

US FOREIGN POLICY AND "EUROPEANISATION" OF THE BALKANS

Zeqirja Rexhepi¹

¹Faculty of Philosophy, University of Tetova

Abstract

While Europe is considered a "cradle" of the system of parliamentary democracy, America (USA), in the late twentieth century is considered the "engine" of this system. Such an assessment for America came especially after the collapse of the communist system in Eastern Europe and Southeast.

Twenty-five years ago, in the southeast corner of Europe, called the Balkans, or in a region known as Yugoslavia, old interethnic contradictions had returned, which returned images forgotten since the World War II. In this historical period, seventy years later the process of dissolution of Yugoslavia had happened. The political creature "framed-up" by Europeans in Versailles (UK and France) had to be "broken up" by the clearheaded Europeans also. At the beginning of this process, the United States, a country that cared for global processes of humanity, as a result of the collapse of communism, took a secondary role in the Balkan events, letting the Europeans to deal with its "internal" issues.

When the Balkan events in Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina went out of control and jeopardized not only the emerging democratic values, but also the humanitarian principles on which US foreign policy was based. This is the time when the US, due to the failure of the Europeans took the initiative for the final settlement of the Yugoslav conflict, a process that led to military intervention against Serb Yugoslav Army and signing of the Dayton peace accord (1995 - Bosnia-Herzegovina), continuing with the Rambouillet Agreement and the intervention of the north Atlantic Alliance against militarist Serbia (Kosovo - 1999), and to complete the process with the Ohrid Agreement (2001 - Macedonia). In the post-conflict period in the Balkans, US foreign policy is focused on the "Europeanization" of the region, which according to historians and Western diplomats, always "produces more history than it can consume"!

Keywords: *Europeanization, the Balkans, democracy, conflicts, agreement*

Despite the fact that Europe historically is considered the "cradle" of parliamentary democracy system, the US, during the twentieth century played the leading role of the "guardian" of the system, and after the collapse of totalitarian systems, fascism and communism, the US takes new role, that of the "locomotive" of the system in question, or in short, the US assumes the role of the permanent guardian of expansion of parliamentary democracy space and the market economy, supporting the establishment of accountable institutions for cultivating the values of parliamentary democracy system.

During the historical development of European civilization they have developed various doctrines on political systems and the state. Among others, Europe is the place where the concept of the nation was born. On the foundations of this concept, in addition to the empires of the time, *nation-states* were born and developed. With the emergence of the nation-state on the historical stage, begins gradual demolition of imperial systems.

During the nineteenth century, under the influence of the ideas of the French Revolution, numerous movements for national liberation and reunification were created and developed. With special specifications of historical development, these movements in some places take the character of national unity of "national pieces" (Italy and Germany), while national movements that were created within the empire, were taking the national liberation character. Italian and German national movements brought into the European political scene, along with consolidated nation-states, two new powers, Germany and Italy.

Echoes the ideas of the French Revolution and other European national movements, is felt even among the people of the Balkans, which was under the administration of the Ottoman Empire. In this part of Europe, national movements initially had liberation character, but after the establishment of the first state formations and their recognition by the Great Powers, the small Balkan nations plotted to dominate over other peoples, relying in any of the European powers. Although the International Order of Vienna had established the so called "status quo" principle, but contending powers (Russia and Austro-Hungary), whenever had a chance of the extended their expansionist policies. Newly established Balkan nation-states, supported behind the scenes by the great "ally" (Russia), on behalf of the "liberation" of the brothers of common descent, actually assume the role of "extended hand" of Russian policy in the Balkans. Russia's such political efforts in the Balkans will leave more serious consequences in the relations of the Balkan nations, consequences that should suffer even today's generations.

During the 19th century, when Europe takes the final shape of its fragmentation - the nation-states, great nations like: English, French, Germans, Italians ... were conducting the international relations. In this historical period, the US was in the consolidation phase as a great power, and its foreign policy was closed in the western hemisphere (the Monroe Doctrine). US came on stage of international relations during World War I, in the beginning of the twentieth century, and the role of its foreign policy grows more and more.

International relations in Europe were traditionally run on the principle of balance of power, but with the emergence of Germany and Italy, the mentioned principle is put in front of Realpolitic concept. It is worth mentioning that both principles on which the European nation-states engage (the Great Powers), lead the European society towards new realignment and confrontation. The above principles of European society led to the creation of two alliances, which collided in World War One. US despised both European principles and provided principles on which a World Order should be built: democracy, collective security and self-determination.

