

KOSOVO CRISIS AND THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION:  
FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF THEORY OF INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY

A Master's Thesis

by  
EMİNE TOKGÖZ

Department of International Relations

İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University

Ankara

September 2011

To my parents

KOSOVO CRISIS AND THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION:  
FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF THEORY OF INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY

Graduate School of Economics and Social Sciences  
of  
İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University

by

EMİNE TOKGÖZ

In Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of  
MASTER OF ARTS

in

THE DEPARTMENT OF  
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS  
İHSAN DOĞRAMACI BİLKENT UNIVERSITY  
ANKARA

September 2011

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in International Relations.

-----  
Visiting Prof. Mark Almond  
Supervisor

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in International Relations.

-----  
Dr. Hasan Ali Karasar  
Examining Committee Member

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in International Relations.

-----  
Prof. Dr. Hasan Ünal  
Examining Committee Member

Approval of the Graduate School of Economics and Social Sciences

-----  
Prof. Dr. Erdal Erel  
Director

## ABSTRACT

### KOSOVO CRISIS AND THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION: FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF THEORY OF INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY

Tokgöz, Emine  
M.A., Department of International Relations  
Supervisor: Visiting Prof. Mark Almond

September 2011

This thesis analyzes the Kosovo Crisis and the stance of the Russian Federation towards the crisis from the perspective of Theory of International Society (English School). In this analysis, the historical background of the Crisis will be given in order to understand the reasons behind it. Such understanding of the causes will be related to the stance of the Russian Federation to see how the Theory of International Society applies to the Kosovo Intervention by NATO. The stance of the Russian Federation is critical in the sense that the Balkans historically have been a Russian/Soviet sphere of influence. The Russian reactions in a post-Cold War context imply a great deal for the future of international relations, mainly signifying a drift towards more convergent norms and values held by the international society of which Russia is an important part as a great power. Justice *within* order is given as the description of the ongoing trend in IR.

Keywords: International Society, Norms and Values, Great Powers, Kosovo, Serbia, Yugoslavia, Milosevic, Soviet Union/Russian Federation, UN, NATO.

## ÖZET

### KOSOVA KRİZİ VE RUSYA FEDERASYONU: ULUSLARARASI TOPLUM TEORİSİ PERSPEKTİFİ

Tokgöz, Emine  
Yüksek Lisans, Uluslararası İlişkiler Bölümü  
Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Mark Almond

Eylül 2011

Bu çalışma, Kosova Krizi ve Rusya Federasyonu'nun kriz karşısındaki duruşunu Uluslararası Toplum Teorisi çerçevesinde incelemektedir. Krizin tarihsel zemini, nedenlerinin anlaşılabilmesi için değerlendirilecektir. Teorik ve tarihsel zeminin hazırlanmasının ardından, Kosova Müdahalesi ve Rusya'nın bu süreçteki duruşu Uluslararası Toplum Teorisi lensinden analiz edilecektir. Böyle bir analiz ile uluslararası ilişkilerin geleceği açısından ne çıkarımlar yapılabileceği gösterilecek ve Soğuk Savaş sonrası uluslararası toplumun normlar ve değerler etrafından nasıl daha çok yaklaştığı ve büyük güç olarak Rusya'nın da nasıl bu uluslararası toplumun parçası olduğu tartışılacaktır. Bu anlamda, gidişat, düzen içinde adalet olarak gösterilmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Uluslararası Toplum, Normlar ve Değerler, Büyük Güçler, Kosova, Sırbistan, Yugoslavya, Milosevic, Sovyetler Birliği/Rusya Federasyonu, BM, NATO.

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

Throughout my master's studies at Bilkent University the faculty has been immensely helpful and inspiring for my intellectual development. I would like to express my deepest respects and appreciation to all members of the faculty for being an intellectual shelter to myself.

I want to express gratitude to my supervisor Professor Mark Almond for awakening my interest in the Balkan region. He has been a great guide for me in this research process and with his lectures and keenness to teach in my master's studies.

I am grateful to Professors Hasan Ali Karasar and Hasan Ünal for their valuable time and guidance in this thesis process.

Bilkent University Central Campus Library, with great books and facilities and above all, with its friendly and helpful staff, has made my graduate study life very enjoyable and fruitful.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
ÖZET.....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vi
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER II: ENGLISH SCHOOL (THEORY OF INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY) AND THE KOSOVO CRISIS.....	6
2.1. English School in International Relations.....	7
2.1.1. The Representatives and the Agenda of the School.....	7
2.1.2. The Ontology of the School.....	9
2.1.3. Epistemology of the School.....	10
2.1.4. The Methodology of the School.....	11
2.1.5. English School and International Relations.....	12
2.2. English School, Human Rights and Intervention.....	16
2.3. English School and the Great Powers.....	20
2.3.1. Russia and the UN Interventions.....	24
2.4. English School and the Kosovo Crisis: A General Outlook.....	24
2.4.1. Conundrum: “There are no rules”.....	27
Conclusion.....	29
CHAPTER III: HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE KOSOVO CRISIS.....	31
3.1. The Importance of the Conflicting Histories (And Myths) in the Kosovo Issue .....	33
3.2. Kosovo and Its Centrality for the Serbians and Albanians.....	34
3.3. Kosovo in the Serbian History.....	37
3.4. 1297: Establishment of Bishopric in Pec.....	38
3.5. 1389, The Battle of Kosovo: Myth and Martyrdom.....	39
3.6. Kosovo and Metohija.....	40
3.7. Kosovo for the Serbs until the Balkan Wars.....	40
3.8. The Balkan Wars, 1913 Memorandum of Belgrade and the Aftermath.....	42
3.9. Kosovo in the Albanian History.....	44
3.10. The Story of Albanian National Identity and Kosovo.....	45
3.11. The League of Prizren.....	45
3.12. The Balkan War (8 October 1912) and the Independence of Albania.....	46
3.13. Yugoslavia in the Inter-War Period.....	47
Conclusion.....	48
CHAPTER IV: THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION AND YUGOSLAVIA AFTER WWII.....	49

4.1. The Immediate post-WWII Developments.....	49
4.2. Tito v. Stalin .....	50
4.3. The Measures of Josip Broz Tito .....	51
4.4. The Legacy of Communism: Milosevic’s Appeasement to the Serbian People .....	54
4.5. The Reactions of the Kosovar Albanians .....	56
4.6. Issue of Kosovo from Yugoslav Dissolution to the Escalation of Tension in 1998 Spring .....	57
4.7. UÇK (Kosovo Liberation Army, KLA) and UÇK vs. JNA .....	60
4.8. 1997 Crisis in Albania .....	61
4.9. Russian Financial Crisis in 1998.....	61
4.10. Russia’s Stance at the UN: How reliable is Russia as an ‘ally’? .....	62
4.11. Holbrooke Agreement .....	65
4.12. Chernomyrdin in the Contact Group.....	66
4.13. Rambouillet.....	68
4.14. NATO’s 78-Day Bombing Campaign.....	68
4.15. The Settlement on 3 June 1999 .....	70
4.16. Russian Troops at the Pristina Airport: A Volte-Face in Russian Stance? ...	71
Conclusion.....	74
CHAPTER V: IMPLICATIONS OF THE RUSSIAN STANCE TOWARDS THE KOSOVO CRISIS .....	75
5.1. The Aftermath of the Crisis: A Summary of the post-crisis developments.....	78
5.2. English School on Kosovo Crisis: Legitimacy, Solidarism and Sovereignty ..	81
5.3. English School and Russia as a Great Power in World Politics .....	84
5.4. Five Implications of the Kosovo Crisis and Its Aftermath for International Relations .....	87
5.4.1. Order Prevails.....	87
5.4.2. The Crisis as a Harbinger of other NATO Interventions.....	88
5.4.3. Russia and the West.....	90
5.4.4. The Norms and Values Becoming More Coherent and Homogeneous....	93
5.4.5. The Balkans: Ending of Chaos.....	94
Conclusion.....	95
CHAPTER VI: CONCLUSION.....	97
SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	101
APPENDICES .....	108

# **CHAPTER I**

## **INTRODUCTION**

This thesis is an attempt to contribute to the existing literature on the Kosovo Crisis for the international interventions have been in rise since the end of the Cold War and making crisis-driven interventions very important as an international relations research agenda. This is partly because the interventions in the Balkans and the rest of the world from 1990s onwards (the most recent one being the one to Gaddafi's Libya) generate an important question regarding the national boundaries, sovereignty, human rights and the people who are left on the wrong sides of the borders and partly because of the stance of the countries who have been not part of the Western Bloc during the Cold War. In this sense, the Russian Federation comes to the center of the picture of international interventions. On the one hand we have a Russian Federation who had put its clear cut bolster in interventions of Somalia, Haiti, and others and on the other we have another Russian Federation, who was expected to stand against the intervention in Kosovo but against such perceptions it simply did not back Milosevic and acted as a part of the West, whose values now seemed to be that of the international society as a whole despite some fractures.

The end of the Cold War was especially critical for the future of international society because while the Iron Curtain had fallen, new political, economic and sociocultural cleavages were in rise. Democracy deficits in the post-Soviet sphere and instability in the Balkan region were going to be important challenges for the international society when looked in a retrospective manner.

Hedley Bull, in his unquestionably influential *Anarchical Society* had foreseen that the international society or system may at times be broken in terms of its rules but in the end an international society led by the great powers existed and tended survive as it is. In this thesis, it will be argued that when it comes to the breach of the violation of international norms and values, it becomes both legitimate and lawful to intervene in order to save peoples from oppression and massacre and that even a great power who had strong ties with the intervened wave its power to confront the intervener because in the end the international society/system prevails with its rules and norms.

In order to probate the argument stated above, in this thesis, in the following chapter the Theory of International Society (English School) will be given; especially its themes of order, solidarity, norms and values, and its examination of the Kosovo Intervention in its legitimacy and lawfulness. It will be seen that the international society puts order on top of everything thanks to the guardian-like great power. Although there are debates over going towards a solidarist international society and also the debates that international rules are violated simply by interventions, these debates are not thought to be valid because of two reasons: firstly, the conditions are very premature in order for a solidarist society be built; secondly, rules and norms

are appointed by the international society and their contingencies are also decided by the international society.

Therefore, it can be claimed that the equilibrium prevails and this equilibrium, at times, is reached despite some seemingly violations of the international rules, such as respect to sovereignty. It will be seen throughout the thesis that order, basic human rights and equality would beat sovereignty principle. The most appropriate premise of the Theory of International Society is that there is no static view of the world; the picture of the world, indeed, is decided by the international society. The prediction that the order, rather than solidarism and chaos, will prevail may seem static but the point is that contingencies can always occur on the order; order is the most basic fundamental of international relations.

In the chronological evaluation, the conflicting histories of and the cultural traits of the two peoples of Serbians and the Albanians will be discussed briefly in order to understand the course of events that followed from the 1990 onwards. It is argued in this chapter that the histories and cultures enlighten the student of international relations up to a limit because they can only explain the attitudes of the peoples towards each other and the expectation for Russia to be a backing ally of Serbia and Milosevic. Histories and cultures are not sufficient to understand the course of events because prior to those stories and traits there are international norms and values which are guarded by the great powers.

Histories and narratives show that the present political leader dwell on them to justify his actions. Most times, clinging onto power, legitimacy and diversion of attention of

the people from the economic, social, political woes require the political bodies to refer to some moral, emotional elements. In Kosovo case, we see a realization of such action. Russia, also suffering from economic and political hardships, mostly was acquiescent and its foreign policy in this case showed a direction towards Westernization.

In the fifth chapter, the empirical evidence are made related to the theory and some implications are inferred from the before, during and the after of the intervention in Kosovo by NATO. Those implications are both broad in terms of being about the international and global relations and interventions and more specific in terms of NATO, Russian Federation and the Eastern-Western relations. The last of these specific terms is argued to be more outdated in this thesis because this thesis sees a world that is more towards converging rather than diverging in terms of its values and norms and their guardians.

It will be thus concluded that the stance of the Russian Federation towards the Kosovo Crisis, when looked through the lenses of the Theory of International Society was in compliance with the norms and values of the international society and thanks to those norms and values themselves and Russian politicians' awareness of them, Kosovo intervention had been perpetrated.

The theme of this thesis is particularly important because since the end of the Cold War and with several interventions by the West so far, one of the most common questions in the mind of the public is whether these interventions, in the name security or human rights had an end other than order and justice. For instance,

nowadays the oppressive regimes in the Middle East are being challenged and the people started to ask whether this challenge is a sign of an upcoming sphere of influence of the West. As long as the oppressive regimes continue and the people are deprived of their basic rights in name of sovereignty, interventions would continue.

Kosovo may be a positive indication that the interventions are not necessarily carried out when a national interest is at stake. The stance of the Russian Federation and the commitment of the UN and the West in intervention despite the lack of resources or that the region was a landlocked, far area where no strategic or economic interests laid. Therefore, despite all the debates around the necessity, means, end of the interventions and the sides who had carried them out, in the end basic rights and order prevail. Even at a geography which has been highly complicated in terms of its history, culture, economic and social conditions and political culture, international norms and values apply. The great powers, be they be on the West or in the East, seem to be converging, especially since the end of the Cold War. Thus, an unfortunate experience like Kosovo Crisis indicates that people who have been left to the whims of some political oppressors, the international society comes at work and Russia is part of this society.

## CHAPTER II

# ENGLISH SCHOOL (THEORY OF INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY) AND THE KOSOVO CRISIS

“Neither Milosevic nor any other Balkan leader is in a position to threaten the global equilibrium”<sup>1</sup>

“The fate of Europe often hinged on the confusion of battle, the temperament of negotiators, or even, as in 1588, the weather”<sup>2</sup>

Before wandering into the world of the Theory of International Society, it should be pointed out that in international relations, one must be aware of the possibility of theoretical pluralism. As a very complicated issue of a very complicated region, the Kosovo Crisis is a very proper example teaching the students of IR that “nothing...neither empirical disconfirmation nor the need to combine theories to explain complex real world events, should be permitted to dampen theoretical pluralism.” (Hellman, 2003: 135) Without disregarding the complexity of the issue

---

<sup>1</sup> President Clinton’s statement, April 1, 1999. “Do the Serbs have a historical case for their occupation of Kosovo?” *The Guardian*, <http://guardian.co.uk>

<sup>2</sup> Daniel H. Nexon. 2009. *The Struggle for Power in Early Modern Europe*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, p. 65.

and the possibility of different arguments, this thesis is an attempt to give the English School perspective on the Kosovo Crisis.

If there is an eponym for English School's (ES) (Theory of International Society) perception of world affairs in its ideal form, this eponym would best be "global equilibrium" as the chief architect of Kosovo intervention put it. ES sees an international system/society that is guided by the great powers and international/global norms. It sees so because there are historical, legal and philosophical indications that there are global norms that take charge when there is crisis and infringement by some actors. Thus, there is an inevitable emphasis by the ES scholars on law and morality, mainly by supporting Grotian (rationalist) tradition. When the international society shows signals of fragility sourced from "state of war and global transnational relations", then the norms, values and rules kind of force the actors to reverse the threats and preserve the international society (Dunne, 1998: 8). In this chapter, after giving the ontological, methodological and epistemological assumptions of the ES, its analysis of the Kosovo Crisis will be analyzed. ES grants the great powers a responsibility to preserve the international society by enforcing the common rules and norms. In this respect, the school's account on intervention and great powers will be separately scrutinized.

## **2.1. English School in International Relations**

### **2.1.1. The Representatives and the Agenda of the School**

The forefathers of ES are Martin Wight, Charles Manning, Hedley Bull, Herbert Butterfield, R. J. Vincent, F. H. Hinsley, Andrew Linklater, Donelan, Mayall, J.

Vincent, E. H. Carr (whose commitment to the School is debated since realist school is a close affiliate of ES), Nardin, Walzer and Adam Watson who emphasized balance of power and great power management of world politics to understand and explain international relations in their writings (Griffiths, 1999: 151-6). Contemporary ES scholars, in parallel to the issues debated in this thesis, appear with different agendas. They advocate intervention, justice and rights of indigenous peoples, which indicate that balance of power is shadowed by justice and freedom. Jackson, Donnelly and Wheeler, on the solidarist camp are writing on humanitarian intervention. P. Keal, Keene, Suganami, Yurdusev and Welsh are writing on history of ideas that came to produce European International Society and Buzan most recently is writing on the meanings of global order (Dunne, 2005: 67-78). They probate on the transition from a strict understanding of order to an understanding that is more concerned with justice rather than sovereignty.

The other themes that the ES scholars write on can be grouped as relationship of ES to IR Theory, representatives of which are Bartelson, Brown, Bull, Buzan, Little, Cutler, Smith, Dunne, R. Jackson, Linklater, Wæver, Wight; balance of power and war, representatives of which are Holsti, Howard, Roberts, Wight and Windsor; and the state, mostly written on by Donelan, Mayall, Navari Brewin, Inyatullah, James, Makinda, Österud.<sup>3</sup> Major cases that have been studied using ES theory are human rights, the expansion of international society, democratization, arms control, Third World-super power relations, Africa, *détente* and perhaps above all, humanitarian interventions.

