reports, that is, making decisions concerning ESDP`s missions, budget control, forming of working bodies, asking parliamentary questions, visiting troops and similar.

In addition to this statement a paper called: "The Roots of Regional Cooperation of the South-East European Countries in the Defence Area", by Dragan Djukanovic and Dalibor Kekic, must not be neglected. Namely, the authors of this interesting paper have agreed with the general evaluation that the Stability Pact for the South Eastern Europe during its existence did not include sufficient number of activities intended for cooperation of countries in the security area. Also, the last book of Timothy Edmunds, called: "The Security Sector Reform in Transitional Societies: Croatia, Serbia, Montenegro", represents a significant contribution to understanding of this same sector reform. The author starts with the general concept of the reform and points out that this sector is consisted of all those organisations that apply force and use it for general purposes. By researching the relation between the societies that go through significant changes, Edmunds defines the Security Sector Reform as: "a process by which the participants of the security sector adapt to political and organizational requirements of the society transformations"[5]. At the same time, he points out that the Security Sector Reform has a special importance for the Western Balkan, because it is being implemented "within a wider process of democratic transformation, post-conflict development and consolidation". However, Edmunds

---

[5] Carotheres, T. (2002), *"The End of the Transition Paradigm"*, Journal od democracy, 1 (13), 21-23.

warns and he is right saying that this kind of process often can lead to some kind of non-democracy or semi-democracy, especially in the post-conflict and post-authoritarian societies[6].

In his book, Timothy Edmunds gives three levels of the security sector reform analysis, and those are:

1. Political;

2. Organizational;

3. International.

Politically speaking, the above mentioned reform concerns a relation between the security sector and political process. The author further says that each government has to establish mechanisms for conducting civil control over the security sector if it wants to enforce its authority. When speaking about the Security Sector Reform at the organizational level, it should be said that those changes happen within the sector itself, so in this way the security sector adapts to the changes within a society. The most important change within this meaning is a professionalization by which Edmunds considers an organization capable to conduct its activities efficiently and effectively within a democratic civil control. Finally, when speaking about the Security Sector Reform at international level, the fact should be pointed out that this reform concerns a relation between the process of reform in the state and external pressure. For us, it is interesting that the author of the book takes the Western Balkan as an example and by that he differentiates three mutually connected strategies:

1. Security support;

2. Preconditioning;

3. Direct conditioning.

After the theoretical introduction, the author of this interesting book, Timothy Edmunds, refers to the concrete cases, specifically to Croatia, Serbia and Montenegro. In this connection, he says that he has chosen those countries particularly because of the great similarity that characterises them. Those countries also have similar problems that are conditioned with post-conflict and post-authoritarian heritage. It is characteristic for the Western Balkan that it represents a rich mixture of various civilizations ethnical communities of Orthodox, Catholic and Muslim confessions, with cultural influences from Ottoman and Austro-Hungarian to Greek and Italian. The Stabilization and Association Process of these countries in the region is a long-term policy that is consisted of new modalities of aid in solving challenges that come from the reforms

---

[6] Petrovic, T. (2008), *"Different Security Policies Between the European Union and Russia: The Kosovo Independence Case and Connection to "frozen conflicts" in Moldova and Georgia"*, in: Journal of the Belgrade school of security Studies, Western Balkan Security, The Security Sector Reform, Belgrade, 3 (11), 29-30.

of democratic institutions, social development and all forms of organized crime. Since the initiation of this program in May 1999, the main goal has been equipping the Western Balkan countries with mechanisms for maintaining democratic institutions, ensuring the rule of law and supporting open and prosperous economy based on the European practice and standards. And all this can be accomplished only if the Western Balkan region is made safe for life and work of every person – the one that lives there all the time, and that one who is only staying there. The activities of the European Union on the Western Balkan toward the goal of ensuring security and stability of this region are a part of a long-term process to which the European Union is adamantly committed.