During the First World War, the US tries to impose the European Powers moral principles of its foreign policy, collective security and self-determination of peoples. This effort starts with the commitment of the Democratic President Woodrow Wilson, who was trying to mediate between the parties for a peaceful solution of the war. Initially it reaches an agreement with the British, in 1916, known as the Memorandum dated 22 February 1916. On this occasion, the Entente allies were assured that will receive US aid if Germany would reject the proposed peace. Emperor of Germany rejects the offer and the project in 1917, the US entered the war to end it and to establish long-term solutions.

However, during the peace agreement in Paris (1919), the traditional diplomacy of European nations did the opposite of what American diplomacy (Wilson) thought. The outcome of Europeans decisions was the restoration of controversies, which brought to World War II. While US foreign policy once again is closed in the western hemisphere - *isolationist policy*.

After the end of World War II, Europe is split between the winning allies, on ideological grounds, East and West. In the West took part countries in which will be restored the market economy and parliamentary democracy institutions, while in the East would fall countries, in which will be set the so-called people's democratic system and state economy. With the changes that occurred in the Yalta Agreement (1944), the number of European countries that entered the realm of so-called "popular democracy" is increased. Some of these countries and European nations "integrate" within the Soviet Union, and other countries, including the Balkan countries, "integrated" in the popular democracies (communist system) with limited sovereignty. At the time of the Cold War, the United States played a major role in cultivating and protecting the values of parliamentary democracy and market economy system.

The cemented communist system was split in 1985, when Mikhail Gorbachev began a program of economic restructuring (*perestroika*), a program that was accompanied by a new social and intellectual approach (*glasnost*) that put to question the basis on which the whole Soviet system was built.

While Bush the senior administration, at the end of the Cold War (1989/90), declared THE NEW WORLD ORDER, which meant a new partnership between nations: the growth of parliamentary democracy system, increasing the prosperity, the establishment of peace and weapons shortage.

The administration of the other US President, Bill Clinton, according to the testimony of US Secretary of State, the US goals in Europe were: the expansion of NATO and urge Russia's integration into the West and reduce the risk of separation of the world. In addition to these American general goals for a better future, American foreign policy was quietly interested in ending of armed conflicts and establishing peace in the troubled Balkan region. At the end of the war in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the United States committed to the full implementation of the Dayton Agreement.

President Bill Clinton's plan was in addition to resolving conflicts in the Balkans, in to create a "sphere of interests" Eastern Europe, where every nation can live free and safe. For this reason, it begins the process of establishing ties between NATO and East European countries through the Partnership for Peace. However, what took place in Yugoslavia did not allow the realization of American goals.

In the Balkans, or more precisely in the vortex of conflict, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Kosovo, US foreign policy faces specific aggressors, who challenge not only US foreign policy, but also contemporary civilization and the basic values of democracy.

By the end of the fall of communism, on the Serbian political scene was coming a totalitarian political class, which was not differed at all from fascist ones. The leader of this political class, Slobodan Milosevic, was no different at all from the fascist leaders. Inspired by the

project of the Academy of Sciences and Arts of Serbia, the Serbian nationalist political class initially put under its control the Yugoslav Army in order to achieve the project of "Greater Serbia" with the force of arms. Even without bursting political pluralism, Kosovo, which had enjoyed the status of a federal unit in Yugoslavia, was imposed a violent constitutional solution, with which Serbia cancels the territorial and political autonomy.

During the armed conflict in Slovenia and Croatia, Kosovo was threatened to become a real slaughterhouse. For this reason, US diplomats of the Bush the senior administration, on Christmas Day 1992, told Milosevic that the United States would respond militarily if Serbs would start an armed conflict in Kosovo.

Yugoslavia as a multinational state without historical attributes, in passing from the communist system to the parliamentary system fails to survive, moreover, becomes reason of an enormous war endemic. In this country, which was actually an experiment of European diplomacy, nations were captured by historical dissatisfaction. By looking for their identity, they dive into conflicts and wars, whose scenes could be seen during World War II. The main driver of the Yugoslav crisis was obviously the Serb leader, Milosevic. In the historical period when European civilization should move towards progress, the market economy and the values of parliamentary democracy, he intended the contrary, the creation of the "Greater Serbia".

He actually intended to use the international principle of state sovereignty, and under Richelieu's Machiavellian model, where achieving the goal justifies the means. What the Serb leader did not foresee were new principles through which the United States tried to shape international relations at the beginning of the XXI century.

However, the mentioned Richelieu's model, according to Kissinger, was always despised by Americans. The United States, which had assumed the role of the New World Order leadership, answered to "Milosevic" challenge with force of arms, like in Bosnia and Kosovo. In circumstances of a savage aggression and ethnic cleansing, the US as a country that had taken the role of caring for peace in the world, cannot tolerate Serbian crimes. Even in the case of Bosnia-Herzegovina and then Kosovo, US foreign policy, worked through the so-called turbo-diplomats (Holbrooke, Gelbard, Hill, etc.). In peaceful conflict resolution efforts, the US used instruments for establishing and maintaining peace, in Bosnia attacked Serb military targets, while in Kosovo crisis attacked the military targets in Serbia.