---

<sup>3</sup> “English School: A Biography” access from <http://www.polis.leeds.ac.uk/research/international-relations-security/english-school/resources.php>

### **2.1.2. The Ontology of the School**

ES's central ontological assumption, which the theorist believes to "constitute social reality", is the existence of an orderly society of sovereign states, an international society, which is the basis for stability and rule of law (Grix, 2002: 177; Bleiker, 2005: 179). There is a recurring pattern of interactions among sovereign states although it is at times oscillated by revolutionist tendencies (Dunne, 1998: 138). This international society has a precarious but a desirable nature because each member's realization of certain elementary goals depends on the society's continuation. International society constitutes the social reality for ES theorists because as Stanley Hoffmann points out, international society is the consistent and continual concern of Bull and others in their theorizing (Hoffman, 1990: 15).

ES scholars start their investigation of social and political reality from an "ensemble" of states; they see a "whole" whose particulars such as culture, place of war, interactions need to be further examined by comparative spatial and temporal studies (Ibid: 17). Starting from the international society, the School sees that there are rules and norms the sovereign states observe and that these rules make up an international law. Some objective, basic rules such as limitation of violence, *pacta sunt servanda* and respect for sovereignty provide the members of international society with leeway to overcome certain states' or individuals overreaching intentions or ambitions (Ibid: 18-20). The existence of an international society and the place of norms and rules keeping this society together are closely related to the School's representatives' belief in natural law tradition (Ibid: 22). Grotian approach's impact makes the ES theorists to see a 'society' (*societas gentium*) bound with common interests and values, common rules and institutions rather than a mere 'system' (*Staatensystem*).

Society can be claimed to be superior to system in terms of the adequate appointment and application of the norms and values because a system implies a less integrated group when compared to a society.

### **2.1.3. Epistemology of the School**

Epistemological assumptions concern with “how what is assumed to exist can be known”, therefore it mainly is about theory’s “knowledge-gathering process...developing new models of theories” (Grix, 2002: 177). The epistemology of ES is related to the interpretivist methodology it employs. Interpretivist social science was founded by Max Weber who declared that “social life is based on social interactions and socially constructed meaning systems” (Neuman, 1991: 77). Reality has a subjective dimension to be understood and in order to do so; the scholar needs to conduct *hermeneutics*, which is reading a text to grasp the meaning “embedded within text” so that s/he can obtain *Verstehen* (Ibid: 75-6).

The social and political reality of international society is known by ES theorists by revealing the states’ meaning giving to reality, the common values and interests shared by the statesmen, diplomats and political leaders, the international laws and norms. The solidarist wing of the School also believes in the possibility of constructing a morally superior social order, which, according to Sterling-Folker makes the School epistemologically closer to the post-structuralist theory (Sterling-Folker, 2006: 308).

Although interpretivism allows ES to understand and describe reality without ignoring norms and values, it still gives priority to the facts and tries to make some objective explanation. Such epistemological emphasis on facts is justified by Wight

saying that “international theory is the theory of survival” (Little, 2000: 400). Bull also wrote that focus should be given to history, country studies and global system as well so that neither the facts nor values and norms are overlooked (Richardson, 1990: 142). Bull saw world politics as the big picture with states system as a part of it. This grand scale world politics can only be understood via ideography, meaning a “detailed study of the history, values and institutions” of individual cases rather than trying to reach general laws (nomothetic) (Wellington and Szczerbinski, 2007: 19). Since reality cannot be insulated from the context, facts can best be understood with detailed studies of the contexts and meanings.

#### **2.1.4. The Methodology of the School**

In terms of the methodology of the ES, it is basically interpretivism since the members of the School are suspicious about the eligibility of positivism as a guide in international relations. Tim Dunne recalls E. H. Carr’s remark in his *Twenty Years Crisis*, “the science of international politics is in its infancy” (Dunne, 1998, 7). Interpretivism requires a holistic approach, which, according to Barry Buzan allows the scholar “the opportunity to step outside the game and cultivate an integrated approach” (Bleiker, 2005: 184). Martin Wight, as one of the most prominent members of the school, had incorporated ethics into the theory by combining prudence and moral obligation. Therefore, as the epistemological part will mostly emphasize, the school does not see states and actors as “strangers to the moral world” (Dunne, 1998: 9-10). Trying to establish this combination of prudence and morality, ES’s interpretivist methodology calls for historical sociology with macro-historical analysis and historical institutionalism and political philosophy as the proper means to acquire an understanding of international relations.

Bull and others employ history in order to see how the international system/society endures, especially the European dominance and the underlying norms and rules in organizing these affairs (Keene, 2002: 15). As interpretivists, Bull and others prefer asking grand questions to understand the reality on a grand scale. In this sense, ES collect historical data with unit of analysis comprising the diplomats and political leaders (Dunne, 2007: 132). Thus, in this thesis, the memoirs of Yeltsin and Holbrooke will be given in order to understand the development, escalation and the consequences of the crisis. Because history, philosophy and law are central to the inquiry, best evidence comes from the hindsight of history, discernments of philosophy and “introspective psychology” so that a true *Verstehen* can be committed (Richardson, 1990: 161-2). In this respect, it could be argued that history, alongside with cultural traits of peoples; philosophical inferences form a set of evidence for the scholars in understanding the path of events in an adequate manner.

### **2.1.5. English School and International Relations**

Seeing an international society and trying to understand it from historical, legal and philosophical perspectives, the main questions that the theorists of ES ask are mainly about international society, order, international law and justice. Relating to these phenomena, five clear-cut primary questions can be identified: What is international society (Wight, 1991: 30)? What is order in world politics? How is order maintained within the present system of sovereign states? Does the system of sovereign states still provide a viable path to world order (Bull, 1995: xv)? What is the relationship between order and justice in world politics? These questions are central for the theorists of ES because their assumption of an orderly international society, though precarious, needs to be examined in detail in order to give a holistic picture of world politics.

The first question of international society is answered that states are fastened together by common values and interests that they tend to avoid expiration of these values via using diplomacy, war, balance of power and international law. At this point, it should be clarified that the formation of the international society and its origins are simply ignored for good by the School because they are unimportant. The important thing is that an international society exists whose material underpinnings such as respective roles of the actors, common values and factors are much more important than its origins. The second question on order is answered that an orderly world politics is one of the alternatives in shaping international relations and it is implicitly advocated as the best alternative because it is needed to be existent for progress and advancement of states and the individuals. Order and international society are glued together because presence of order means that a number of states have formed a collectivity. Order therefore is maintained basically by a “sense of common interests”, by preserving the international society, through international law, diplomatic relations, balancing, making war when necessary and respecting each other’s sovereignty.

ES theorists admit that the order is insecure but they emphasize that its preservation is advantageous because its deterioration to Hobbesian anarchy is improbable and Kantian cosmopolitanism would not be as healthy as Grotian international society. At the end of the day, there is a scarcity of resources, a scarcity of altruism and inequality among the members and these scarcities and inequality can best be compensated for order with basic rules that are in interests of all (Bull, 1995: 51-3). Although Hobbes’s anarchy arises from the equality of men in the absence of a

common power in state of nature, in world politics there will always be states more powerful in relation to the others and this exasperates disorder and resentment without common ground. Therefore, ES do not shelter illusions about a better world, a cosmopolitan one specifically. The states are the principal institutions to supervise and implement the rules and they utilize institutions of war, balance of power, collaboration, diplomacy and management of relations (by great powers) (Ibid: 68-71).

It should also be pointed out that the English School warns against the dangers of the Hobbesian anarchy, understanding of Hobbes's state of nature and the need for security is critical for this thesis. Thomas Hobbes wrote his *Leviathan* at a point of conjuncture when the throne battles had created an anarchic atmosphere. Hobbes, seeing all these, in his political treatise, opted for an absolute monarchy because he had seen the worst. His treatise actually touches upon other kinds of governing systems as well but the conjuncture he lived in pushed him to believe that without a sovereign power with all the rights and competences, people would go as far as extinction.

Hobbes's vision of the world, of course, is a hypothetical one, but in theory he saw that the optimum solution for the people to be able to live in security is signing a covenant and transferring the rights to that Leviathan. It is seen that Hobbes values security more than any other value because security was the sine qua non of everything else. Hence, while degrading anarchy of Hobbes, it should always be emphasized that Hobbes's theory, as well as that of Kant had greatly influence the

agenda of the English School because thanks to such a theory, the importance of security and order could be accounted for.

Thanks to such management of common rules and values, a satisfactory ratio between the society and state of war can be fulfilled. Although at time periods, the international society gets threatened, the management gets at the helm and the chaos gets solved. As hinted before, Hedley Bull concerned himself mostly with ‘order’ rather than all dimensions of world politics simultaneously.

Looking at the contemporary world, ES indicates that system of sovereign states continues to be *the* path to world order because alternative forms of states systems with a “disarmed world, solidarity of states (cooperation on a global basis), ideological homogeneity and world of many nuclear powers” do not seem to be realizable in a foreseeable future (Ibid: 225). Therefore, alternative systems of system but not society, states but not system, new medievalism and cosmopolitanism are not viable paths (Ibid: 240-7). And in relation to this orderly international society, justice would always be secondary to order.

Bull himself does not believe that there is a “global emergency” calling for justice and he rejects that global centralism and regionalism can be reformed versions of international society (Ibid: 286-94). Although there is a Grotian twist in international legal regime after 1945, the promises of the solidarists for a more inclusive just order are not in horizon (Bull and Watson, 1984: 429-31). The main point for such healthy avoidance of illusions is that ES recognizes the impossibility of a “just change”; they warn beforehand that such a change would mean redistribution of power, wealth and

amenities (Bull, 1995: 304) and needless to say, such redistribution is a vain hope. This is why sticking with common basic rules and values seems to be only way to maintain international society and order in world politics. This has been so and seems to remain so in future as well. Nevertheless Makinda, Linklater and Suganami point out that transformation of international society and the theme of international citizenship need more space in research agenda of ES more (Makinda, 2001: 335; Linklater and Suganami, 2006).

## **2.2. English School, Human Rights and Intervention**

In order for a healthy understanding of ES position on intervention, one must distinguish between the solidarist and pluralist camps of the school. While the pluralists perceive a morality in the international society that is rather “thin”; the solidarists go for a “thick” morality. The pluralists are more in favor of international order while the solidarists are not satisfied merely with ‘order’ but demand for “justice”. Here, it should be noted that the pluralists see order and a thin moral fiber sufficient. This view of sufficiency of thin morality highly disturbs the solidarist ES members who warn that pluralism creates a safe haven for the “repressive governments to hide behind the norm of sovereignty” (Dunne, 1998: 11). The solidarists are optimistic that universalist ethics, especially, human rights can be promoted rather than sufficing with order. Nevertheless, ES, as a whole can cover basic international relations questions such as war, intervention, global resource arrangement and human rights.

ES’s account of intervention goes back to Hugo Grotius. Hedley Bull believes that since 1945, there is a “Grotian turn” in world politics where the oppression and

mistreatment of individuals and groups in one state started to be important because the term of 'sovereignty' started to change. As William Bain notes, under a sovereign state, the predicament of the people "who found themselves on the wrong side of the border" started to matter a lot (Bain, 2003: 67). The differentiation between the European and non-European started to be blurred and it was recognized that "non-European peoples [were] equal and independent members of the society of states..." (Keene, 2002: 9). After the fall of the Berlin Wall, solidarism gained even more momentum when Bush called for "solidarity against aggression" (Dunne, 1998, 139, 152). When sovereignty, as a concept, changes, then intervention, mostly under 'humanitarian' justification, becomes inevitable when the international actors and powers can no longer deny the suffering of peoples in one state. This Grotian turn shows that international society, rather than a mere system, is more observable when there is an intervention trampling a state's sovereignty.

The recognition of other peoples beyond Europe and more proclivity towards justice rather than plain order, have its roots in writings of Emerich De Vattel who supported that "revolutions were justifiable if a ruler had violated the fundamental principles of natural law, and that interventions in support of revolutions in other states might be justified on the same grounds" (Keene, 2002: 17).

Scrutinizing of an intervention undoubtedly entails the issue of human rights, since the interventions are most times conducted in a humanitarian manner. The global public opinion started to be formed on Kosovo in 1981 Pristina student demonstrations. Later, in February 1990, Enver Hadari, a Kosovar Albanian attempted to raise European Community's awareness by organizing a demonstration

outside the Yugoslav Embassy in Brussels, but was killed by the Yugoslav secret police. The initial reaction from the international society came from the European Parliament (EP) and the United States Congress which both declared their concern for the murder, by sending a delegation for the investigation of the situation. This was followed by a EP resolution “calling for a new Yugoslav constitution that would facilitate respect for democratic self-determination” (Bellamy, 2002: 16-7).

The conflict between human rights and sovereignty can best be grasped from the identity of the UN (United Nations), itself. While it purports to promote human rights, it also purports to be respectful of all states’ “equal and independent territorial sovereignty.” The humans inside the borders of a state started to take precedence over the state’s sovereignty (Keene, 2002: 141-2). When we take into account the fact that there was objection for intervention, but that the intervention materialized in the end, it can be claimed that the international society is more inclined to solidarity and justice. But one should approach these inclinations with reservations and giving a caveat because such inclinations may be on paper and may have been appointed as an ideal rather than as a realistic and applied fact.

Although Hedley Bull himself was not positive that there could be collective legitimization for solidarist activity, but Nick Wheeler and Justin Morris were. Bull’s main reservation was that order could collapse since it would be very hard to agree on a single understanding of justice. This is critical and very reasonable because despite globalizing; cultures, social contexts, passions of the persons, and boxes remain. As Hollis and Smith put it, most times self-interests of nations play too

important a role that it would be very hard even to agree on the terms of an international issue.<sup>4</sup>

Taking account of such hardship to agree on justice terms, Bull was foresighted in understanding that order tends to prevail rather than seeking solidarism. For example, order could collapse while debating on the limits of human suffering for humanitarian intervention (Dunne: 1998, 153). However, freedom and equality of nations in the end was left secondary to the freedom and equality of individuals, making Grotian tradition victorious. As R. J. Vincent emphasizes, with turn to Grotianism, human rights and intervention debate started to consider *jus gentium intra se* concurrently with *jus gentium inter se* (Vincent, 1990: 244). Vincent (248-51) requires three steps in establishing the existence of legitimacy of a humanitarian intervention: first, individuals have to occupy an independent status in international law, second, domestic jurisdiction should not deny this independent status of individuals in any state and finally, states have to enforce this humanitarian intervention .

Such three-step criterion seems plausible because we see that the international system has to first accept that state sovereignty is questionable when it starts to oppress individuals and then intervene to end such oppression. Also, in practical terms too, this criterion is fulfilled when we examine Kosovo intervention as well. Sovereignty, as Kosovo proved, was an evolving concept and was not a priority when order and basic global human rights were being violated.

---

<sup>4</sup> Boxes, here, are used as the set of policies, values and characteristics of an element of international society that cannot be opened and thus remains as a mystery. Such boxes make it hard to create a game or understand or explain the international relations. For further information, see, Martin Hollis and Steve Smith. 1990. *Explaining and Understanding International Relations*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp. 186-188.

In terms of UN Charter, there are again two camps of interpretation. The first camp believes that the UN Charter only allows armed force for self-defence and interventions approved by the Security Council. The second camp on the other hand believes that in decades following the application of the Charter, international law has evolved allowing intervention in some certain instances. In this sense, T. M. Franck asks for the condition of “extreme necessity” while Nicholas Wheeler requires “supreme humanitarian emergency” to be present for a legitimate intervention. Either way, however, the performing of the humanitarian intervention indicates that there is a common morality (Nardin, 2005: 260-2).

Thus, the Theory of International Society, accepts that there is a common morality, inviolable human rights and humanitarian emergency and accepts that sovereignty can be left secondary at those times. But this does not mean that the Theory sees a Kantian world where there is pure justice. Justice is a value but it is kind of a consequence of order, which would be reached through violation of sovereignty at times.

### **2.3. English School and the Great Powers**

International society is a polyvalent entity that is mainly driven by balance of power, international legal norm and rules, diplomacy, warfare and the concord of the great powers (Linklater and Suganami, 2006: 46). Undeniably, the great powers are the main guardians of the common morality stated above because it is their diplomats, leaders and forces who decide that there is the violation of international law and intervene to reverse such violation. The caveat should be given here that throughout

the evolution of the IR and political theory many camps had been suspicious of the role of the great powers for the health of the international relations. Thucydides was the outmost critic that the great powers tended to abuse their dominant position and exploit the weak states (Miller and Kagan, 1997: 53).

At this point, it is also important how the statesmen present such values and norms to the public. No matter how great a power a country enjoys and how resourceful a country is, the public opinion, the people still matters. This is why it was hard to implement a ground operation from the start rather than an aerial bombing campaign by NATO therefore risking Kosovar casualties rather than own soldiers.

Andrew Linklater and Hidemi Suganami point out that the end of the Cold War gave way for the creation of ‘international society’ after decades of ‘international system’. While the Cold War years passed with the prevailing of unspoken rules about the spheres of influence, the post-Cold War years saw the shelving of such sphere of influence of institution (Linklater and Suganami, 2006: 125-7). From the end of the CW on, free trade, threat of terrorism and the issue of justice began to prevail. This is best depicted in Russian failure to prevent intervention in its ally<sup>5</sup> FRY (Serbia). Although economic, political and personal reasons are also important in Russian stance, the Kosovo intervention despite Russian abstention in the Security Council tells a great deal about the post-Cold War international society.