3. DOUBLE STANDARDS TOWARDS UNILATERAL DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

When it comes to the security policy and necessity of the police reform in the Western Balkan countries, it is really important in this place to analyze the Kosovo independence case and its connection to the „frozen conflicts" in Moldova and Georgia. Namely, these cases influence the relation between Russia and the European Union and their different security policies and all of this tumbles over and drastically influences the security of countries in the Western Balkan region. The basic research question here concerns the influence that the connection of the Declaration of Kosovo`s independence with so called "frozen conflicts" can have in the post-Soviet sphere. In the centre of attention in the first place are differences in the European Union policies and its most prominent members on one side and the Russian Federation on the other. Also, in the focus of our analysis are also the possible consequences of further disagreement of mentioned parties because it is known to everyone that nowadays Kosovo (the only right expression for the South Serbian Province is Kosovo and Metohija or Kosmet) represents, a possible focus of numerous problems, misunderstandings, disagreements, conflicts and even a war. And also it can even become a significant factor of stability and peace in the South-Eastern Europe, especially in the Western Balkan region[7].

This is why it is very important to indicate growing disagreements between the European Union and Russia concerning the role of the EU in the post-conflict regions in the neighbourhood, the issue of "specificity″ explanation of the Kosovo case and a possible occurrence of a chain reaction in the post-Soviet sphere. By speaking about a danger of a different approach to the problem of Kosovo, incompatible opinions of some great powers and so called "soft approach″ of the European Union promoting sustainable solutions for separatist conflicts, Fransoa Reno, a member of the European Centre for strategically important data and security, thinks that „all people, areas or minorities that tend to the independence now will be

---

[7] Hösch, E., Nehring, K., Sundhaussen, H. (2004), *Lexikon zur Geschichte Südosteuropas*, Böhlau/OTB, Wien, 33-36.

able to build its case on the example of Kosovo"[8]. Hence he supposes that Russia[9] will be able to support secessionist actions in the post-Soviet sphere in an appropriate manner, and that Kosovo script will be applied in other parts of the Balkans (for example, Serbs in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Albanians in Macedonia, Serbs in Kosovo and Metohija), and also in some European countries (Catalans in Spain, Basque people in Spain and France, Turkish Cypriots, Flemish people and Hungarians in Slovakia etc.). Of course, here we should mention some very peculiar statements from particular EU officials, according to which Kosovo is a unique case, and from that reason any other group seeking independence, will not get the support?!

The thing that stands out immediately is the fact that the European Union does not have an integral approach to the independence of Kosovo. Namely, there are some very distinctive differences considering the attitudes of particular state members, so the European Union made a decision that each country will decide about this matter individually. So, for example, the most prominent countries in the EU, such as Germany, the Great Britain, France and Italy – immediately recognized the independence of Kosovo. Those countries followed the example of the USA that also established formal, diplomatic relations with Kosovo. On the other hand, the EU members facing the similar problems of secessionist actions, such as Spain, Greece, Slovakia, Romania and Cyprus – have not supported the Declaration of Kosovo`s independence. Considering that Russia is in the group of countries that have not recognized the Kosovo`s independence, the European Union is disappointed with the prospects for "Europisation" of Russia, while for Russia the European Union represents "a bureaucratic formation that imposes socialistic policies suffocating the economic growth".

Particular members of the European parliament think that unilateral declaration of independence represents a dangerous precedent that endangers the concept of the EU Common Foreign Policy itself. " According to them, the so called "legalisation of extreme actions" can follow from this, such are those in Corsica, in Basque country, Northern Ireland, Flemish part of Belgium and other parts of Europe. This altogether represents a threat to the European security and stability, which has a further consequence - disrupting the idea of united Europe. The representatives of certain countries try to justify their recognition of independence of Kosovo, by stating that this issue represents sui generis, which Russia has constantly denied, threatening to recognize South Ossetia and Abkhazia, if the West recognizes the Kosovo`s independence. And Russia has done so at the end of August 2008. However, the Western European countries reacted immediately to this move of Russia (appliance of double standards for the same problem), implying various accusations, that they „categorically refuse this and respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Georgia", that "this recognition is contrary to duties of Russia towards the

---

[8] Renaud, F. (2008), *Independence of Kosovo: "Does it set a dangerous precedent?"* , The European Strategic Intelligence and Security Center.