In fact, until 1994, the US's foreign policy was focused on the arms embargo, giving chance of achieving peace through political means. By this time the United States take the initiative to terminate the process of division of Bosnia and ended the armed conflict. During this period, the US passed on the strategy of "lift and strike" under which was envisaged the suspension of arms embargo on Bosnians. The change of the course of American foreign policy will enable field military successes against Serb forces. The new political course gave the US the opportunity to take the leadership role in the whole process, both military and diplomatic.

The leading role of American diplomacy resulted in peace agreement at the US Air Force base in Dayton, Ohio. However, the Dayton Agreement did not end the war in former Yugoslavia, because there were still many other unresolved issues, in order to conclude the Yugoslav "chapter".

It is worth noting that the Kosovo issue, at the time when negotiations were held in Dayton, was not a US foreign policy priority. Kosovo at this time was kept under full military-police regime, where mistreatment of ethnic Albanians was everyday routine. According to "Human Rights Watch" in Kosovo were violated the human rights of Albanians, forcing Albanians to armed self-defense.

Due to permanent deterioration of the situation, in Kosovo appears an armed resistance movement against the Milosevic regime, known as the Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA). During this time, the US administration of President Bill Clinton, once again reminded Milosevic with the "Christmas warning" of 1992. This means that, after the Dayton Agreement (1995), American diplomacy had focused its objective to bring the "Yugoslav crisis" to an end and direct the Balkans towards a process of Europeanization. To achieve the ultimate objective, the US aimed at the demilitarization of the Balkans, starting with the overthrow of Serbian military force, creating a spirit of cooperation among countries of the region and finally the integration of these countries into Western European structures, NATO and the European Union.

On the eve of the Kosovo War (1999), US diplomacy, headed by Madeleine Albright, was engaged in the unification of NATO allies' attitudes. Some issues had already started to open up as a result of KLA activities in Kosovo (after the massacre at Prekaz - 1998), in the Contact Group meetings, held in London, after many controversial debates, it decided to impose sanctions on Serbia. Although the measures adopted against the Serbian regime because of their delay, in most cases do not yield the expected result to thwart the murderous regime of Milosevic, Albright brings conclusion that the acceleration of the conflict settlement should be led by US.

Developments in Kosovo were deteriorating the already grave situation. While diplomatic efforts were made to find a political solution to the crisis, on January 16, 1999, Serb military forces committed the next massacre in Racak, whose footage shocked the world. A few days later, on January 29, 1999, at the next meeting of the Contact Group, among the possible alternatives it was decided for peace talks, which were set to be held in Rambouillet, France.

Despite the extraordinary efforts of international diplomacy, particularly the American diplomacy, for a peace agreement on Kosovo, the same is not achieved due to the rejection by the Serbs.

USA, however, made the last attempt to prevent Milosevic's military actions, sending in Belgrade one of the most prominent diplomats, Richard Holbrooke. The US diplomat delivered an ultimatum that if he does not accept the offered agreement he will be attacked by military means. On March 23, 1999, Holbrooke returned to Brussels, informing the NATO allies about Milosevic's negative attitude. After this moment, NATO Secretary General, Javier Solana orders General Wesley Clark to begin military operation to prevent a humanitarian catastrophe in Kosovo.

During the NATO bombing, on April 15, 1999, President Clinton among others, will declare: "We, along with our 18 NATO allies, are here in Kosovo today, because we want to stop the massacre and ethnic cleansing, because we want to build a stable Europe, united, prosperous, to include the Balkans and its neighbors because we do not want the 21st century to be dominated by dark unification of modern weapons with ancient ethnic, racial and religious hatred. We cannot

sit and stare how hundreds of thousands of people are treated brutally, killed, raped, forcibly evicted from their homes, how the stories of their families are extinguished, all in the name of pride and ethnic purity ...!

It is worth mentioning that, Milosevic, like all other dictators throughout history, did not have the capacity to understand that his "policy" of genocide and ethnic cleansing for the creation of a "Greater Serbia" belongs to the historical past and not the future and that European civilization processes developed in the opposite direction to the Serbian mentality.

Thanks to US foreign policy, international relations, at the beginning of the third millennium would be developed on moral principles, for which were engaged President Wilson, Roosevelt and lately President Bush and Clinton. These principles will become part of foreign policy of European nations.

New World Order, US foreign policy commits for, goes beyond the selfish interests of the Balkan nations.