---

<sup>5</sup> Throughout this thesis, the concept of ‘ally’ is not being used in its traditional sense where the parties have a binding written contract to be sided in international or regional disputes and wars. Instead, in this thesis the alliance of Russia and Serbia are analyzed, claimed or proved to be ineffective in terms of the two countries’ people, histories, statesmen, religion, culture and their support for each other in the international arena.

Russia had actually backed the UNSC condemnation in 1998 although it was not sympathetic to the KLA. The point is that there is a siding<sup>6</sup> problem between the parties and most of the time the national interests even more complicate the siding balances. It could be maintained that the international politics has taken so complicated shape in the last decades with the tides of globalization, economic and financial crises<sup>7</sup> that the 18<sup>th</sup> century kind of alliances and balance of power concepts cannot be easily adapted to the contemporary international politics picture. Now the statesmen have to take many determinants into account, one cannot clearly define who the allies are and who are against. Furthermore, the stance of a country also is very difficult to appoint that in the end even a great power like Russia seems to demonstrate a foreign policy line in a crisis involving one of its supposedly natural allies that may seem as an aberration.

Moreover, it is seen that the international society is moving towards more “civility in relations between separate political communities” when compared to less civility in respect of weaker states’ human rights and individuals’ protection before (Linklater and Suganami, 2006: 135). Therefore, the view that there is an international society where justice *within* order because great powers are no more unfettered to be able to stumble on the freedom and equality of individuals seems to be more appropriate. 9/11 can be claimed to be the most obvious case proving that internationally agreed norms are obligatory, no matter they are in a written form or not, even for the great powers.

---

<sup>6</sup> Siding, here, was meant for partisanship, indicating that the parties’ support for each other tended to change and be adapted according to the conditions, interests and the context.

<sup>7</sup> In terms of Russia and Central and Eastern European states, economic crisis was a common encounter especially after deterioration of the Party from 1960s onwards. Low purchasing power, low productivity and deflation were common phenomena in this part of the world, which kind of assisted the convergence of West and East through reliance on economic terms on the West by the East.

It should be pointed out that the role of the great powers and their entitlement as moral guardians or the enforcers of international society rules and norms have led to debates, too. In this sense, it has been argued that great powers' intervention for compliance would be a common practice and that the international society would be nothing more than the society led, exploited and shaped by the great powers. However, "coerced compliance" in international society is only an exception and it is only performed when the sustainability of the society is under threat by some incorrigible elements such as Slobodan Milosevic (Morris, 2005: 266). Therefore, despite some competition between the West on the one side and Russia, China, India on the other, when it comes to most basic norms and values in international politics, there is agreement among the great powers.

When there is competition between the Western and the Eastern great powers, it is mostly caused by the worry of the latter that Kosovo could become a precedent threatening their own integrity. This tendency of great powers to be reluctant for a precedent when it would threaten their own populations and the cooperation despite such a fear also indicates that the norms of the international society has actually been composed by the great powers who do not have a secession threat at their own land. It should also be pointed out that lack of democracy is also an important factor in the different lines taken by aforementioned states. Norms, we see, are set by the states who do not have a secession problem, themselves. But it will be seen that when the secession is a problem of a great power itself, it can be overlooked as in Chechnya and Georgia as well.

What is important for the aims of this thesis is that order is the first value of the international society and it is not sacrificed; it can be protected by emphasis on human rights as in Kosovo, or it can be protected by being silent in issues like Chechnya. At best, therefore, we have justice *within* order.

### **2.3.1. Russia and the UN Interventions**

Russia, as this thesis will propose, matters a lot in the case of Kosovo because of both what it did and did not do. Russia's stance in the former UN interventions, particularly, in Somalia, Rwanda, East Timor and Haiti was positive as it voted in favor. Between 1991 and 1993, Russia was an active part of the Vienna Declaration and the Program of Action which resulted in World Conference on Human Rights in 1993. But when it came to Kosovo, Russia seemed on the opposite side but not because of its general opposition to human rights, but because it failed to be an active actor in the resolution of the crisis. And this has its reasons, as the next chapter will examine. It should also be pointed out here that Russia did not miss the chance to justify its actions in Chechnya from 1999 onwards and Georgia in 2008 by referring to Kosovo.

### **2.4. English School and the Kosovo Crisis: A General Outlook**

English School's analysis of Kosovo intervention and the aftermath is critical mostly because the intervention was carried out without UN authorization and the handling of the intervention, as well as post-intervention dealing. Since this thesis covers the period from 1991 to 1999, the aftermath of the crisis will not be analyzed deeply. Nevertheless, as it will be seen in this research, even if there had been an explicit UN authorization, things might have developed in the same way as they did. Because

what mattered in Kosovo case was Milosevic himself, the public in Serbia, the KLA and the Kosovar Albannians. Holbrooke, Chernomyrdin, Yeltsin, other international actors did all what was in their limits. It will also be seen that despite explicit authorization, the global public opinion was undeniably against Milosevic.

In the case of Kosovo, ES questions the legitimacy of the intervention despite the lack of agreement in UNSC and evaluates the consequences of intervention indicating to the rise of solidarism while the sacrosanct principle of sovereignty is violated. In the case of Afghan intervention, ES again looks at the decision, conduct and implications of the consequences of the intervention and concludes that what we are witnessing contemporarily is a change in international society and that there is a challenge of solidarism in international society. These two cases point to a lack of clear-cut agreement on the nature and principles of contemporary international society as well.

Regarding the case of Kosovo, ES questions the usual view of Kosovo intervention as just another instance of violent conflict given birth by the collapse of the USSR that obligated the international society to intervene and restore order. ES goes beyond the automatic explanation of the intervention and searches for a thick story of what really happened. Since it holds the balance of power and great powers' preponderant management of the rest of the world as legitimate and proper mechanisms to provide order under anarchy, it first looks at the interveners' roles, intentions and conduct of intervention in this case to see whether they abided by rules and norms of international society properly. It also analyzes the link between

principle of sovereignty and human rights. Finally looks at the fragile issue of international justice since it mostly eludes the international society.

Main concerns of the ES regarding the intervention decision are i) the legality (lawfulness) of the intervention ii) the legitimacy of the intervention. It is found out that while the intervention was not initiated on purely legal grounds, it was still legitimate to intervene. The affirmation of legitimacy is derived from mainly the discourse surrounding the reactions to the events in Kosovo. The legitimacy was obvious in NATO's and Annan's humanitarian views and also overall support from worldwide NGOs and public opinion. Therefore, the intervention decision was legitimate despite the objections/reservations of Russia, China and Namibia (Knudsen, 2006: 314-6). However, ES is not satisfied merely by concluding that the intervention was legitimate. It asks further questions to interpret the story for the prospects of international society, principle of sovereignty and humanitarian intervention notion.

The first problem that ES identifies is on the transfer of authority from the parent state to an international organization. Yugoslavia was an established sovereign state which was reluctant to swerve from its sovereign status. Naturally, experiencing the disintegration of multi-national partnership state, Yugoslavia presented an important case for the IR theorists. In such a case ES questions whether the future of international society will witness such cases where sovereignty principle was not sacrosanct anymore. It draws attention to the fact that stopping the armed conflict and allowing the retention of chaotic state of relations would be meaningless. On the other side, however, UN Trusteeship system was never intended on replacement of

established states. Its application in Kosovo, therefore, is significant. ES interprets the revival and mutation of UN Trusteeship as a sign of solidarist camp's triumph against the pluralist camp of the ES since the UN Trusteeship and defection of Russian objection constitute a proof that humanitarian intervention and national self determination weigh more than sovereignty principle in the present international society (Ibid: 321-4).

The second problem that ES identifies in this case is related to the conduct of intervention. NATO forces did not try to save the victims by intervening on the ground, but they intervened only from air (Ibid: 319). ES questions such conduct because if the intention was to save the victims, it was obvious that operating from the air was not sufficient.

#### **2.4.1. Conundrum: "There are no rules"**

As stated above, the Kosovo intervention paved the way for a significant conundrum which was to be culminated in the post-intervention situation and the Bush administration's actions from 2002 on. In this sense, the main question becomes when the rules lose their applicability and when it becomes easy to get away with impunity. "There are no rules" statement of Bush can be traced back to Kosovo intervention in its realization and such denial of the rules of international society was well exemplified in the US handling of Al-Qaeda supposed perpetrators in Afghanistan, violating the Geneva Convention (Bleiker, 2005: 181). While Hedley Bull would point to the possibility of disorder to justify such rule breach for the sake of order, since Kosovo, the trade-off between order and justice have been questioned frequently.

This questioning centers on an “unjust order” and the “west-centricity”<sup>8</sup> Richard Devetak also points to the fact that the US foreign policy makers’ discretion sits “above the collective judgment” (Devetak, 2005: 244). These debates inevitably reduce the human rights and humanitarianism as an instrument for breaching rules.

However, the Kosovo Crisis, although the post-intervention and lack of UN approval can be criticized, should not be confused in terms of its humanitarian dimension and breach of rules. As stated above, an acceptable level of legitimacy in favor of intervention was present and the concept of sovereignty, which became questionable by corruption of power by Milosevic and historical grievances already, had started to modify itself. Sovereignty itself was dynamically at a transition proved by the domestic abuse of sovereign power and international use of power through global governance. A more important element of Kosovo intervention was that when order is needed, war can be the instrument to reach order. At the end of the day, there may be challengers of order who cannot be quashed other than by a method of actual fighting. Wars are sometimes useful tools for reversing disorder. As it will be seen, in his case diplomacy and international law were limited in their uses to provide order.

Hence, despite some criticisms, in terms of legitimacy, human rights and protection of a just international society, the ES verifies that the intervention was righteous. It was righteous because all great powers, even Russia, silently endorsed the intervention and Bull’s “fortuitous and contrived balance” was preserved (Little, 2003: 448).

---

<sup>8</sup> The term of “west-centricity” belongs to Hidemi Suganami, which mainly intends to remind that the Western experience is imposed to “judge the other societies”.

In brief, Kosovo case, with the decision, conduct and implications of the consequences of intervention demonstrated that international society, with its most significant institution, the United Nations, is not united at all in decision-making. Secondly, it also demonstrated that the common rules and norms are changing along with the state sovereignty definition and the character of international society. Finally, it showed that the conduct of intervention may seem problematic in operating the intention of saving people. At the end of the day, it is fair to say that despite criticisms and objections in some sense, the international society ended disorder and ongoing conflicts in Kosovo. As this thesis will place the dynamics of the international society in Kosovo case, as Ian Clark (2003: 88) notes, although we do not and cannot perceive a “society of mankind”, we do perceive an international society that survives and approves intervention even when lawfulness is debatable.

## **Conclusion**

International Relations theories, as in all theories, are difficult in their formation and application. International Relations are conducted by nations, which have officials of various backgrounds; all nations are different boxes with own learning, history, culture, and values. But the theory has to have some lenses to examine these boxes, it has to be aware of the “other minds” and be able to give a overall vision of the world of international relations.

Theory of International Society focuses on understanding the international relations and it does not delve into too much the problem of boxes. It is successful in giving a holistic picture of the world which tends to order via the efforts, sacrifices and

enforcements of the great powers. The norms and values are very appropriate proxy to see where the international relations is going and how the crises would be handled.

The great powers, of which Russia is an example, would involve in the crises and reverse any disorder and they are supported by the norms of values of the international society such as justice, global basic rights, the oppression of sovereign people by their own leaders. Those crises, in particular Kosovo, prove that any crisis as complicated as Kosovo, would be solved, even to the surprise of those who would argue that Russia would challenge the West. In the end, this crisis made a very important reference point for the international society's existing norms and values as well as the future interventions and stance of a great power such as the Russian Federation.

## CHAPTER III

### HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE KOSOVO

#### CRISIS

“...religion’s uses are often different from religion itself”<sup>9</sup>

Kosovo has a land area of 10.908 km<sup>2</sup> with only two important remarkable traits: mineral resources and coal mining district of Trepça. In Kosovo, there has not been a reliable population census since 1981. Therefore, in demographic terms there is no consensus of the true proportion of the Serbs and Albanians. The demographic uncertainty was also in the political leadership of the region. While the Serbs had the “upper hand” in the inter-war era, and later until 1968 and 1987-1999; the Albanians enjoyed preponderance during World War II (WW II), during 1969-1987 and during the intervention in 1999. This swap of preponderance was a proof of the complicated past stories of the two peoples and it contributed to only one thing: “perpetuation” of the crisis (Ramet, 2001: 33).

---

<sup>9</sup> December 19, 2009. “Where Piety Meets Power”, *The Economist*, p.68.

The crisis, as this thesis argues, stemmed mostly from historical devotion to the land by two recalcitrant peoples. The religion of the Serbs and their Orthodox Church in Kosovo aggrandized the hardship of coming to terms. The Church in Orthodox tradition would become a very powerful force on top of every other force where all the people turn for solace and rescue. Notwithstanding the importance of historical circumstances, it should also be pointed out that history was not everything. There was a leader who knew how to manipulate people through referring to the distorted version of history in order to ensure that the people fight for it. Slobodan Milosevic's rise to power was simply accelerated and consolidated by his speech in 1987 in Gazimestan. But that was not sufficient. He had to watch for the ensuing consolidation and hard-lining. He preserved his power through his dominance at the state structure, the divided opposition, first-past-the post election system and local conflicts (Bideleux and Jeffries, 2007: 14-5).

All these elements assisted Milosevic to use history in the way he wanted. He used conflict as a way to implement a policy that harmonized with the Serbian historical desires and claims. At the end of the day, a people whose imperial and clientalistic past showed no vision other than ethnic collectivism, conflict and crisis seemed the true path to follow. In the Balkans, the competition between "ethnos" and "demos" would result by the victory of "ethnos" (Mann, 2005). This was only to be interrupted and resolved through NATO intervention, which Russia unwillingly countenanced.

### **3.1. The Importance of the Conflicting Histories in the Kosovo Issue**

Kosovo Crisis was not a crisis that erupted out of nowhere. It was there, it brewed, culminated in and led to, a serious humanitarian, political and social crisis. Religion and religious, national motivations were very important in the course of Kosovo's historical pattern. Daniel H. Nexon (2009: 132) writes in his *The Struggle for Power in Early Modern Europe* that when dynastic politics combined with religious differences, it became inevitable that the local upsurges get internationalized. When Nexon's view is applied to Kosovo Crisis, it will be seen that in a political environment already in turmoil for centuries, the reference to religious, national and historical cause would make that environment even more precarious inviting international attention.

This is not to pejoratively belittle the crisis as just a repetition of history or the past. The point is that religion and national sentiments are labored most times by politicians leading to crisis because the people get separated around own religious identities and 'grievances' (Ibid: 8-9). Hence, when one analyzes the Kosovo crisis, one cannot underestimate the religious contention that would hardly allow the Yugoslav composite state of the time.

The history of the Balkans is quite complex and the challenge of modernity and state building after the Ottoman dominance is important in understanding the Serbian society in the sense that the centrality of religion, language and past prevailed rather than being a modernized and democratic people. The Balkans is a good test milieu for political scientists because it had come through many civilizations, wars, state types, rulers. Moreover, it tested feudalism and socialism and its experience with

democracy, nation-state and liberalism was very short-lived, ostentatious and nowhere near a genuine effort other than emulating the West for aid and support. Even though the liberal and class-based, modern nation state was a prevailing norm, the Balkan states had missed the opportunity to seriously reform and adopt that system. The Theory of International Society would also see this failure in adopting the modernization and liberal nation-state model as a determinant in the crisis-driven Balkans. At this point, however, the emphasis should be done to the fact that this past and the failure to reform political and social systems and sufficing only by copying the Western values for aid and support, the Orthodox peoples of the Balkans paved the way for a crisis-driven region since the end of 18<sup>th</sup> century.

The past simply had shaped the claims of both the Serbian and the Albanian peoples; even when Serbia created a ‘democracy’ it could not overcome the legacy of the past and its democracy was far from being led by true social democratic transformation. The only common point between the two peoples is that they both had an inextricable claim to Kosovo and that both had a very complex history sometimes it is being extremely difficult to identify where to belong, what to support and whom to trust (Djordjevic: 2003, 165).<sup>10</sup> Therefore, this chapter is an attempt to give a general picture of the histories of these two peoples to see how these histories played their role in complicating the political and social destinies of them.

### **3.2. Kosovo and Its Centrality for the Serbs and the Albanians**

Kosovo has always been the poorest part of the former Yugoslav state and this poverty and backwardness would not be overcome by government investment in its

---

<sup>10</sup> Serbia, for example, oscillated between being allies with Russia and Austria in different times.

industry. It, for the rest of the Yugoslav history, had the lowest per capita income in all six republics and provinces of the former Yugoslavia. But it would be wrong to be surprised that such a poor region would drag the entire Balkan region to the brink of chaos and made the first NATO intervention happen despite a reluctant attitude in the UNSC from the Russian Federation. Kosovo, in the Balkans, signified a center of culture, minerals and mountains which surround it and makes it a defensible and secure region for the nation/state/republic who possesses Kosovo (Cox, 2002: 6-7). This is how Slobodan Milosevic could use Kosovo as a central theme in his Gazimestan speech for his agitation/propaganda ends. In his speech he clearly vented his stance:

“There remain a small number of fanatics who still dream of altering borders, of allowing Kosovo separate from Yugoslavia and join Albania. I will ensure that these dreams never come true. Serbia will never let Kosovo go; those who hope it will are not only fighting in vain but also exposing themselves to tragic consequences. They will never succeed because Kosovo is Serbia’s rightful heart” (Stevanovic, 2004: 39).

