

Implications of the new NATO concept

REPORT

Skopje, 25 February 2011

On 22 February, the Marshall Center - Macedonia welcomed academia representatives and former Macedonian Ambassador to NATO, along with a panel of distinguished experts, to participate in a roundtable debate entitled “Implications of the new NATO concept over the security and defense system reforms in Republic of Macedonia.”

The purpose of the roundtable was to identify trends and issues that will shape the national security understanding of the NATO Strategic Concept, and to identify country’s role in further Euro-Atlantic integrations. The roundtable focused upon the dual requirements of promoting the stability consensus and the name issue, influence of the NATO transformation on partnerships and common tools, as well as the national inertia towards defence and security domains.

The MC - Macedonia is pleased to present the principal conclusions in this report.

I look forward to welcoming you to future debates!

Best regards,

Mitko Saraliev
Secretary
MC - Macedonia
T: +389 (0)2 328.22.48
saraliev@ecbs.org.mk



Principal Conclusions in this Report

1. Debate participants emphasized their concerns about interpretation of the recent assessments on defence and security developments. They complained about not having an adequate evaluation of the status of the transformational efforts and integrative processes. On the other side, they find unclear the provisional contents in the recent Alliance policy depict by the new NATO Strategic Concept. Participants are not confident with the real determination and willingness and believe that officials have lost the idea and trust in the integrative processes. The question how to proceed with the conditional name issue as a major obstacle should be posed and answered with which accomplishments and fulfilled membership conditions could be valorised. Subsequently participants perceive that government is hard to be convinced for interim inefficiency and has lost trust in international representatives in the country. It is somewhat confirmed that two years after Bucharest the process reached the dead-end and NATO if not involved in the name issue mediation has to take a part in reinvigorating the integration process.

2. Participants find NSC as a three-fold strategy document. The NSC, as they said influences the NATO interim transformation, the setting of the new relations with countries and organizations but not so much the need of re-in vigorating the partnerships according to new circumstances. All three have a reflection to partnerships in general and to the country specifics. The responsibilities are recognized not only at the partners and governmental side but also at the organizational NATO side including foreign representatives, diplomats, and advisory groups.

3. The NSC is perceived as a document which has to aim to resolve the relation between new challenges and new answers where NATO must continue with the reforms. Participants have foreseen four major questions that implicate future NATO credibility; new NATO missions, new NATO-Russia relations, the way how new challenges will be addressed, and reformed partnerships. Some of those postulates such as the renewal of the START process and protracted transfer of the security to the Afghan National Structures have started unfolding, while the collective defence and crises management among allies is reconfirming. Something that should be new is the cooperative security, which expectingly brings additional substance to the partnerships.

4. At the regional aspect, there is no special part in the NSC for the Balkans, although there are unavoidable specifics concerning integrations of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia, and especially Macedonia. Although open-door policy still remains and PfP activities keep enlarging with other countries, three Balkan countries remain to be unsettled. Bosnia and Herzegovina is a two-constituency country that can not be integrated without an agreeable solution in the process of redistribution and decommission of defence property. Serbia still has three types of anti-NATO positions caused by the NATO bombardment, the irrelevance of the integration with the organization in which most members have recognized Kosovo, and the renewed NATO-Russia relations in addition to the always present Russian-Serbian ties. At the end Serbia does not want explicit membership even though NATO could accept it, Macedonia desperately preys for full-fledged membership which NATO could not accept, and Bosnia and Herzegovina wants to get out of the limbo but does not know how.

5. Because of all these circumstances, revoking the time when France used to be a part of NATO politically but not militarily, someone asked if it is possible for Macedonia to be a

part of the alliance militarily, despite not being politically acceptable for consensual reasons?

6. In associations with the NSC, participants expressed huge concerns about the depletion of national defence resources, which has caused a slowdown of the modernization of the armed forces. National alteration processes depend on implications that derive from NATO transformations. They pointed out that the biggest achievements have been made within the country's defence integration. Despite the sustained contribution to NATO-led operations, armed forces are still heavily dependant logistically which undermines autonomy of conducting operations. Obligations for members described in new global security, including broader crises management challenges, have raised national security concerns and force re-assessment of the shrinkage of the national force structure.