Conclusion

Since in the 19th century, America is consolidated as a major power, in the 21st century, its efforts will begin with the draft of ideas about the functioning of international relations (collective security, self-determination), ending with the imposition of solutions on principles that go beyond the traditional principles of European powers (humanitarian intervention). So, the basic principles upon which American foreign policy moves during the 20th century, from World War I, launched by President Wilson, then President Roosevelt and recently Presidents Bush and Clinton, strengthened the US more and more by giving America the role of effective defender of peace in the world. Indeed, without the US, European nations as separate, have never been proven that they are able to resolve conflicts, nor keep peace. It was so during the wars in former Yugoslavia also.

In the 20th century, the totalitarian doctrines were discredited due to the commitment of American foreign policy. In the following period, in the era of the New World Order the US's role is in setting moral standards in foreign policy. In this regard, one must understand the US commitment to the establishment and functioning of parliamentary democracy system in the Balkan region.

Geography had placed the US in the Western Hemisphere, it was protected by two great oceans. The size and strong economic growth in the 20th century enabled America's basic premise to exercise leadership processes in global relations, at the beginning of the third millennium, always based on the values of parliamentary democracy system, political pluralism and market economy.

After the fall of communism, the US has become indispensable factor without which it is almost impossible to bring peace and stability. As a World missionary of peace, the role of America probably would have faded in front of human civilization problems, so it is often forced to urge the Western European allies to take more effective decisions to resolve the crisis and establish peace (the case of Yugoslavia).

Given that parliamentary democracy will always remain an option "attacked" by different totalitarian systems or ideologies, as a selfish inclination of human nature, America would have lost the war acting on its own. In its mission, the US needs, more than ever, a strong Europe. Therefore, it is no surprising the American effort to establish peace and stability in the soil of the origin of democratic values. In the same context should be seen the American diplomacy effort for regional cooperation (Western Balkans), preparing the path for all countries of the region, towards integration into NATO and the European Union.

However, before the Balkan people, especially before us Albanians, the dilemma arises, which requires quick response, primarily by academic classes: In what direction are moving social processes in the region and in particular in Albanian territory, and if these processes move in the right direction, then at what stage are we Albanians and others?

On this occasion, I would like to emphasize that, at the present, the revolution of progressive ideas such as Western European ideas, i.e. in favor of New World Order, which can only be the product of genuine academic class, is inevitable. This will raise the awareness of the political class of the time to endorse the contemporary processes. If this cannot happen because of "barrenness" of politicians, the academic classes should be imposed as a factor in the socio-political life in order to take the responsibility that it belongs to, to face the contemporary social developments.

References:

- [1]. Ahrens, Geert Hinrik, *Diplomaci mbi tehun e thikës*, Tiranë, 2010.
- [2]. Albright, Madeleine, *Zonja Sekretare (autobiografi)*, Tiranë, 2004.
- [3]. Banac, Ivo, *Raspad Jugoslavije*, Zagreb, 2001.
- [4]. Buxhovi, Jusuf, *Kthesa historike 1*, Prishtinë, 2009.
- [5]. Human Rights Watch, *Raporti Botëror* (1996).
- [6]. Joviç, Borisav, *Poslednji dani SFRJ*, Beograd, 1995.
- [7]. Kadijeviç, Veljko, *Moje vidjenje raspada*, Beograd, 1993.
- [8]. Kaufman, Joyce, *NATO and the Former Yugoslavia – crisis, Conflict, and the Atlantic Alliance*, Lanham: RL Publishers 2002.
- [9]. Kovaçeviç, Zhivorad, *Amerika i raspad Jugoslavije*, Beograd, 2007.
- [10]. Clinton, Bill, *Ne luftën, ju paqen*. Fragment nga komentet e Presidentit Bill Clinton drejtuar Shoqërisë Amerikane të Reporterëve të Gazetave lidhur me situatën në Kosovë. Hoteli Fairmont, San Francisko, Kaliforni, ora 3:06, e enjte, 15 prill 1999; Tiranë, 1999.
- [11]. Nathanaili, Petrit, *Marrëdhëniet ndërkombëtare nga origjina e deri më sot*, Tiranë, 2009.
- [12]. Silajxhiq, Haris, *Shqipëria dhe SHBA në arkivat e Uashingtonit*, Tiranë, 1999.
- [13]. Talbot, Strobe, *The Russia Hand*, New York, 2002.
- [14]. Touval, Saadia, *Coercive Mediation on the Road to Dayton*, International Negotiation I, Kluwer Law International, Holandë, 1996.
- [15]. Press Statement by Javier Solana, 23 March 1999.

- [16]. Wesley, Clarck, *Waging Modern War*, New York, 2001.
- [17]. Zenelaj, Eqerem, *Historia e diplomacisë*, Prishtinë, 2013.