Although it would be a simplistic reductionism to link the Kosovo crisis to the ethnic hatreds and historical disputes between the Albanians and the Serbians, the geographical piece of Kosovo is certainly an undeniable element that exasperated the Yugoslav crisis. Noel Malcolm points out perspicaciously that “The Yugoslav Crisis began in Kosovo and it will end in Kosovo” (1998: xxvii). This makes it hard to deny that the resolution of the Kosovo crisis was a must if the conflict in the Balkans was to be ended. This however, is not to point out that these two peoples have always been in an identical and ethnic struggle against each other. Noel Malcolm gives two important occasions where the Serbians and the Albanians actually were together: they fought together in 1389 Kosovo War against the Ottomans and three centuries

later, during the Austrian invasion, they rebelled together to end the Ottoman rule in the region (Malcolm, 1998: xxviii-ix).

Therefore, it would be wrong to reduce the crisis only to ethnic hatreds and different identities. These occasions prove that despite the linguistic and religious differences, the two peoples could and did move together. In this sense, we encounter the role of leaders, the conjuncture and the role of outside powers and their stance as crucial to the outbreak of the crisis and exasperation.

In this chapter, the historical centrality of Kosovo, in Serbian and Albanian histories is analyzed to understand how those conflicting histories were utilized in 1980s and 1990s to aggravate the situation. Although there are facts that the appearance of Milosevic on the anniversary of Kosovo War, 28 June, in Gazimestan may be seen as an accident since Stambolic<sup>11</sup> could have appeared there himself despite sending his protégé, it is also a fact that Slobodan Milosevic had learned history well and was undoubtedly a politician who knew how to exploit a people for whom the past is everything (Sell, 2002).

The Kosovo historian Noel Malcolm also emphasizes that the past is always important in understanding the claims and the context of the contemporary times. In the Serbian history, the religion and political myths become critical as they have been adopted upon Kosovar land. In the case of Albania, again, the land is claimed to be first occupied by the Albanians and the land of the League of Prizren. Although such claim of being the first to conquer or inhabit may seem parochial, those

---

<sup>11</sup> Stambolic was a romantic Communist, being similar to Tito in his political views. Thus, if he had appeared in Kosovo on that particular day, the course of events could be slightly different, in their timing at least.

historical break points are the fundamentals of peoples of the Balkan region. Such claims of being first to come, originate in a certain piece of land had been the gravity of their identity as a people and therefore such historical stories have to be taken into account in order to understand the fundamentals of the conflict that escalated in 1999.

### **3.3. Kosovo in the Serbian History**

The place of Kosovo in Serbian history has been one of the most critical reasons behind the Kosovo Crisis, especially when this history was in conflict with the history of the Kosovar Albanians. According to the conventional Serbian view, Kosovo was populated by mainly the Serbs until the last decades and was always a sacrosanct term for the Serbs who would be proud of repeating, in a fashion of liturgy, that “Kosovo is Serbia” (Judah, 2000: xviii, 2). Such pride and incessant championing of sheltering Kosovo as a Serbian heartland have its roots in the famous Battle of Kosovo of 28 June 1389. Since then, Kosovo had always been a “national spiritual mission” for the Serbs to preserve rather than being a usual territorial target for diplomatic/political or militaristic ends (Healy, 1997: 67).

The Battle of Kosovo has forever gravely a “martyrological” image of Serbia and therefore meant that regardless of demographic or political realities, Kosovo would be a taboo for the Serbs. As Thomas A. Emmert writes in his article, there was “the ethos of Kosovo” which brewed generations to “avenge the loss of Serbian freedom at Kosovo and liberate all Serbs from oppression”; this is why the Serbian historical consciousness never did and still do not concede the idea and practice of a multinational state (Emmert, 2003: 167). In this chapter, the sacred place of Kosovo

in the Serbian history and historical consciousness will be given to understand why it was easy for Milosevic to consolidate his power by touching upon such vulnerability of the Serbian people.

### **3.4. 1297: Establishment of Bishopric in Pec (Peja in Albanian)**

At the root of the sacrosanctity of Kosovo in the Serbian history there is the establishment of a new Bishopric in Pec, Kosovo, in the year 1297. Until 1219, the Serbs were between the two Christian Churches, Catholic and the Orthodox ones. For instance, Stefan Nemanja had asked the Roman Catholic Church for blessing while his brother Sava had been blessed in accordance with the Orthodox tradition. Sava became more successful and in 1219 he acquired autocephalus status<sup>12</sup> from the Orthodox Patriarch in Constantinople. From then on, for a long time, the Nemanja dynasty found most support from the Church. Hence, the state and Serbian identity cannot be separated easily. Unlike many other contemporaries, not the nobility, but the Church was a sine-quo-non for the support and existence of the state and authority of the monarch. And Nemanjics well understood and exploited this strong link between the Church and state. They were “church-builders”; and they built most famous ones of those Churches in Raska and Kosovo such as Patriarchate in Gracanica and Monastery of Visoki Decani (High Decani) in western part of Kosovo (Judah, 2000: 3).

The vital place of the Church was not only crucial for the existence and continuity of the state itself, but the the expansion and strengthening of the territories of the

---

<sup>12</sup> Autocephalus status meant that the Church was rooted in its own nationality. For instance, Macedonia and the Ukraine had no such status and theirs respectively were located in Pec and Moscow.

Medieval Kingdom of Serbia and the establishment of the Bishopric coincide (Bideleux and Jeffies, 2007: 514). It believed and emphasized that only after the establishment in Pec, Kosovo, the Medieval Kingdom expanded and reached its the peak.

### **3.5. 1389, The Battle of Kosovo: Myth and Martyrdom**

In 1389, Murat I of the Ottomans attacked Serbia whose geography and mineral resources were desired. Tsar Lazar, who had never declared himself “king of Serbia” was the leader of Serbian army (Pavlowitch, 2002: 9-10). The battle was fought in the field of Kosovo (Kosovo Polje) near Pristina and both the Tsar and the Sultan died on the battlefield. Ottomans nevertheless occupied the land.

The myth, however, was to be extremely powerful for the Serbs that the fallen Prince, Lazar, had to choose between the kingdom of earth and kingdom of heaven. Kingdom of earth would mean that he was to win the Battle of Kosovo and Kingdom of Heaven would mean that he would lose the battle but win eternal life in heaven. He in the end chose the Kingdom of Heaven and became a martyr in the battlefield. From 1389 onwards, both the anniversary of the Battle of Kosovo, 28 June and this notion of martyrdom have constituted a great place for the Serbian identity and historical consciousness. Kosovo would always be of an “emotional resonance” since then for the Serbian people and naturally, for the politicians. Slobodan Milosevic would not find it hard to use the myth of Kosovo and speak to the hearts and emotions of the Serbian people by referring to Kosovo and the martyrdom of Serbs there. Serbs think of Kosovo as their “cradle” from where they, as a people, came to be (Danreuther, 2001: 13-4).

### **3.6. Kosovo and Metohija**

For the Serbs, Kosovo is not 'Kosovo' merely but "Kosovo and Metohija". Metohija was standing for the 'land of monasteries'. Even such referral that have been voiced for centuries, is a strong sign that the Serbs, as Orthodox people have a strong tie to the land. On 4 March 1989, Matija Beckovic, the President of the Serbian Writers' Association, stated that "Kosovo's soil had absorbed so much Serbian blood and had been home to so many sacred Serbian relics and graves that it would remain Serbian even if not a single Serb remains there" (Bideleux and Jeffries, 2007: 514).

### **3.7. Kosovo for the Serbs until the Balkan Wars**

Serbs, until the outbreak of the Balkan Wars, would rather disregard the Albanians and Muslims in the region by forcing them to expulsion and in 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries, blaming the Albanians for the Austrian repression and attacks. For Serbs, 1683 Vienna defeat was a result of mass Albanian immigration to Kosovo and when the Habsburgs were at the peak of their military power, they conquered Belgrade in 1688. After Belgrade, the Austrians moved into the Balkans and occupied Nis, later Macedonia and Kosovo (Pavlowitch, 2002: 19). Serbs, therefore had to move to Vojvodina leaving Kosovo in 1690. This forced movement of the Serbs from Kosovo to Vojvodina, in their historical consciousness is their second great defeat (Ramet, 2001: 30-1).

After the return of the Ottomans in 1739, Ottoman Empire restored order in the Balkans, but the Serbs were moved by this second defeat and continued to define their selves always in relation to their Church. An important example of the respect

and adherence of the Serbs to their Church can be easily perceived in a 1772 catechism which had emphasized Prince Lazar's cult and legend of Kosovo in order to have a pan-Slavic tone put Serbian identity as it follows ((Pavlowitch, 2002: 23):

Question: Who are you?

Answer: I am a human being, a Serb, a Christian...

Q: Why do you call yourself a Serb?

A: I call myself a Serb because of my birth and of my language, which is that of the people from whom I originate and who call themselves Serbs.

Kosovo, was always and still is thought by the Serbs as "the Old Serbia."

The Congress of Berlin in 1878 was another turning event in Serbian political history. It convened with the promise of storing a new order in the Balkans. It was followed by the defeat of the Ottomans by the Serbs and Montenegrins with the support of the Russians following a bad harvest in 1875. Montenegro and Serbia had become sovereign kingdoms in 1882 and expanded to the south-east. Serbia immediately initiated southern expansion for Macedonia which consisted of important vilayets of Bitola, Kosovo and Salonika. The Treaty of Berlin restored the existence of "Albanophone inhabitants" in the vilayet of Kosovo and the League of Prizren was established there. This League was basically a movement, which promoted Albanian nationalism. The League demanded Albanian speaking officials and Albanian-language schools (Benson, 2001: 7-11). Such demands of the Albanians were to be reacted by referring to the claims of Great Serbia/Greater Serbia.

### **3.8. The Balkan Wars, 1913 Memorandum of Belgrade and the Aftermath**

The Balkan Wars, starting in 1912, was another turning point in the region, again having deep repercussions in the conflict between the Albanians and the Serbs in Kosovo. 1912 became a year of “systematic hostility and hatred” in the region with the imposition of policies by the Serbs and Montenegrins. According to the Serbs, the Balkan Wars, the first was a “liberation war” for the Serbs of Kosovo from the hands of an alien rule (For the Albanians, however, this war was a colonialist one) (Malcolm, 1998: xxxi). After the Balkan Wars, state of Albania was created and this was an automatic throwback for the Serbian ambitions whose access to Adriatic Sea had been cut, but to their advantage they were given Kosovo (Danreuther, 2001: 14). This military occupation of Kosovo by the Serbs was to be proven critical in the upcoming decades.

In 1913, a memorandum was sent by Belgrade to the great powers which entailed three justifications for Serbian rule in Kosovo (Malcolm, 1998: xxxi):

1. The moral right of a more civilized people;
2. The historic right to an area containing the Patriarchate buildings of the Serbian Orthodox Church and had before been a part of Medieval Serbian Empire; (Kosovo was described as “Jerusalem of the Serbs)
3. Ethnographic right that at some time in the past Kosovo had had a majority Serbian population.<sup>13</sup>

This memorandum is exemplary for the rest of Serbian policy making and perception in the future Yugoslavia and it signified that the Serbs would not let Kosovo out easily. The huge influence of this memorandum can be seen in its replication after almost seven decades by the Serbian Academy of Sciences would publish (although

---

<sup>13</sup> Those claims, though, are rejected by the author by putting out that Serbia had not been a political whole for long years and that the main center for the medieval Serbia was not Kosovo but Rascia (Raska).

it was supposed to be secret document, it was leaked to the press) a similar manifesto claiming Kosovo to be the cradle of nation with hatred and hostility towards the Albanians.

As the following paragraphs would also show, 1986 memorandum, similar to its 1913 antecedent, is very important as an academic support trying to legitimize the antagonistic attitude of the Serbs against the Albanians. In the memorandum, Vladimir Dedijev examined Tito's role during the WWII and his policies were heavily criticized. The main criticism was unsurprisingly on the 1974 Constitution. Tito's policy of initiating a slight turn towards market economy in a very rudimentary form from 1965 onwards left an economically powerless Yugoslavia, which was a further opportunity for Milosevic to exploit the people in his own nationalist narratives more successfully. An important phrase existed, that is of vital importance for this thesis, that Kosovo was a "litmus test" to verify that an anti-Serb coalition was being established in order to enfeeble the Serbs (Lampe, 2003: 346-8). Such narratives were used whenever the Serbs seemed to be on the 2<sup>nd</sup> place to the other nationalities in Yugoslavia, it was the same after the end of the World Wars and the same during the era of Tito.

Kosovo was included in Yugoslavia after the end of the WWI in 1919 despite the Albanian population's and particularly Kosovo Committee's attempts. This inclusion may in a small part be related to the unflinching fight the Serbs gave during the War. Moreover, the heroic fighting of the Serbs in WWI created such a historical consciousness amongst the Serbian people that they simply challenged any state in the form of multi-nationality after the end of WWI. Again, in WWII the Serbs were

to be proud of their martyrdom as well. It is not difficult to see that the ethos of Kosovo and the heroic and martyrological image of Serbia were great motifs to build a national image (Djordjevic, 2003: 167). It may be safely claimed that one of the most important themes in this thesis is the understanding those turning points in the histories of these peoples creating an inextricable historical consciousness in them. Thus, if we need to give a formula that shaped the attitude and politics of the two peoples it is simply the addition of Kosovo in its material form and Kosovo with its mythological form along with the sacrifices and heroic battles fought.

### **3.9. Kosovo in Albanian History**

Illyrians were a branch of the ancient Dardanians (Darnanae are claimed to be the first inhabitants of the Balkans. Albanians claimed to have descended from this tribe around 3<sup>rd</sup> B.C. around Scutari (Shkoder) and the bay of Kotor. Illyrians supposedly inhabited in the most parts of the Western Balkans before the arrival of intruders. Slavs had come to the region around 600 A.D. Serbia and Greece had also had Albanian minorities (Logoreci, 1997). The contemporary borders between Albania and Kosovo had come into being at Versailles Treaty, where the Albanians believe that they had been betrayed by Britain and France. For Albanians, Kosovo was divided from Albania in order to satisfy Britain and France's war time ally, Serbia (Pettifer, 2005: 25-7). Serbia, in WWI fought against the Germans and had been kind of a buffer zone. After WWI, Kosovo was included into the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes (Danreuther, 2001: 14).

### **3.10. The Story of Albanian National Identity and Kosovo**

Just as Kosovo is a symbol and center of Serbian religion, identity and national sentiments, it is as important as a symbol and center of Albanian nationalism. Konstandin Cekrezi, as quoted by Noel Malcolm, contends that the fundamentals of the Albanian national identity rest on the myth that the “Albanians are the most ancient race in southeastern Europe...the descendants of the earliest Aryan immigrants who were represented in historical times by the kindred Illyrians, Macedonians and Epirots” (Malcolm, 1998: 70-81). The Balkan Peninsula was claimed to be native land of the Albanians, for which Kosovo is critical with the League of Prizren.

### **3.11. The League of Prizren**

The Ottoman reforms were accelerated around the 1800s in order to avoid dissolution of the Empire and these reforms had worked for the advantage of the Albanians. The Albanians enjoyed a “liberalized life” and were allowed to establish schools in their language from the year 1912, mainly. However, the Treaty of San Stefano signed in March 1878 created a Greater Bulgaria and showed the signs of a Greater Serbia. Against the negative consequences of the Treaty of San Stefano, on June 10, 1878, the League of Prizren was convened. The main aims of the League were two: seeking independence and seeking autonomy. The November 1878 meeting had set up the agenda of “employment of local officials speaking Albanian language, schools, the right to elect a general assembly and the right to use revenue taxes for local needs” (Kola, 2003: 8-9).

### **3.12. The Balkan War (8 October 1912) and the Independence of Albania**

The Balkan Peninsula was giving signals of instability since the Congress of Berlin. According to Edwin E. Jacques, the expansionist policies of Serbia, Montenegro, Bulgaria and Greece were to start a war when the Porte had recognized the Albanian administrative autonomy. The Balkan Alliance was formed immediately and they had agreed a secret agreement sharing the Albanian land, before declared war on the Ottomans in October. Fighting against the Ottomans gave them the easy subterfuge of invading the Albanian land and the first bullet was fired in Shkodra to surround the fortress of Shkodra. In November, the northern and central Albania were in the hands of the Serbians (Jacques, 2009: 274).

The irony was that when the Serbs arrived in Kosovo, they were so excited and frenzied that they now possessed Kosovo that they could not understand that there were only a small number of Serbs in the land (Kola, 2003: 12). In 1913, against the memoranda given by the Serbs, Greeks and Montenegrins, Austria and Italy were on the side of the Albanian cause against Russia who was a natural supporter of Serbia. The Conference in London, as pointed above, shrank the northern Albanian borders and gave Kosovo to Serbia. Although the Conference chairman Sir Edward Grey had assigned a commission to work in Albania in order to fix the borders, this plan was never realized due to the predicament created by those Balkan states' troops in Albania (Ibid: 14-5).