[9] Petrovic, Dj. (2008), *"A Timothy Edmunds` book review, "The Security Sector Reform in Transforming Societies: Croatia, Serbia and Montenegro",* in: Journal of the Belgrade school of security Studies, The Western Balkan Security, The Security Sector Reform, Belgrade, 8 (11), 93-94.

resolution of the United Nation Security Council and by that the prospects of peace in Kavkaz do not get better", that this conclusion is "for regret and that efforts for Georgia`s territorial integrity should be made".

It is obvious that this kind of policy represents a big danger and test for the European security generally speaking. Namely, considering the Kosovo case, the European Union made a very risky move because its most prominent members recognized Kosovo`s independence, by which in terms of politics the EU has collectively taken a great responsibility for the success of that very risky project. In spite of it, the EU decided to keep on refusing the independence of countries of the former Soviet Union in the cases that were very similar to the Kosovo case. Justification for this kind of approach is allegedly, as mentioned above, in the "specificity" of the Kosovo case. Such EU Foreign Policy (appliance of two approaches for the analogue cases) and the security situation influence relations with Russia to be more complex. This "impasse" position which the United Nations Security Council faced represents an additional endangering of the international law, while the unilateral declaration of Kosovo independence resulted in destabilisation of the Balkans, and it seems it produces a chain reaction in other countries (in the Balkans in Bosnia and Herzegovina and in the North Kosovo and Metohija it might be Serbs, Albanians in Macedonia and the South Serbia and in particular countries that are the EU members where separatists tendencies have been existing for a long time). This is why a statement of the Czech president Vaclav Klaus is exceptionally important saying that: "Kosovo is not an isolated problem which is solved on one part of the Balkan ... For me Kosovo is a precedent. We have opened a Pandora`s box and this can have drastic consequences"[10].

4. THE EUROPEAN UNION – AN EXAMPLE OF A SECURITY COMMUNITY

When we speak about the Common European Foreign and Security policy, we can say that the first seeds of this policy could be found in motifs of the European Union`s "founding fathers" whose antecedent is the European coal and steel community, established in 1951. Swayed trust among the European countries after the World War II and maintainable peace in Europe should be achieved exactly through this community. Namely, in the middle of the 20th century, the European politicians using achieved economic integrations were trying to create a political community and introduce the Common Foreign and Security Policy which from the beginning of the European Union until now has gone through great changes. Namely, the EU system of Common Foreign and Security Policy practically represents a process that provides constant exchange of information and opinions on international politics and security issues through which the national attitudes are getting closer and the common ones are adopted. Further, those attitudes transfuse into joint actions that should contribute to the establishment of a clear EU foreign policy identity and realisation of the EU Common Foreign and Security Policy goals that were defined by the Treaty on the European Union, Article 11. In the first place those goals include preservation of independence, security and immunity of the Union as basic

---

[10] Klaus, V., Gasparovic, I. (2008), *"Klaus and Gasparovic: Kosovo, a precedant"*, B92.

foreign affair interests (including gradual defining of the Common Security and Defence Policy, as well as ensuring peace, strengthening democracy, a state of law and human rights.