7. From the operational perspective participants underline that tactical mistakes could have strategic impact. They suggested new projects supported by new guidance for frank cooperative security with a new type of information, including economies. While being a leader in the operations among the neighbourhood, new threats come out from society, not only security ones. If Macedonia has a plan to include civil society, it could overcome new leverage of the problem. Sociological stability and security are not prescribed only to NATO. Working in parallel with NATO, participants find mutual benefits in the imperative to focus on social and civilian deployable capacities, instead of being only a military contributor.

8. Participants, concerning deployable civilian capacities and addressing security challenges that we all face and we will face in a future, underline the first step which should be preparation of the legislation that will support and regulate inclusion of those Macedonian capacities in future operations.

9. Participants recognized that there are still so many non – NATO PfP countries that are or are not interested in the membership. They find an interest without complaining that they are not members and without begging for donations. However, although not complaining, government position is not clear, and there is no comprehensible vision of how to proceed in the integrative processes. Therefore, our unclear visions lead the international community to think that we are complaining.

10. Participants agreed that there many opportunities for partners which NATO should also see, but they are stuck somewhere. Macedonia is fighting for her sustainability survival while some partners (EU members) are not struggling and have not the same concerns. The main question is if we are capable to live without the name issue and how long NATO could live with that?

11. At the end, participants stressed that national institutions should look repeatedly at the NSC and its implementation and bring the national strategic documents in accordance with it.

List of Participants:

Aleksandar Glavinov, PhD, Professor at Military Academy, MC-Macedonia

Anna Villa Traine, Assistant at Norwegian Embassy

Biljana Popovska, MA, lector at the Military Academy, MC-Macedonia Council Member

Gabrijela Gjorgjevikj, Former Defence Counsellor in the Mission of the Republic of Macedonia to NATO, MC-Macedonia Associate

Ilija Nikolovski, BG retired, Former MILREP of the Republic of Macedonia to NATO

Igor Gjoreski, PhD candidate, MC-Macedonia Council Member

Kjetil Paulsen, MA, Ambassador of the Kingdom of Norway

Manfred Steib, LTC, NAT Member

Metodi Hdzi-Janev, PhD, Professor at Military Academy, MC-Macedonia Member

Michael Tarquinto, MAJ, ODC Chief, American Embassy

Mitko Saraliev, MA, MC-Macedonia Secretary & Council Member

Nano Ruzin, PhD, Professor at FON, Former Ambassador of the Republic of Macedonia to NATO

Oliver Andonov, PhD, Professor at European University

Sasho Kuzmanovski, MA, Former Defence Counsellor in the Mission of the Republic of Macedonia to NATO, MC-Macedonia Council Member

Stojan Kuzev, PhD, Professor at European University, Former MC – Macedonia President

Stojan Slaveski, PhD, Professor at European University, MC – Macedonia President

Zdravko Popovski, BG, Former MILREP of the Republic of Macedonia to NATO, MC-Macedonia Member

Vilma Temelkova, MA, Parliamentarian Assistant, MC-Macedonia

Tod Brown, COL, Military Attaché of the USA

Ton Kuedam, LTC, Military Attaché of the Kingdom of Netherlands

Vase Atanasov, LTC retired, Former Senior Staff officer in the Mission of the Republic of Macedonia to NATO

Next month at the MC – Macedonia

© Original Artist
Reproduction rights obtainable from
www.CartoonStock.com



search ID: dbrn295

"...and so it's agreed, in order to sharpen our crisis management skills, we're enrolling in an apology workshop."

CRISES MANAGEMENT Coordination of the Sectors 24 March, Army House, Skopje

Speakers list include:

Metodi Hadzi-Janev, Professor at Military Academy - Skopje

Oliver Bakreski, University Professor at the Institute for Security, Peace and Defence-Skopje

Lidija Georgieva, University Professor at the Institute for Security, Peace and Defence-Skopje