“Committee for the National Defense of Kosovo”, the ‘Kosovo Committee’ in simpler terms, under the leadership of Hasan Prishtina worked hard in its lobbying

and attempts to gather the attention of the international actors in order to include Kosovo in the new Albanian state. In their attempts the Committee opted to work and to show their cause as a peaceful, fair and legitimate cause; in their agenda it was a priority not to respond to the Serbs in a violent manner. The movement was known as “Kaçak movement” and it was mainly supported by the Italians. It was not a violent movement and it even sent a clear message to the rebels to show their reactions in a way not damaging houses and churches (Malcolm, 1998: 271-4). The Kaçak movement was not successful however and it was quelled by Albanian leader Ahmed Zogu (Bideleux and Jeffies, 2007: 522). Such stance of the Kosovo Committee prior to the formation of the Albanian state and later in the issue of annexing Kosovo is very similar to Ibrahim Rugova’s attitude to show itself later.

Although Albania was given independence, it was not represented in the Paris Peace Conference in 1919. And northern parts were added to Yugoslavia while Greece had got the southern part. Later, petitions to the League of Nations to unite Kosovo with Albania were not heeded.

### **3.13. Yugoslavia in the Inter-War Period**

After the end of WWI Yugoslavia<sup>14</sup> was established with the name of ‘The Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes’ in which Serbians were clearly dominant and the ruler was the Serbian Prince Aleksander Karadjorjevic. Noel Malcolm emphasizes the fact that at the time Kosovo was not an official part of Yugoslavia but it was simply dragged as an integral part of Serbia without a legal certainty.

---

<sup>14</sup> The name of ‘Yugoslavia’ was officially given later in 1929.

In 1929, Yugoslavia got divided into nine governorships, *banovinas* in Serbian, and the boundaries each banovina was drawn in such a way not to allow one group of people to live in a homogeneous way. Kosovo itself was divided among three peoples: Vardarska, Moravska and Zetska. Vardarska included the territory of Macedonia and its capital Skopje. Moravska included the east parts of Serbia and Nis. Zetska included the whole of Montenegro with the center of Cetinje. The point is that there was a heterogenous composition and the governors of the bonavinas were appointed from the center from military hard-liners such as General Krsto Smiljanic, one of the members of the White Head nationalist terrorist organization. Furthermore, these governors were also the harbinger of a progeny of hard-liner, nationalist and authoritarian figures such as future Prime Minister Vojislav Marinkovic, Milan Stojadinovic and Dmitrije Ljotic (Malcolm, 1998: 283). It was the initiations of such leaders who perpetrated the confiscations and oppression of the Albanian population, which only was to be alleviated under Tito's rule.

## **Conclusion**

It is not difficult to understand why the two peoples cling to their past and thought in relation to the international context, the conflicts that have been fought in the history books' pages fed itself and culminated in 1999 in Kosovo. It is into such a context that the NATO intervention was ordered.

## **CHAPTER IV**

### **THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION and YUGOSLAVIA after WWII**

The context of the Cold War is immensely important for both the internal developments experienced in the former Yugoslavia, and Kosovo in particular and also the escalation of the Crisis. Without looking at the events of the post-WWII era in the context of the Cold War, one cannot accurately interpret the events that led to intervention. Without a communist past, without a Russia that had seen Yugoslavia inside its sphere of influence and without a debate on the *raison d'être* of NATO after the end of the Cold war, the Crisis and the intervention would not have matured into the conditions it presented in that particular manner.

#### **4.1. The Immediate post-WWII Developments**

At the end of WWII, after the Germans pulled out of Northern Albania and Kosovo and Kosovo was seized by Yugoslavia. Although the issue of Kosovo did not come on table in Yalta Conference, Great Britain had showed consent for Tito's Partisan Movement in Teheran Conference. Tito himself could not try to exclude Kosovo from Yugoslavia because he knew that "only by retaining Kosovo within

Yugoslavian borders could he hope to win over the Serbs to the Communist cause” (Logoreci, 1977: 82-7).

In 1945, Albanians were recognized as a “nationality” rather than a “nation”. A nationality was short of a nation in its prospects of being an independent state (Malcolm, 1998: 327-8). When a group of people were named as a “nationality”, this meant that these people were short of being capable of forming a state mainly because their fellows lived in a different country or dispersed in other countries.

#### **4.2. Tito v. Stalin**

The Soviet Union and Yugoslavia, as the so-called Tito-Stalin split reveals, did not have close relations. And in the case of Albanian relations with the Soviet Union, although the lack of common frontiers between the two countries prevented intense liaison, Hoxha used to rely on Stalin for a balance against Yugoslavia. After all, the main fear of the Albanians was that Yugoslavia might have tried to attempt at controlling Albania. In 1953 Balkan Pact, Albania saw realization of such fear. It was Khrushchev who tried to improve Albanian relations and ease fear of the latter. But Tito continued his stubbornness when he sent to Moscow Kardelj instead of himself and also refused to sign the statement that the Soviet Union was the leader of the international communist movement (Logoreci, 1977: 113-23).

After the death of Stalin, Soviet policy of coexistence with the West was being criticized by Mao’s China. This split between the Soviet Union and China improved relations between the former and its allies in Europe. In May 1959 Khrushchev went to Albania from where he reminded Italy and Greece not to allow NATO establish

nuclear bases in their territories and also he wanted to prevent any ties between Albania and China disregarding the Soviet Union. But Khrushchev's attempts at winning Albania over China were fruitless as in the 1961 November meeting of the 81 Communist Parties in Moscow Khrushchev criticized harshly the Albanian foreign policy. It was in 1971 after the 1968 Czechoslovak Crisis coupled with Tito's reforms that Albania decided to reshape its foreign policy and started diplomatic relations with Yugoslavia (Ibid: 125-136).

### **4.3. The Measures of Josip Broz Tito**

Tito is particularly important with his Kosovo policy because it was during his term that the Albanian people found opportunity to experience their own cultural and educational, linguistic terms rather than being suppressed as in the terms of the former leaders. Noel Malcolm categorizes the intention of Tito into three in applying reforms that gave kind of autonomy to the Albanians in Kosovo in their daily lives. The first of Tito's motives as the respect to the rights of the Albanians and those measures were mainly stemmed from the demands of the unsatisfied Albanian population and thus implemented rather in a half-hearted fashion. The second form of measures were rather genuine and lastly some of his measures were guided by pragmatic reasons with no regard to the Albanian people but the purpose being the direction of the Serbian people to Vojvodina for colonization attempts (Malcolm, 1998: 314). Thus it can be argued that, genuinely or not, Tito implemented some measures that kind of distracted the balance in Kosovo in favor of the Albanians and contributed to the Albanian revival of nationalism/irredentism in Kosovo.

The measures of Tito, in the future, were going to form the complementary part of the Albanian arguments that they were the majority and they had an established order and thus they were righteous in their demand for independence. During 1960s and 1970s Albanians gained status of autonomous province and as a Kosovar nationality rather than being merely a regional council. And one of the most important concessions that the Albanians got during the term of Tito was the fall of Aleksander Rankovic, the chief of secret police, which however added to the Serb paranoia (Bideleux and Jeffies, 2007: 528). The intolerance between the two peoples was so obvious that whenever one side had a concession or prevalence, it simultaneously added to the paranoia of the other side.

After the Soviet-Albanian rift in 1960s and student demonstrations in 1968, the Serbian suffix of 'Metohija' was deleted from the name of the region and in January 1969, the Serbian Parliament granted Kosovo a legislature and a Supreme Court of its own. Pristina University was founded and the League of Communists of Kosovo (LCK) was given greater autonomy.

In 1974, Kosovo along with Vojvodina became constituent parts of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (SFRY). But again, Kosovo was not given the status of nation, but still was recognized as a nationality. In the Constitution of 1974, Yugoslavia was defined as "a Federal Republic of free and equal nations and nationalities" ((Malcolm, 1998: 328). In 1978, Fadil Hoxha, an Albanian Kosovar, for the first time, was elected as Vice-President of the nine-member state presidency of the SFRY and later to the League of Communists of Yugoslavia (LCY) (Bideleux and Jeffies, 2007: 529-30).

Those reforms of Tito were immensely important for the course of events. This is not to say that the Albanian population used the policy of Tito successfully and their demand for independence was merely a continuance of Tito era measures. But just as it happened in disintegration of the Soviet Union, when a people are given rights and forms of autonomy they would always ask for more. It is undeniable that Gorbachev did his reforms not in a vision of disintegrating the Union, he only wanted to gather support for his reforms from the peoples of the Soviet Union but in the end peoples were not satisfied. As Gorbachev opened the system, they wanted him to open even more and in the end the collapse materialized. An analogy therefore with the independence of Kosovo is not irrelevant though the conditions and the context were not exactly the same.

Tito's cosmopolitan Kosovo policy is also indicative of the fact that the relations with the Soviet Union were not very bright because whereas Tito was more in favor of national rights and tried to create a pot-pourri of peoples in a harmony in order to avoid history repeating itself in further Balkanizing the region. The nationality policy of the two federations being the subject of another paper, this section will suffice by giving the Yugoslav-Russian relations in order to be enlightened about the Russians' attitude towards the Yugoslav developments.

#### **4.4. The Legacy of Communism and Milosevic's Appeasement to the Serbian People**

For the sake of elimination of an over-simplification of the rivalry among the two peoples by referral to the history only, one should also heed to the legacy of communist past. In 1989, it was easily observable that the economy was too weak to handle a crisis. There was no social ownership system and there was a very feeble economic system that would not be able to implement a stabilization programme. Thus as the economy deteriorated, real income levels plummeted with the soaring inflation (Lampe, 2003: 332).

An important role leading to the escalation of the crisis was played by the domestic political conditions and the Communist Party's internal frictions in the Communist Party. The rivalry of the Party officials was an important source of the exasperation of the ethnic and cultural tensions between the peoples. When such internal tensions coalesced with the collapse of the Soviet Union, a scene appeared where the peoples simply were deplorable in all dimensions of social and political terms. The over-emphasis on the investment in heavy industry in the past was also pointed to as a root of economic hardships in the region. The member of the Serbian Cultural Committee, Tihomir Vlaskalic was perspicacious with his view that because of over-emphasis on heavy industry, agriculture was neglected (Malcolm, 1998: 336).

Yugoslavia, in effect, died in 1991. In July 1991, there was secession within secession in the Federation. Firstly, with the collapse, the League of Communists was no longer the sole and effective authority to provide order for the people from one center. Second, economic crisis began in 1989 with no hint of a recovery soon.

Economic tensions also worked to increase polarization and become a catalyst for dissolution because the Serbs were claiming that they were the ones “carrying the burden” and subsidizing rest of the Federation (Nimni, 1991). These conditions such as unemployment (ascended to 57 % in 1989), hyperinflation after period of fixed prices<sup>15</sup> and when everybody had a job, forced the people to question the whole structure of the Federation. The ousting of the Federation’s tensions was thus done through referrals to the ethnic origin and religion (Lampe, 2003: 332-43).

From 1982, Serbian nationalist writers<sup>16</sup> became very popular with their writings that assailed Tito’s Kosovo policy harshly. The reports of the media are very clear in depicting the antagonistic themes between the peoples. For instance in 1986 the Belgrade Media gave reports in voicing the view of people as “other republics using the federation to discriminate against Serbia” and in such reports the emphases were always on the past events, opportunities, betrayals, heroism and so forth. Slobodan Milosevic was the new hero of the Serbs similar to the past heroes like Obilic, Tsar Dusan and Karadjordje. New songs started to be written for him (Duijzings, 2000: 197-8):

*My dear brothers, a new era has started  
Milosevic ‘Slobo’ is born  
A true hero, with a great heart,  
He fights for the twentieth-century Serbia.*

It was a grievance for the Serbs that Kosovo and Vojvodina were added as separate parts of the Federation therefore reducing the power of the voice of the Serbian

---

<sup>15</sup> Socialist economy tended to overestimate the health of national economy. In accounting the national income, not gross national product (GDP) was utilized but GSP (Gross Social Product) was preferred. The reason why the Communist regime used GSP rather than GDP or GNP was that GSP would give high growth rates for an industrial economy. For further information, see Bideleux and Jeffies, p. 530.

<sup>16</sup> Examples were Vuk Draskovic, Dobrica Cosic, Antonije Isakovic, Veselin Djuretic. These writers, no need for clarification, were historical revisionists. For further information see Bideleux and Jeffies, p. 531.

people, with Serbia's vote in the Parliament was only 1/8. In order to reverse those losses, in 1988 amendments were done to the Serbian Constitution to keep Kosovo and Vojvodina more under influence (Lampe, 2003: 349).

#### **4.5. The Reactions of the Kosovar Albanians**

As the Serbs' nationalist tendencies seemed to bubble, it was the same in the Albanian camp. In 1984, the arguments for nationalism by the Albanians were very strong and this was most visible in the work of the Kosovar historian Hajredin Hoxa who published a study of 1943-4 Bujan Conference. Bujan Conference was significant for the Albanian nationalism in the sense that it was the platform where for the first time the right to secession had been enunciated (Malcolm, 1998: 337).

There is an undeniable organic link between the collapse of communism and the vanguard party and the recommencing of the issue of national question. The resentment that had long been possessed by the Albanians was soon to be ousted. Towns of Diber, Gostivar and Tetovo started to be reclaimed (Vickers and Pettifer, 1997: 169-71).<sup>17</sup> The political discourse was turning promptly into an inimical one with mostly the referrals to the past unfair actions and the unfinished businesses. In terms of the Albanians, Ibrahim Rugova, western educated, came on the scene and became the leader of the Democratic League for Kosovo (LDK) in December 1989 (Lampe, 2003: 408). The initial agenda was a return to the 1974 Constitution with the autonomies that had been granted by "father Tito".

---

<sup>17</sup> These towns were claimed to be given to Serbia in 1913 for the aim of ensuring Serbian support in the upcoming wars and also to assuage the Russians.

Ibrahim Rugova, the leader of LDK, was a peaceful resister. His policy was directed towards gaining the attention of the international community and he saw the legitimate cause in non-violent resistance. He was a post-modern secularist with no communist past and if there is a leader amongst the Balkan leaders to whom he could be compared, he is Izetbegovic with his quiescent attitude and being outside the communist apparatus. Rugova's most prominent achievement in the whole process was to create a parallel state with own facilities, schools and everything so that when the opportunity presented itself, the extant Serbian state could be expelled and the parallel state could become the legitimate one. It should be reiterated that the school curriculums were an important part of the debates and rebellions.

#### **4.6. Issue of Kosovo from Yugoslav Dissolution to the Escalation of Tensions in 1998 Spring**

Ibrahim Rugova on the side of the Albanians and Slobodan Milosevic on the side of the Serbians were not alone in their power to appoint those peoples' destiny. Rugova was for independence of Kosovo; he did not want a union with Albania. Rugova was reliant on Sali Berisha, non-Communist president of Albania. Though it was hard to keep such reliance when Berisha opted for retracting Albania's support for independence of Kosovo because of Western diplomatic pressure, as it will be seen Albania was also not in a luxury to challenge the West especially given the economic hardships of the country (Ibid: 411). But it should also be pointed out that the retraction of Berisha's support was nowhere near downgrading the Albanians' resistance in Kosovo. The Albanian Diaspora throughout the world reacted with the

tone of clear discontent. Especially when the students were forced to join the Yugoslav Army (JNA) they started to form their own guerilla organizations.

The Dayton Accords is one of the most important turning points for the Kosovo Crisis. It was in these Accords that Milosevic simply saved Kosovo under his influence by accepting Dayton and excluding the issue of Kosovo from the negotiation table (Ibid). It could be claimed that the Dayton Accords concluded with kind of face-saving measures, being a disappointment considering from the viewpoint of the Muslim population. No wonder that the implementation of the measures was also a disappointment and thus the result was less than an independent state. To make things worse still, Dayton Accords simply allowed Milosevic to fully turn his attention towards Kosovo which the Serbs were surely unwilling to grant secession. The problem for the USA was that they had two choices; they would either get involved in a fight they did not start and risk the lives of their own citizens or simply ignore the crisis and let the slaughter go on and feed itself.

It was in June 1998 that NATO, under mostly the influence of Tony Blair, started to express the intention to use force if the conditions did not improve in favor of the Albanians. But there was a clear of lack of accurate agenda here because in the summer of 1998 no one was agreed on the ultimate objective of a future use of force: was it going to result in a cease fire only or a complete cessation. It must be because of this very lack of clarity that NATO and the American officials were equivocal about the possible use of force: trying to use carrots and sticks to see which would work better. For example in October 1998, it was seen that the lifting of the sanctions by the USA which were put in February, was reacted antithetically by Serbia which

chose to respond with increasing atrocities rather than signaling amelioration (Pavehouse and Goldstein, 1999: 539).

Here, a very important distinction between Bosnia and Kosovo should be drawn in order to understand the stance of the international society and the USA and Russia in particular. Unlike the Bosnians in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Kosovar Albanians were more vulnerable and defenseless because Bosnia bordered the Croatians and the Slovenes who could successfully defend their territory while in Albania the only force against the Serbs was the KLA. Secondly, Kosovo was a Serbian province and despite the Albanians' being the majority with almost 90% of the population in late 1990s and also Kosovo was very central to Serbian identity as explained above. Therefore, Dayton and the retreat of Milosevic in Bosnia are not applicable directly to the context of the Kosovo crisis. Kosovo was not as easy a territory as Bosnia to give up although in economic terms it was quite poor (Ibid).

Kosovo was also significant because the crisis escalated at a time when NATO expansion to the East was a hot issue in world politics. Russia, as expected, had objections towards such eastward expansion but because of newly-repaired relations with the West at an economically hard time, Yeltsin and his entourage were careful not to alienate US President Clinton and the German Chancellor Kohl. Despite Yeltsin's Foreign Minister Primakov had sent warnings to the NATO expansion, Russia could not say much. In June 1997 Russia was admitted to G-7 which became G-8, the world's "most exclusive club" (Felkay, 2002: 163-7). Russia, simply was getting closer to the West.