Here it should be pointed out that the EU Common Foreign and Security Policy includes more aspects that can be reviewed through an exhaustive analysis. In terms of this it is necessary to point at the summits held in Cologne and Helsinki during 1999. Namely, after these significant assemblies it has come to the accelerated development of the Common Defence and Security Policy as well as with central goals that were and still are to strengthen the ability of the Union in cooperation with NATO to solve crisis in neighbour regions first of all by establishing rapid reaction forces which would be qualified to execute peace-maintaining missions and other non-combatant missions. The common defence is predicted as a possible form of reaction in situations when so decided by the European Council and when this decision is ratified by member states (in accordance with its internal regulations). The Treaty on European Union, approved in Maastricht in 1992 (with later changes and additions[11]) can be named as a basic legal source of current system of the European Common Foreign and Security Policy. In Nice 2000, the institutionalisation of the European Security and Defence Policy was implemented as a part of the EU Common Foreign and Security policy which implies that unanimity[12] is needed for all decisions concerning military and defensive policies. It can be immediately concluded that this kind of solution aggravated changes of the way the systems of the EU Common Foreign and Security Policy function in a direction of further Communitarisation[13].

However, a decade ago, in Amsterdam and Nice, and besides the mentioned aggravations, some new structures are created within the system of the European Common Foreign and Security Policy, so currently, four basic features of this system[14] can be named: 1) domination of international elements and strict respect of member states' sovereignty – a request for all decisions to be made through consensus; 2) divided sovereignty –decision-making is possible by votes of qualified majority in the Council and constructive abstention of some members during a voting; 3) member states still have relevant authority, but the formulation and appliance of the policy are „Europised"[15]; 4) supra-nationality of the EU`s Foreign and Security Policy system.

---

[11] Those additions and changes were implemeted in Amsterdam in 1997 and Nice in 2000, and with provisions of articles 11-28of the Treaty on the European Union, the above mentioned system of the Common Foreign and Security Policy was standardized .

[12] Treaty on European Union, Article 23. Paragraph 2.

[13] Creation of communitarian law, which includes a collection of all adopted regulations and acts within the three pillars of the European Union (*Acquis Communautaire* – The Law of Europen Unions since 1951, and The Law of European Union since 1993).

[14] Muller, G., Bocquet, B., (2002), *The New CFSP and ESDP Decision - Making System of the European Union*, The European Foreign Affairs review, 7, 257-282.

[15] Some call this Europisation as "Brusselisation" of function and services, with the headquarters in Brussel (this in the first place refers to the positioning of a Council`s General Secretary, High representative of the EU Common Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, and also to the establishing of the Political and Security Committee).

Speaking about the European Union as an example of the security community, we have to mention in the first place the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) which is the biggest Intergovernmental organisation engaged in the security matters. Within its domain are matters such as arms control, human rights, freedom of the press and free choices. The majority of 3 500 members of the OSCE stuff is engaged in the field tasks, while the 10 % is engaged in the organisation`s headquarters in Vienna. According to the United Nations Charter, the OSCE represents an *ad hoc* organisation that has a goal to warn about and prevent a conflict, to manage crisis situations and to make restitutions after wars. This organisation has 56 members from Europe, Kavkaz, Central Asia and North America and covers the largest part of the Northern hemisphere, and it was established during so called "The Cold War", as a forum of the East and West.

It is very important to point out in this place that the security was never a prominent subject when researching the public opinion in the Western as well as in the Eastern Europe, mostly because it was never accounted for appropriate for public to interfere in political-military affairs. However, at the end of the millennium, the situation significantly changed, so with the occurrence of the international terrorism it was more and more important for public to accept political decisions regarding the security. In the last few decades it has come to the transformations of post-communist security forces, a change from the conscription to the concept of volunteers, as well as completely new challenges for the European rapid reaction force. This cannot be done without a whole-hearted support of the public opinion whose role in the contemporary world has become more important than ever before, in other words, the public opinion, nowadays, represents a strategic component for every form of decision-making. The Republic of Serbia as well as some other European countries being in the process of transition from a totalitarian to democratic system, represent a very significant component in preservation of the European peace and security. Hence those countries have also been in the centre of attention of so called "Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces" since its establishment and the new chapter of transition represents a significantly increased public respect towards changes in the Security and Defence Policy. In the first place this was all done in order to achieve a balance between making policy decisions and public opinion that cannot be neglected in any case. This is why in the last few years numerous studies have been conducted regarding different levels of defence and security transformations in the Eastern part of Europe. This includes following countries[16]: Poland, Hungary, Slovakia, Ukraine, Russia, Slovenia, Serbia, Montenegro, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Macedonia, Bulgaria and Romania by which the Central, Eastern and South-Eastern parts of Europe are covered. The choice is mostly made in that way to include countries from the first and second circle of the NATO expansion with a special interest for the Stability Pact members in the South-Eastern Europe.