#### **4.7. UÇK (Kosovo Liberation Army, KLA) and UÇK vs. JNA**

UÇK was a traditional guerrilla organization which was rather romantic and resided in mountains and by the rivers. Prior to KLA a similar group was formed by Bujar Bukoshi, under the acronym of `FARK`. The KLA, as the Mitrovica Serbs themselves in Kosovo, were a subversive group to further the ends of prevailing at the cost of the other group. UÇK's image is a bifurcated one. While some define it as a guerilla organization, others see it as a terrorist organization because the casualties it had committed were killed in ambushes rather than in open fightings. What is certain about the organization is that it was the only weapon of the Albanians in fighting against the Yugoslav National Army, JNA (Yugoslav National Army).

UÇK's recorded attacks had begun in April 1996, and this date coincides unsurprisingly with the date of EU recognition of the Yugoslav Federation. It should also not be forgotten that Kosovo had been governed under emergency laws from Belgrade since 1989, which as time went by, added to tension and guerilla attacks by the UÇK. The Albanians in Kosovo saw that they were alone and may have thought that they had nothing to lose and that they were left to the power of themselves. Therefore, not hoping mercy of Albanian state and resenting the EU recognition, UÇK seemed to be the only hinge for the Albanians in Kosovo.

#### **4.8. 1997 Crisis in Albania**

In spring of 1997, the fall of Sali Berisha stroke alongside an economic and political crisis. Berisha's government was morally and politically a supporter of LDK<sup>18</sup>, being also the only government to recognize Kosovo Republic (Malcolm, 1998: 354-5). Albanian army literally collapsed amidst such economic and political crisis indicating that the Kosovar Albanians would be devoid of Albanian backing in their struggle from Spring 1997 onwards. However, despite being devoid of such political support on the international arena, the government collapse was also good news for the UÇK because it was easier to find weapons in such a chaotic environment.

#### **4.9. Russian Financial Crisis in 1998**

Eastern Europe had a very hard time recovering from the transition from the socialist economy. The Russian financial crisis in particular made things worse as given in an exemplary story in the *Economist*: "Before the Russian financial crisis of 1998, Mr. Ojog sold his tomatoes for almost a dollar a kilo; now he gets ten cents."<sup>19</sup> Russia defaulted on its debt when the money was dragged away immediately as it always does in a financial turmoil. Ruble simply collapsed with causing a massive inflation rate plummeting the rate of the standard of living (Yeltsin, 2000: 196).<sup>20</sup> Russia had to finance itself through selling treasury bonds called 'Short-Term Government Bonds' (GKO).

---

<sup>18</sup> Sali Berisha had strong and multiple far-flung family ties in Kosovo. Himself was an Albanian Northerner (named locally as 'Gheg' while the Southerners were called 'Tosk'). Berisha was initially in favor of a union with Kosovo but later he had opted out from such union.

<sup>19</sup> September 23, 2000. *The Economist*. Issue: 8189, p. 29.

<sup>20</sup> Yeltsin believes that one thing saved Russians from the collapse of the economy: it was because the Russians' confusion did not turn into a panic.

As interest rates soared to 150 % in one night and the IMF negotiation seemed to take too long to agree on and save Russia, Yeltsin had sent Anatoly Chubais to Washington to Clinton to negotiate debts. Clinton Administration was careful not to bail out Russia once more fully relying on itself therefore Clinton made a statement that he was going to negotiate the terms of borrowing of Russia from the IMF and World Bank. IMF offered 17 billion \$ emergency loan and made subsequent arrangements for saving Russia from bankruptcy (Felkay, 2002: 175-6).

Boris Yeltsin writes of the Autumn 1998 crisis as it follows: “That was the autumn I nearly disbanded the Duma. That was the autumn Russia’s economy dissolved into chaos. That was the autumn that almost tore us apart” (Yeltsin, 2000: 179). It was under such conditions that Yeltsin replaced Kiriyenko with the more powerful figure, Viktor Stepanovich Chernomyrdin as his Prime Minister (Yeltsin, 2000: 186).<sup>21</sup>

#### **4.10. Russia’s Stance at the UN: How reliable is Russia as an ‘ally’?**

For the sake of not diving too much into history, it is important to understand why the Russian Federation was seen as a natural ally as a country sharing the similar history, religion and culture with the Serbs and how such ‘alliance’ turned out to be inane and proved to be no more than an an age-old patron and protector relationship (Mac Kenzie, 1996: 3). At this point, a caveat has to be made that the histories are most significantly crucial in grasping the fact that the norms of the international

---

<sup>21</sup> Yeltsin writes that even his decision to appoint Chernoyrdin was tried to be challenged by the communists, who plotted to have their own candidate Yury Luzhkov, Moscow mayor be elected. This particular incident, where the will of Yeltsin and reformers against the will of the communists was in conflict, was a clear sign that internally Russia was not very peaceful.

society prevail even when the strong ties between ‘allies’ are at stake. Thus, as much as the histories and national myths and affinities there is another element mattering a great deal: international society’s norms and values.

From these points, in analyzing the Russian stance towards the crisis, not just the conflicting histories and stories should be given and then conclude that the crisis was inevitable but also that Russia did what it did because at the end of the day it was more a part of the international society than being a natural ally of Serbia.

It was seemed *prima facie* that Russia, undoubtedly, would have never affirmed whole-heartedly when an intervention in Yugoslavia, especially on the Serbs, was on table. As implied above, there were two very basic reasons; first the religious, historical and cultural ties<sup>22</sup> and secondly, Russia had its own minority and ethnic problems, thence not favoring a Western intervention attitude. Such view should have been adopted by Milosevic himself that he “assumed that he could count on Russia’s continued backing” and also by the public opinion in Russia (Hosmer, 2001: xv).

However, despite being guided by such political, historical, social and cultural ties Russian Federation chose to let Milosevic down because as stated in the first chapter, it was part of the international community that simply condemned Milosevic and moreover, it was an imminent financial breakdown problem which further forced Russia to decline from any direct military intervention on behalf of Serbia or arms supply. Stephen T. Hosmer (2001: 42) states that “Russia’s power projection

---

<sup>22</sup> This relationship was touched upon above as qualifying Russia as a natural ally, not in a strict and formal sense, but as a historical, religious and societal relations of the two peoples.

capabilities were extremely limited and the land and air routes to Serbia were controlled by the countries that supported the NATO campaign”. Besides, Moscow’s only direct way to the FRY was through sea through Montenegro’s Adriatic ports and this way was openly prone to blockade and interception (Hosmer, 2001: 43). Moscow was also reluctant to provoke the US because of its of economic and financial problems whose solution kind of rested in the hands of the Western powers.

The financial crisis that had started in 1997 in the Southeast Asia and had affected Russia in 1998 made Russia’s position very fragile in the negotiations on a political crisis involving one of its natural allies. Moreover, it was observable that the international society was decisive for Kosovo intervention. As Clinton predicted in one of his remarkable speeches, the international society (through NATO in this case) was to persist until it prevailed. China, with its distance and reluctance to challenge the international society was useless in this case in opposing the West in its intervention (Posen, 2000: 46-50).

Amidst such an environment, Boris Yeltsin knew that a powerful but still tamed foreign policy and powerful reformer figures<sup>23</sup> were key to recovering from the woes of transition from the socialist economy. Therefore, one should always bear in mind in analyzing the Russian stance towards the Crisis that Russia itself was going through very harsh times struggling with the old schools inside, political and economic crises. Therefore, while the international norms and values played in

---

<sup>23</sup> During Yeltsin’s presidency, his reformers were Chubais, Nemtsov and Kiriyenko. Yeltsin’s foreign ministers were Primakov and Ivanov and his prime ministers were Chernomyrdin, Kiriyenko, Primakov, Stepashin and Putin respectively. Of all these figures, Chernomyrdin, Primakov and Luzhkov were seen as the “heavyweights”.

important role in the shaping of the Russian stance, the internal confusions, tensions and conflicts also required a Russia that did not press the West on too much.

#### **4.11. Holbrooke Agreement**

In October 1998, US envoy Richard Holbrooke on the diplomatic mission prevented an air bombing campaign and got Milosevic agreed on the withdrawal of force from Kosovo and also allowing the entrance of about 200 unarmed observers (Redd, 2000: 167). Richard Holbrooke gave five factors for explaining the tragedy to the outer world (1998: 21-2):

“- A misreading of Balkan history,  
- The end of the Cold War,  
- The behavior of the Yugoslav leaders themselves,  
- The inadequate American response to the crisis,  
- The mistaken belief of the Europeans that they could handle their first post-Cold War challenge on their own.”

Holbrooke’s wisdom was not something to be debated. His journalist past and his way of understanding the locals was a well-known fact. He would go into the tents and homes of the locals to grasp the ongoing events on the ground deeply.<sup>24</sup> Thus, he was wise again in seeing both ways of the roots of the conflict. While historical enmity was not to be undermined, it was a fact that this enmity was utilized at a time of political and economic crisis by tyrannical elites. Holbrooke explains the ignorance of the West of the Balkans especially in 1990 and 1991 by stating that “...having lost its strategic importance in the eyes of the most Western policy makers, Yugoslavia fell to its death almost ignored by the West” (Holbrooke, 1998: 24).

---

<sup>24</sup> December 18, 2010. “Richard Holbrooke,” *The Economist*, p. 150.

Holbrooke Agreement and the endorsement of it by the UN can be shown as an indirect approval by the UN for the use of force in Kosovo because by accepting the terms of the Holbrooke agreement the UN also accepted that the use of force could be a reality. Nevertheless, Holbrooke Agreement was short of eliminating the ongoing conflicts. On 24 December 1998 the Serbs instigated Operation Horseshoe. On 15 January 1999, 45 Albanian civilians were reported to have been massacred. The violence was going on in the forests and the Serbians were kind of encouraged by the rather “unwillingness” of the West to genuinely end the offenses of Milosevic. As the following section shows, the Contact Group further delayed a hard and emergent response by the international society.

#### **4.12. Chernomyrdin in the Contact Group**

Because of the boiling tension and the predicament with massacres and refugees and smuggling in Kosovo, on May 10 1998, the Western media reported the seeking of an alternative solution in order to put an end to the war in Kosovo, through diplomatic means via Contact Group which was composed of the United States, Great Britain, France, Italy, Germany and Russia.<sup>25</sup> The Contact Group felt important pressure in order to pull Milosevic to the negotiation table with the Albanians in a manner that was in compliance with the norms and values of the international society. Yeltsin preferred Viktor Chernomyrdin as his negotiator.

At this point, as an important internal development for Russia, and also reflective of the Russian stance towards the Crisis, Yeltsin also dismissed Primakov as his Prime

---

<sup>25</sup> May 10, 1998. “To Prevent a Wider War in Kosovo”, *The New York Times*, [www.NYTimes.com](http://www.NYTimes.com)

Minister and replaced him with Sergei Stepashin to be replaced by Putin three months later.<sup>26</sup>

The pressure put on the Contact Group and the inclusion of Russia in it was sourced from a common apprehension that the Crisis would be a tool for intervening by various actors in and around the region, further escalating the conflict and the territorial, religious and historical disputes. It was known that the conflict would get wider and the Contact Group had the mission of avoiding such widening and deepening of the crisis. While trying to avoid a hard response, though, the Contact Group's weak response resulted in the escalation of the Crisis. The Times' main story for the rest of the year was on 'how far the Europeans were to submit to Russian blackmail through the Contact Group and allow Milosevic to conduct his offensive' (Pettifer, 2005: 169-71).

The first action carried out by the Contact Group was freezing the assets of Serbia in foreign countries and a ban was invoked to curtail any investment in Serbia. Such sanctions however would not be effective if not supported by mutual understanding of the repercussions of a future crisis therefore in the upcoming days Clinton had met Boris Yeltsin and later sent his envoy to Belgrade in order to seek understanding. It was also clear at this time that for the US and the West, use of force was not eliminated as an option.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> The successive dismissals and appointments could be understood as a harbinger of the Chechen War that erupted in the same year with the Kosovo Crisis in the month of August. Similar to Kosovo, in the Chechen War the method of fighting was also aerial bombing, this time the West being silent while Russia intervening in Chechnya.

<sup>27</sup> May 10, 1998. "To Prevent a Wider War in Kosovo", *The New York Times*, [www.NYTimes.com](http://www.NYTimes.com)

#### **4.13. Rambouillet**

On 6 February 1999, Peace Conference adjourned in Rambouillet<sup>28</sup>, France. Despite efforts of a three weeks' time, the officials of Yugoslavia were obdurate not to sign a deal. The Rambouillet talks had focused on four elements: general elements such as ending the violence immediately, going to free and fair elections and so on; governance in Kosovo; human rights and implementation of the agreement (Weller, 1999: 226).

On March 15 1999, the people in Novo Selo, a village in Kosovo where both Albanians and Serbians resided in a harmony, stated in an interview to the New York Times that if “the West gets serious, they [Belgrade] will sign.”<sup>29</sup> Such statement reveals the fact that foreign pressure was not abhorred or unwanted in Kosovo, but the people wanted more of it so that tranquility, even normal life, would not be a dream impossible to reach. Rambouillet, however got short of fulfilling those wishes.

#### **4.14. NATO's 78-Day Bombing Campaign**

NATO aerial campaign commenced on 24 March 1999 and it ended on 10 July 1999. The operation was planned in accordance with three main phases: firstly the Yugoslav air forces were to be destroyed, secondly, arms depots and armor of the Serbian forces were to be hit and finally 28000 NATO troops were going to be sent onto the ground to implement the ceasefire. As the British Foreign Secretary Robin Cook stated, the ground troops would only enter the region after an important deal of

---

<sup>28</sup> Located near Paris.

<sup>29</sup> March 15, 1999. “Villagers Hope Kosovo Peace Arrives Before the War,” *The New York Times*, [www.NYTimes.com](http://www.NYTimes.com)

Serbian forces was exhausted by the aerial bombing.<sup>30</sup> The main plan was that Serbia would in the end accept the Rambouillet provisions.<sup>31</sup>

During the air bombings of NATO, the battle on the ground continued, by the Serbs paramilitary forces displacing the Albanians and the mutual killings as well. The main profile behind the killings of the Albanians was Arkan and the organization of 'Black Hand' (which was also responsible for the assassination of Archduke Ferdinand in 1914). Despite claiming to have an "invincible" army, Milosevic got overpowered and was forced to step down on 5 October 2000 (Ramet, 2001: 35-41).

NATO would never have been able to keep the bombing campaign unless there was an ongoing ethnic cleansing of Milosevic in the eyes of the people around the world (Hosmer, 2001: 39). Contemporarily, when we compare Milosevic and Gaddafi in Libya it is seen that in both air bombing campaigns were continued for long times because of the recalcitrant attitudes of the leaders behind the oppression. Warren Zimmerman, the US Ambassador to Yugoslavia after 1989, had resigned from the State Department in 1992 partly because he was resented that the Clinton administration was reluctant to use force against the Serbians (Rogel, 2004: 148-9). When such meticulous conditions are taken into account, it is seen that the use of force tends to be the last resort for the international society. It should be this way though, because crises could take place and sovereign states may solve their own problems. But when order gets threatened because the crises get worse rather than

---

<sup>30</sup> April 20, 1999. "April 20: Blair declares NATO cause 'just'," [www.guardian.co.uk](http://www.guardian.co.uk)

<sup>31</sup> "Do the Serbs have a historical case for their occup," [www.guardian.co.uk](http://www.guardian.co.uk)

<sup>31</sup> April 1, 1999. "Do the Serbs have a historical case for their occupation of Kosovo?" [www.guardian.co.uk](http://www.guardian.co.uk)

better, then the international society has no choice and there is no room to avoid an intervention at that point.

#### **4.15. The Settlement on 3 June 1999**

Settling the crisis sourced from such complicated histories, alliances and diplomatic entanglements was not to be easy; but if there was one thing for sure, it was the fact that in Kosovo, the Serbs and the Kosovar Albanians would not live in a tranquil state without a genuine partition and settlement criteria. John Mearsheimer has expressed the vain dream of a shared leadership settlement as it follows: “NATO’s goal of a stable, tolerant, multi-ethnic Kosovo is a pipe dream...there is no instance in modern history of rival ethnic groups having waged a bloody civil war and then established a workable long-term arrangement for sharing power. The only solution...is to partition to province” (Carpenter, 2000: 6). Mearsheimer had also warned that NATO would have to act as guardians along with other international forces for a very long time. The settlement in Kosovo was not formed easily and it did not end the crisis immediately.

The aftermath of the crisis developed as it was predicted by Mearsheimer because of the years of intermittent conflicts. From the outset, the settlement’s promise of pullout of the Serbs and the entry of NATO troops were problematic. The Serbs were afraid of the reprisals and a peace deal that was bolstered by the UN Security Council was going to be signed. From the initial period, the officials knew that peace building would be difficult. This is why NATO Secretary General Javier Solana had

confidently stated that if “Yugoslavia had reneged on its agreement to withdraw”, then the bombing would continue from where it stopped.<sup>32</sup>

The settlement that was agreed on June 3, 1999 was agreed upon especially because it was also supported by Russia strongly. Otherwise this settlement was merely some modification of the Rambouillet (Doder and Branson, 2000: 9).

#### **4.16. Russian Troops at the Pristina Airport: A Volte-Face in Russian Stance?**

On 10 June 1999, Russian troops entered Pristina amidst the cheering of the Serbians and quickly reactions followed that Russia had promised not to send any troops. Russian Foreign Minister Igor Ivanov gave a statement immediately declaring that the entry of the troops was an “unfortunate mistake”; but the mistake was perpetrated in a strange fashion because the entry of the troops was followed by spreading of Yugoslav flags and flowers. The US officials were simply shocked and only after Ivanov’s statement could their fears be eased. At that time the US and Russia were discussing on the formation of KFOR<sup>33</sup> under whose command Russia was reluctant to put his troops.

US Deputy Secretary of State, Strobe Talbott got in touch with Moscow immediately and at the same time reminding that a ‘unilateral’ Russian move would be dangerous.<sup>34</sup> US was content with Ivanov’s statement about the lack of government

---

<sup>32</sup> June 11, 1999. “Russian troops enter Kosovo; Moscow orders them to leave,” *CNN*, [www.cnn.com](http://www.cnn.com)

<sup>33</sup> KFOR stood for Kosovo Force which was established as a peace implementation force in Kosovo, commanded by British Lt. Gen. Michael Jackson.

<sup>34</sup> June 11, 1999. “Russian troops enter Kosovo; Moscow orders them to leave,” *CNN*, [www.cnn.com](http://www.cnn.com)

authorization and order by Moscow to leave the ground. One of the important reservations of the US was that Russia should not be the prevailing power in implementing KFOR.<sup>35</sup>

The Westerners did not include Russia in intervention much for the good of success of the resolution. Thus, Russia's exclusion was culminated when the Russian troops seized the Pristina Airport previous to NATO troops' arrival. The British General Sir Michael Jackson, commander of the NATO peacekeeping force and his troops had to contend the Russian troops. In Pristina, Russia was to build its own garrison with more troops from home and thus wanted to be a part of the peacekeeping mission. It was reckoned that NATO would be unable to deny the Russian presence as a peacekeeper with this airport seizure of the Russian troops. The result of the seizure, however, was nowhere near Russia's reckoning. As the United States turned Hungarian, Romanian, Bulgarian countries against Russia in rejecting Russian overflight, the Kremlin had to suffice with much less troops who were only to stay under NATO control. Later, Russia also had to reestablish its liaison ties with NATO, which were torn by Primakov when the NATO attacks had begun. Primakov at the beginning of the intervention declared that Russia was "categorically" against any use of force.<sup>36</sup> Again it was a sign that Russia was reserved not to be left back.

It may be claimed that amongst all the contention, contumacious actors and peoples, the presence of the Russian troops at the Pristina Airport was the peak of the crisis. It may be seen in this way because the former Soviet Union was now against the West and this was the first time when a direct confrontation was up and imminent. This

---

<sup>35</sup> June 12, 1999. "NATO Enters Kosovo," *BBC News*, [news.bbc.co.uk](http://news.bbc.co.uk)

<sup>36</sup> Chris Bird. March 24, 1999. "War looms as Serbs defy NATO," *The Guardian*, [www.guardian.co.uk](http://www.guardian.co.uk)

particular event is also significant because this formed a clear caesura in the course of Russian muteness towards NATO intervention since March 1999.

Notwithstanding the importance of the encounter at the Pristina Airport, it still was a weak confrontation not sufficient to conclude that the international society or the system came about to be broken by the disagreement of two important sides. The following statement of a senior Russian diplomat makes it clear that Russia had not been into confronting the intervention's legitimacy or lawfulness or put it into a militaristic jeopardy; on the contrary Russian diplomatic corps saw the particular event as 'insignificant' (Pouilot, 2010: 103):

“That can happen, I don't know, between Great Britain and France. It wasn't anything dramatic. You shouldn't disregard us if you want to play along, like with Belgrade and others, like today with Kosovo. But we weren't close to war over Pristina. It wasn't the best point in our relationship, but it wasn't dangerous.”

As a Canadian official expressed, neither the Russian themselves nor the Westerners thought that the Pristina incident was perceived as a threat to use force in an imminent and confrontational manner by Russia. It is believed that Russia's tension was eased and through negotiation it had not been difficult to deal with Russia (Ibid).

Therefore, the arrival of the Russian troops was not a reversal of the policy of Russia towards the Crisis, it was merely a signal that Russia is a part of the process and is not simply sidelined by the Western powers. As a great power itself, as its fellow Westerners, Russia wanted to prove that it has the military capacity and it was an important part of the whole process.

## **Conclusion**

As it is seen from deeply entangled histories of the two peoples, the Serbs and the Albanians have their own imagined communities, own pasts and own mythical, mystical points in the past that mark their memory and togetherness. Such emotions however, are liable to be used successfully when the politicians want to go back and refer to the past moments in order to awaken nationalistic tones in the peoples. In this sense, the Milosevic speech in Kosovo in 1987, on the 600<sup>th</sup> anniversary seems very masterly and perspicacious. Nevertheless, it would be wrong to see those conflicting histories as the only determinant to the exasperation of the Kosovo Crisis. As Malcolm pointed out, these two peoples could live together and fight together twice and Yugoslavia had been a multi-lingual and multi-cultural society under Tito. Therefore, other determinants of leadership, international conjuncture are also at work in the process.

Kosovo Crisis, in flesh clashing terms, lasted mainly from February 1998 to March 1999. It can be claimed that the Kosovo Crisis, like the World War I has got deep causes which stretch from remote dates.

After the withdrawals of the Serbian Army, Russian troops entered Kosovo before the Western counterparts although the Russians had earlier guaranteed that they would not enter before NATO forces. The Media reports show that the Western media were trying to put the blame on Russia ignoring the historical and cultural links between Russia and Serbia. But in the end the same media also recognized that the end of the conflicts and a convergent international community stance mattered more.

## **CHAPTER V**

### **IMPLICATIONS OF THE RUSSIAN STANCE TOWARDS THE KOSOVO CRISIS**

Kosovo was somewhere else. It was no Bosnia, no anywhere. As the previous chapter depicted, the Serbians, from the start to the end were decided not to sacrifice Kosovo. Russia, as a natural ally and being previously the sole challenger of the West, also supported the idea that the Crisis be resolved through an agreement that did not leave Yugoslavia be devoid of Kosovo. The Western statesmen and diplomats undoubtedly knew that. All the talks, Contact Group, negotiations and agreements, though were not committed in vain. It was those talks, negotiations and arguments that gave NATO intervention its legitimacy. It was from the outset clear that if it was left to the United Nations, no successful intervention or a resolution as a matter of fact would have resulted.

The main point is that everybody got their lessons from Bosnia and political history well. Kosovo, as it was indicated, was a territory to fight for and to stand for. But the Westerners, for the sake of legitimacy and lawfulness, knew that diplomacy, talks and negotiations have to be consummated beforehand. Madeleine Albright's later

explanation clarifies the attitude of the west towards the method of resolution: “Once the Serbs had said no and the Kosovars had said yes, it was a very clear choice, and that...made it clear that the use of force had to take place” (Headley, 2008: 364).

It is seen that the West did not get meddled with the issue in Kosovo earlier. This may be partly because of a reserve against another split with the former Soviet Union but the West did not involve in the issue seriously until 1998 Spring. The September 1991 Referendum by the LDK went largely unnoticed by the West. In this referendum, 99% of the Kosovars said “Yes” to the question of declaring Kosovo a sovereign and independent Republic. On 24 May 1992, elections were carried out in Kosovo where the private houses were used as polling stations. As it is seen, the Albanians in Kosovo were creating a political culture with some entity coming close to a parallel state. The Democratic League of Kosovo was a reflection of League of Prizren and in the future it was to come sympathetic to the West because of emphasis on democracy and peaceful resistance it tried to adopt (Malcolm, 1998: 347-8). While LDK was being successful in creating a parallel state, the tensions were exacerbating everyday since for both parties, the competition to prevail was a zero-sum game.

The West seemed to be thinking that Milosevic would do what he had done in Bosnia and agree on the negotiation table just as he did in Dayton. But as pointed above, the West calculated inaccurately and Kosovo was no Bosnia. The West also missed for a long time that from 1992 onwards, alongside Bosnian Crisis, the situation in Kosovo was in a sharp deterioration. The Serbian Media was not equivocal in its rhetoric that “there was a threat of an ‘Islamic crescent’ extending from Bosnia through the Slav

Muslim territory of the Sandzak to the predominantly Muslim Albanians of Kosovo” (Ibid: 350). Moreover, the international sanctions on Serbia and Montenegro after Bosnian Crisis distorted Serbian economy even more thus helping to escalate the Kosovo Crisis more.<sup>37</sup>

Russia was seeing all these developments and despite being counted as a natural ally, was not going to challenge the intervention seriously. At most, it tried to be an important voice in the process, but not against the process. After the intervention, Russia, via envoy Chernomyrdin, insisted that the peacekeeping force would involve neutral third party. This is how Finland President Martti Ahtisaari was proposed by the USA and approved by Russia (Pouilot, 2010: 200).

Although NATO in the end NATO got to be the pivotal body in the peacekeeping force, such movements by Russia to be part of the process and demand things and challenge some policies were very important in analyzing the Russian stance and also the evolution of international society.

Russian stance was for the intervention because both the facts of Russian internal problems, relative size of Kosovo to get against West and the undeniable violence going on in the region and also the recalcitrance of Milosevic were obvious. Therefore, the important point in examining the Russian stance becomes the efforts of Russia to have more voice in the process in most times parallel to the main plan of the West with rather minor criticisms such as the pressure of Chernomyrdin in the

---

<sup>37</sup> The economic misery was not naturally only caused by the international sanctions. Milosevic’s economic management was very incompetent. Printing money in order to pay the soldiers and leaving trade into the hands of the mafia groups, he created an economy devoid of all plausible fundamentals. For further information see Malcolm, p. 351.

Contact Group, the event at the Pristina Airport, absence in the UNSC and so on. This is a very positive picture for the international society because an analogy could be made with a national legislature where the main aim is the welfare of the people despite the differences of views and backgrounds of the parties sitting in the Parliament. Hence, the Crisis' handling and the aftermath of it tell a great deal approving the views of the Theory of International Society in terms of the great powers, order and legitimacy of international interventions.

### **5.1. The Aftermath of the Crisis: A Summary of the Post-Crisis Developments**

In February 2008, Kosovo was recognized by the West while the Russian Federation and China did not accept to recognize it. But the main objective of the intervention was for the sake of order and human rights and therefore it was a “just” intervention. The aftermath of the crisis and the issue of recognition are not highly relevant for the evaluation of the crisis for the purposes of this thesis. Tony Blair, during the NATO bombing gave a speech in NATO Headquarters in Brussels on 20 April 1999 and emphasized that he was “proud” of the labor of NATO and that its struggle “was engaged in a just cause.”<sup>38</sup>

But everybody was not as optimistic and satisfied as Tony Blair was. The British Member of the Parliament (MP) had told that NATO's bombing campaign did the opposite of its intention: it contributed to the ascension of the conflicts and increased the violence, committed exclusively by the Serbs: “What was supposed to be the first

---

<sup>38</sup> April 20, 1999. “April 20: Blair Declares NATO cause ‘just’,” [www.guardian.co.uk](http://www.guardian.co.uk)

humanitarian war, actually created a humanitarian disaster.”<sup>39</sup> Such criticisms were often encountered and they had more to do with the method of handling the crisis resolution, rather than the intervention per se.

Just before the NATO bombing started, the Serbian Media Center reported that the KLA was knowingly “provoking” the Yugoslav forces in an attempt to make NATO use force against the Serbs. Against such argument the Albanians pointed to the presence of the guerrilla forces before and also the lack of proportionality in the use of force by the Serbs.<sup>40</sup>

Because of the handling of the intervention, the casualties and the refugees were high in number. The method of the war led to a definition of Kosovo war as a “non-war” because there was no risk in leaving bombs from the air and with no troops on the ground. This is why it was hard to deny that the casualties were kind of sacrificed for the sake of putting an end to the ethnic cleansing. Moreover, as the bombing continued and no troops were sent to the ground, the war became kind of a tragedy film rather than a reality.<sup>41</sup>

Nevertheless, the NATO intervention with its glitches, handling and casualties created was righteous. On 18 April 1999, in the village of Izbica and a mass grave was found and it was also discovered that the Serbian forces in Kosovo was using Albanian captives as mass grave diggers. 3200 people were reported to have been killed in the period from 25 March to 14 April by Serbian forces in Kosovo. Robin

---

<sup>39</sup> Ibid.

<sup>40</sup> Carlotta Gall. March 16, 1999. “For Villages of Kosovo, War is Part of Everyday Life,” *The New York Times*, [www.NYTimes.com](http://www.NYTimes.com)

<sup>41</sup> Diana Jean Schemo. May 16, 1999. “The World; Kosovo War Doesn’t Do Much for U.S. Recruitment,” *The New York Times*, [www.NYTimes.com](http://www.NYTimes.com)

Cook had stated that Great Britain had collected 87 examples of international law violations such as massacres, bombings, rapes of Albanians. Such collection of significant figures in the atrocities was reported to the International Criminal Tribunal for Yugoslavia (ICTY), led by the chief prosecutor Louise Arbor.<sup>42</sup> The lack of oil and important geopolitical conditions were also important in setting the intervention righteous despite the lack of physical engagement in the eyes of the people around the globe.

In the course of the fighting, the Albanians, most probably seeing that a cognizant save would not come soon from the West, rested on their own power and it was reported that the Albanian rebels acquired anti-tank and anti-aircraft weaponry. But it should never be forgotten that this crisis was taking place in the villages of Kosovo in which violence and fighting and shooting were simply part of every day life for almost a decade: “Another day in Kosovo. A war is going on and it is happening outside everyone’s backdoor.”<sup>43</sup>

As of July 11, it seemed that the conflict was far from over because of the changed balances in arsenal possessions of the two sides. The Westerners also seem to have silently ratified the passing of the weaponry into the region, mostly from Albania. Moreover, a good deal of monetary backing was procured by Albania further letting KLA get stronger. Thousands of recruits of KLA, in their red and black uniforms were robust in their actions. It is also reported that after the end of NATO bombing campaign, the Serb paramilitary forces and the special police force got hesitant in entering the zones that were known to be held by those Albanian rebels. Albanian

---

<sup>42</sup> Rachel Sylvester and John Davison. April 18, 1999. “War in Europe: Serbs use ‘slave labor’ to hide mass slaughter,” *The Independent*, [www.independent.co.uk](http://www.independent.co.uk)

<sup>43</sup> Gall.

forces were not only composed of recruits and non-militaristic men but men who were professional soldiers and mercenaries erstwhile.<sup>44</sup>

## **5.2. English School on Kosovo Crisis: Legitimacy, Solidarism and Sovereignty**

The legitimacy and the lawfulness of the Kosovo intervention have been questioned vigorously. First, the intervention was launched without UNSC authorization but on the initiative of NATO. In Liberia, Sierra Leone and Lesotho, similar interventions were launched without approval as well. Secondly, the aftermath of the crisis was not fruitful and thirdly, the handling of the intervention seemed problematic. In terms of the handling of the Crisis and the post-Crisis peace force, the West's reluctance of committing an on-ground operation was observable. After the Dayton Accords, US President Clinton had addressed his people that "the US mission to Bosnia would be limited, that it would be restricted to one year, and that the number of troops would be minimal. Americans were not being sent to Bosnia to fight a war, but to secure peace" (Rogel, 2004: 178).

The intervention was always reasonable though, because there was a history that almost shouted that the region was bubbling with hatred for centuries. Serbians were living for "Greater Serbia" while the Albanians were increasing in demographic terms everyday and demanding independence (Doder and Branson, 2000: 41). And Serbians were very vulnerable in being shaped by an extremely oppressive politician like Milosevic.

---

<sup>44</sup> "With Beter Arms, Kosovo Separatists Turn Tide in War" 11 July 1998, *The New York Times*, [www.NYTimes.com](http://www.NYTimes.com)

As pointed out above, the statesmen chose to promote NATO intervention as the true way of dealing with Milosevic. From the speech of Tony Blair given at the Economic Club, Chicago on 24 April 1999, shows his view of international community and responsibility taking of the great powers: "...how do we decide when and whether to intervene...War is an imperfect instrument for righting humanitarian distress, but armed force is sometimes the only means to deal with dictators...we exhausted all diplomatic actions. We should always give peace every chance..." (Barnett, 2008: 196). Later, on May 14 1999, at the other end of the Atlantic, Bill Clinton iterated the same attitude commending the decision for military intervention in the Balkans.<sup>45</sup> Those remarks defending the intervention are not only one's backing his own actions but also a signal that the international society is led by them (Western powers) and that they defend the norms they had set to the end. This thesis shows that English School can explain the Kosovo Crisis as an ordeal for the international society who preserved the idea of intervening despite some lack of lawfulness and in some violation of sovereignty in favor of order, if not very much for the sake of solidarism.

The Kosovo Intervention was not without criticisms as pointed several times in this thesis. Although aimed at ending the massacres of the Albanians in the region, "the intervention generated more carnage than it averted" and again, the method of the Intervention had been questioned. Kofi Annan asked promptly that "...if humanitarian intervention is, indeed, an unacceptable assault on sovereignty, how should we respond to a Rwanda, a Srebrenica – to gross and systematic violations of human rights that affect every precept of our common humanity" (ICISS, 2001: vii).