---

[16] These researches of public opinion and conducted studies were carried out in 12 countries in the first place because of the nature of the public opinion itself.

Considering that the attitude of public opinion is very important, we will indicate the fact that the most precious results of the research develop through a trend analysis and by researching the formation process of public opinion. However, unfortunately those studies are very rare due to their costliness and impossibility to provide adequate financing, necessary time and highly qualified stuff. Hence the author hopes that this modest paper will contribute to a complete knowledge of the security and defence in Europe, and especially in the transition countries.

REFERENCES

1. Batavelijc, D. (2002), *"The European Union Constitution"*, Legal Life – Magazine for Legal Theory and Practice, The Lawyer Assosiation of Serbia, Belgrade, 4 (12), 449-455.

2. Batavelijc, D., Vojvodic, A. (2009), *The European Federalism at the Beginning of the 21st Century*, Andrejevic Endowment, Belgrade, 113-124.

3. Petrovic, N. (2011), *The Roads of Studying Authoritarianism*, Library "Academia", Andrejevic Endowment, Belgrade,   55-69.

4. Acimovic, Lj. (1978), *The Security and Co-operation Problems in Europe*, Belgrade, 38-41.

5. Carotheres, T. (2002), *"The End of the Transition Paradigm"*, Journal od democracy, 1 (13), 21-23.

6. Petrovic, T. (2008), *"Different Security Policies Between the European Union and Russia: The Kosovo Independence Case and Connection to "frozen conflicts" in Moldova and Georgia"*, in: Journal of the Belgrade school of security Studies, Western Balkan Security, The Security Sector Reform, Belgrade, 3 (11), 29-30.

7. Hösch, E., Nehring, K., Sundhaussen, H. (2004), *Lexikon zur Geschichte Südosteuropas*, Böhlau/OTB, Wien, 33-36.

8. Renaud, F. (2008), *Independence of Kosovo: "Does it set a dangerous precedent?"* , The European Strategic Intelligence and Security Center.

9. Petrovic, Dj. (2008), *"A Timothy Edmunds` book review, "The Security Sector Reform in Transforming Societies: Croatia, Serbia and Montenegro",* in: Journal of the Belgrade school of security Studies, The Western Balkan Security, The Security Sector Reform, Belgrade, 8 (11), 93-94.

10. Klaus, V., Gasparovic, I. (2008), *"Klaus and Gasparovic: Kosovo, a precedant"*, B92.

11. Those additions and changes were implemeted in Amsterdam in 1997 and Nice in 2000, and with provisions of articles 11-28of the Treaty on the European Union, the above mentioned system of the Common Foreign and Security Policy was standardized .

12. Treaty on European Union, Article 23. Paragraph 2.

13. Creation of communitarian law, which includes a collection of all adopted regulations and acts within the three pillars of the European Union (*Acquis Communautaire* – The Law of Europen Unions since 1951, and The Law of European Union since 1993).

14. Muller, G., Bocquet, B., (2002), *The New CFSP and ESDP Decision - Making System of the European Union*, The European Foreign Affairs review, 7, 257-282.

15. Some call this Europisation as "Brusselisation" of function and services, with the headquarters in Brussel (this in the first place refers to the positioning of a Council`s General Secretary, High representative of the EU Common Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, and also to the establishing of the Political and Security Committee).

These researches of public opinion and conducted studies were carried out in 12 countries in the first place because of the nature of the public opinion itself.