---

<sup>45</sup> *NY Times*, May 14 1999.

Annan pointed to the operational and legal questions surrounding the interventions but again, his statements imply that the morality, emergency and requirement of the intervention would not be questioned. Otherwise the members of the international society would get lost in formalities and miss the big picture.

The big picture showed that the people in Kosovo, since the rise of Milosevic to power, have been suffering physically, politically and culturally. Even during the bombing campaign, it was observable that the international society was right with its intervention. The President of the ICTY reported on 18 April 1999 to all the members of NATO in a letter that the witnesses, mostly refugees, told their experiences and “if true, belong in a place and time that we are supposed to have left behind.”<sup>46</sup> The statement reveals that the West was aware of what was going on in the region and decisive in their ending of the crisis in one way or another.

The main support for the bombing campaign of NATO was the presence of an escalated crisis which involved ethnic cleansing and a recalcitrant Slobodan Milosevic. When sovereign powers start to mess with order inside, the international society intervenes. Although the intervention had some drawbacks and had been criticized for the way it was handled in the end, the intervention remained to be legitimate. This is a significant point because the Balkans had long been a very problematic part of Europe, kind of the proof that the order of the international society was not steady and under threat.

---

<sup>46</sup> Rachel Sylvester and John Davison, “War in Europe: Serbs use ‘slave labor’ to hide mass slaughter”, *The Independent*, 18 April 1999, [www.independent.co.uk](http://www.independent.co.uk)

When the order is under threat, even the system of states which can seem bipolar at times, with the US and UK on the one side and Russia, India and China on the other, it turns out to be unipolar handling the issues threatening order in one voice. The point is that there are no natural allies or powerful nationalisms, ideologies when it comes to commonly accepted norms and values. Russia, in its own calculations did show some reservations via UNSC, which is the most appropriate place to debate on the issues of the international society. As Andrei P. Tsygankov writes in his article, Russia did want to and was a part of international society and the proof was its debating in the UN (Tsygankov, 2001: 133). The problematic thing for Russia was more the part it played in this Crisis. The end of the intervention was Milosevic's fall and this end was not even debatable. Russia, after the end of the Cold War, did not want to be sidelined from the affairs of the globe as a great power. It was the economic and national interests that pushed Russia to show a rather weak stance towards the Crisis. But this stance, nevertheless, was in compliance with the norms and values of international society.

### **5.3. English School and Russia as a Great Power in World Politics**

Boris Yeltsin, though Russia seemed at first against the international involvement led by the Western powers, came to accept that Russian support to the Serbs in terms of weaponry and diplomacy was limited. Serbia was a small country and obviously Russia was not powerful enough to challenge NATO. All Russia did was to be absent from the UNSC therefore causing some debates whether the intervention was legitimate without UNSC authorization. But the legitimacy was restored both ex ante in statements of the political leaders throughout the world, as well as Annan and also it was restored ex post facto, too (ICISS, 2001: 54).

The intervention was clearly a verification of the assumptions of Theory of International Society in the great powers' agreement on the intervention though the handling was questioned by some environments. But criticizing is always easy in print than in flesh because the intervener nations also had domestic considerations. They had parliaments and congresses which represented the people and unsurprisingly the people did not want casualties of their fellows on the ground. On 30 April 1999, it was reported from the US Congress that neither the Americans nor the British wanted entanglement with their soldiers in Kosovo. Even the aerial campaign was criticized by the US Congress pointing to the presence of 365 US planes and only 20 British ones.<sup>47</sup> Therefore, among the great powers themselves there were occasional disagreements as well.

The arrival of the Russian troops prior to the NATO countries' forces was simply a source of quarrel between the two sides. Russia, as a great power, wanted to be involved in the process, especially in the peace building process during which the future of the two peoples was going to be shaped. It was unclear in the UN what the role of Russia was going to be in the peace building process, which added to the frustration of Russian politicians. Chernomyrdin's efforts were in part fruitful in this sense, who was successful in adding Martti Ahtisaari to the peace building process. Milosevic, on June 3, agreed to the Chernomyrdin-Talbott-Ahtisaari Plan (Pouilot, 2010: 199). Therefore, concessions and compromises, as always were at work between the members of the International Society that Russia was active in the process, as it would desire as a great power, and also agreed to the centrality of

---

<sup>47</sup> "War in the Balkans: Capitol Hill-US Congress splits on Kosovo", 30 April 1999, *The Independent*, [www.independent.co.uk](http://www.independent.co.uk)

NATO in peace building. Thus, it is seen that Russian stance, though at times challenging the West, as in the event at the airport on June 11, in its holistic form, was in compliance with the West.

English School's argument that the great powers always preserve the balance of order as the most convenient forces in international society has clearly been applied in the case of Kosovo because Blair, Clinton and Yeltsin all were critical of Milosevic policies. Yeltsin's avoidance of any hard assistance in military terms to Milosevic and his criticisms being only in terms of "rhetoric and domestic criticism" proves well that Russia, as a great power, was in line with the other great powers (Ibid). The common theme among the great powers was that the seemingly unending conflict over Kosovo between the Serbs and the Albanians had to be put an end to. When histories and cultures and the recalcitrant Milosevic signaled that the intervention was the only way to preserve order, NATO took the helm. A statement of Recep Tayyip Erdogan, Turkish PM also summarizes and verifies the view of ES that order is the ultimate aim: "In the world of 21<sup>st</sup> century, no place can be given to the debates of symbols. In the world of 21<sup>st</sup> century conflict of beliefs cannot be given any place."<sup>48</sup> In this sense, historical, religious and cultural conflicts and repressive regimes do come to an end and order prevails through interventions when needed.

One open-ended question clearly indicates to the issue of intervention and lack of a genuine international society which is not short of any coherence: Why has been more international involvement in the Balkans, but not the Caucasus? The answer is

---

<sup>48</sup> "Balkanların Huzuru için Gerekeni Yaparız", *Zaman*, 5.11.2010, p. 19.

not to be questioned in this thesis. But as it was stated in chapter one, we are living in an “anarchical international society” which is not a Kantian one yet. Therefore, there are and will always be contingencies but the international norms and values would prevail without need for altruism or danger of a Hobbesian extinction.

## **5.4. Five Implications of the Kosovo Crisis and Its Aftermath for International Relations**

### **5.4.1. Order Prevails**

As given above, the legitimacy and lawfulness of the Kosovo Intervention had been questioned. The lack of UN authorization in some environments had been given as a clear indication to the lack of legitimacy. Five years after the Kosovo Intervention in 2004, The Report of the UN Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change was issued and in this report the list for describing an intervention as legitimate had been given (Hurrell, 2010: 60):

1. The threat must be serious.
2. There must be a proper purpose.
3. The intervention should be a last-resort solution.
4. Proportionate means must be used.
5. The consequences must be balanced properly.

These criteria point to one fact: when there is a serious threat against order and that there is no chance of restoring order through diplomatic or political or economic tools, military intervention comes to work. The main point here is that the balance is the order in the international community and that it must be protected by proportionate means. The balance and the purpose are both representatives of the ultimate aim of order. Bull had also pointed to the fact that the best thing for people to suffice with was order when compared to the vain attempt of Kantian perpetual

peace and Hobbesian state of war. Hence, it is natural to expect order to be the unchallengeable value of international society.

A valuable criticism in this sense is not that the intervention was implemented and ended a humanitarian crisis. A valuable criticism can be launched in terms of the failure of the great powers in preventing the crisis in the first place. Despite all the statements by Blair, Clinton and other statesmen, the Crisis was left to escalate without a successful preventive diplomacy. The point is that, when looked from the end point, the intervention was successful because the violence ended, but it is also undeniable that 1990's removal of autonomy, the demonstrations, the Dayton Accords and the afterwards could have been better used to prevent the crisis before the exacerbation of the situation (Russell, 2009: 488). Nevertheless, as far as this thesis is concerned although these criticisms are very constructive and important for the future interventions and the agenda of the school, the stance of the great powers, alongside Russia, had been rather consistent and only an escalation could have led the use of aerial bombing and consent of Russia.

#### **5.4.2. The Crisis as a Harbinger of Other NATO Interventions**

Alongside Kosovo, the interventions that were committed in the name of humanitarianism are Northern Iraq, Somalia and Haiti. As intervention is mostly debated because it is a challenge to the sovereignty of the nation-state, which had been the most basic and respected norm of international relations since Westphalia, any precedence of such humanitarian intervention is of great importance for the future of international relations (Beitz and Goodin, 2010: 58-9). These interventions prove that international relations are not committed merely on the grounds of

national sovereignty anymore, but that there are some basic rights which are unrecognizable in lack of order have to be watched for.

These global basic rights and the awareness of people around the world of these rights by the people of the international community are in rise thanks to these intervention precedents. Thus, Kosovo Intervention is a good proxy in understanding the norms and values of the international society that tell that sovereignty is not everything when the order disappears and it becomes hard to fulfill the global basic rights of the peoples.

In Kosovo, the intervention was seen as against the UN Charter, whose Chapter VIII requires UNSC authorization for use of force. Furthermore, the handling of the Intervention was very speculative seen from the reactions of the people around the world because of bombing from the air, which meant more innocent casualties on the ground. However, in order to gain legitimacy internally, the individual intervening nations also had to get the approval of own citizens.

In 2011 March, almost after 12 years, and again in March, another air bombing campaign was activated by NATO in order to topple another dictator, Colonel Gaddafi, though officially to protect civilians. The Kosovo Crisis has been an undeniable harbinger of future interventions because the Western powers intervened despite lack of natural resources in the region.<sup>49</sup> Therefore, the popular claim that the

---

<sup>49</sup> At this point, it should be noted that there are views that the US and NATO intervened in order to secure the Balkans as a pipeline route to the West from the Middle East and the Caspian Basin. As an answer to such allegations and scathing, the British Foreign Secretary Robin Cook had stated that "There is no oil in Kosovo." However, there have been projects by the oil companies such as Texas Halliburton and the British Petroleum that meant the building of a pipeline that would go from Burgas in Bulgaria to Vlora, an Albanian Port. For further theories of the natural resource and transition

Westerners only intervene when some important natural resource is at issue did not work in this case. Kosovo proved that the international society does intervene for the sake of human rights, the global basic rights and it will continue to do so in the future regardless of natural resources involved.

### **5.4.3. Russia and the West**

In the interventions in Somalia, Haiti, Rwanda and East Timor it is seen that Russia voted in favor of multilateral intervention to protect human rights. In the period from 1991 to 1993, it is seen that Russia has worked extensively on the Vienna Declaration and Program of Action, both of which were adopted by the World Conference on Human Rights in 1993. In the case of Kosovo, however, Russia did not hesitate to express its opposition because it perceived that itself was not part of the solution. The statements of Albright and other Westerners prove that the intervention was to take place *despite* Russia. The operation, therefore lacked legitimacy vis-à-vis Russia as an agent, but not because it had rejected norms of “Human Rights”.

This thesis argues that Russia is a part of international society defending and not challenging the norms of values of it. The main point is that the norms and values of the international society are the ones that matter, not the agents. The agents are merely the ones who voice and implement, apply those measures which further the particular norms and values. Therefore, as an agent, Russia, had some reservations against the Intervention during the Crisis but it was not those minor reservations but the norms and values of the International Society that prevailed in the end.

---

route dimensions of the intervention, for further information, see Bulent Gökay, “Oil, War and Geopolitics from Kosovo to Afghanistan” *Journal of Balkan and Near Eastern Studies*, 4:1, pp. 8-12.

Another important point is that Russia, despite showing reservations and sometimes challenging the Intervention, knew how to use the intervention for its own good. For the 2008 intervention in Georgia for instance, Kosovo was the referred antecedent to be exculpated in the eyes of the international community.

Moreover, in Kremlin, there was a Yeltsin who was turning to a genuine democrat. He was very determined to implement reforms in parallel to the Western values. As Yeltsin accurately puts it, in the minds of the people the first thing to be reformed is the Party nomenklatura which had to be put an end to; people were simply tired of the nomenklatura and thus they “needed to have fewer bosses, and the state should not poke its nose into our affairs” (Yeltsin, 2000: 198). Although a transition from autocracy to a consolidated democracy at a single step is not to be realized easily, it was clear that Yeltsin had in mind not to give up democracy or the reforms despite all the political and financial/economic crises or the international crises which involved an ally.

Russian foreign policy had been oriented around two paths of “Westernization” and “Eurasianism” and the former path has been furthered rather than the latter. Russia, as the Kosovo intervention also indicates, desired to be a major European power. The sporadic tensions that seemed challenging the West were only reactions by Russia expressing mainly the incentive of Russia not to be left backward (Baev, 1999: 76-7). Secession, for Russia was not a positive element of politics, especially when we think that the Soviet Empire collapsed due to secessions. However, for Russia, there

are more important targets on the agenda such as Westernization, being part of the international society and more generally adapting to the globalizing world.

It is safe to claim that Russia, after the Soviet past, was decided to be a part of the international society democratizing and restructuring gradually. This is not to say that strong state tradition or authority were forgotten abruptly, but that it was obvious to the Russians that communism and similar old school techniques to go out of the crisis were no more than going backwards.

Yeltsin's appointment of former Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin as his presidential envoy was critical in the ending of the conflict and making Russia and NATO get closer. Albright and Ivanov had discussed the conditions for ending of the bombing in Oslo. These conditions were three-fold: predictably, the first condition was the end of violence in Kosovo, the second was the withdrawal of the Serbian forces and lastly, the return of the refugees. Such discussion shows clearly how Russia and the West have got closer.

Kosovo Crisis is ironic in the sense that just as Russia overlooked an intervention in a natural ally, the West has been overlooking in Russian interventions in Chechnya and Georgia. Those overlooking perceptions are not simple, however. They are the signs that order is attached great importance and that Kantian solidarity is still not sufficiently realized as a substitute for order yet.

#### **5.4.4. The Norms and Values Becoming More Coherent and Homogeneous**

A very important implication of the Kosovo Crisis is that repeated interaction can and does amount to change in the relational context for collective action. Such repeated interactions between actors and bodies of international relations simply amount to more intense and strong ties between the actors and bodies. Kosovo Crisis, therefore, not only worked to end a humanitarian and political crisis in the Balkan Peninsula but also increased the relations between Russia and the West therefore contributing to a better connected international society. The previous Russian countenance of the interventions also shows that Russia is and wants to be a part of the international society even though such partnership means sacrificing sometimes.

Another important implication of the Kosovo Crisis is that the desire for global equilibrium is not merely a perception but a reality both from the viewpoint of Russia and the West. The standards of the international community may seem double or complicated sometimes but it is always a priority that 'order' prevails in reality. If order is not perceived, than measures are implemented to make it exist.

As Noel Malcolm had warned, ethnic hatreds, historical antagonisms would lead one to overlook the primary role of the politicians. Kosovo is a very important example to remind that the politicians which use historical and ethnic hatreds and thus perpetuate the crisis have to be stopped. The sovereignty at such a point becomes nothing more than a narrative. At such point it becomes obligatory that the people be saved from the sovereign himself.

The interventions after the end of the Cold War, of which Kosovo is the foremost precedent, are important in examining whether there is a convergence of international norms and values. Above all, interventions are almost the most controversial issues, both in their absence and presence.<sup>50</sup> This is mostly due to the conflicting views about the necessity, means and consequences of the intervention. But there is one more determinant in making interventions extremely controversial, which is the need to secure all great powers' approval, not necessarily on paper, but in an understanding. The point is that if the great powers do not agree, then the intervention would not be successful because in such a situation there would not be a reference point available in terms of international norms and values.

Kosovo is especially critical in this sense. It included a Russia which has been a natural Serbian ally. But the intervention is also critical in its consequence that if Russia did not opt for challenging the intervention, then this constitutes a very clear indication that the norms and values of the international society is one that is approved by all the great powers.

#### **5.4.5. The Balkans: Ending of Chaos**

After the end of the intervention, under the UNSC Resolution 1244, UNMIK (autonomous interim government) was established and from then on, intense efforts to establish peace and governance in Kosovo continued. Although the international society is not one where we have a perpetual peace, it is also not a society where we have a state of war/ Kosovo, this tiny part of Eastern Europe, is a part of international society where great bloodshed had been poured.

---

<sup>50</sup> As much as the West had been criticized for implementing interventions and use of force, it can also be criticized when it fails to intervene in time as it was the case in Rwanda.

In saving the international society from the whims of some dictators or the whims of history itself, intervention and military campaigns are not everything. There is the later step of creating true order and stability where the society can develop and flourish. At this point, again, the international society, particularly the great powers have duties. This is not to claim that the international society is turning away from mere order towards justice and solidarity; this is not to be realized soon. When the issue at hand is the Balkans, assistance in economic and social terms are critical as given the lack of expertise, physical lack of capabilities and a system that is very far from democratic credentials.

Nevertheless, ethnic cleansing and massacres came to an end in spite of differences, disputes, the transition began. And on this road, the norms and values of the international society would prevail again leading the torn apart peoples converge towards an orderly and a peaceful globe. The Kosovo Intervention, in this sense, gives hope for the future interventions because the peoples who are left backward under the repressive regimes may see that the main norms are order and peace rather than oppression and repression.

## **Conclusion**

The Kosovo Crisis was a human tragedy that was another scene of Balkan crises. The population was terrorized, people were expelled, massacred by the paramilitaries, the Kosovar Albanian elite were decapitated and it was simply going towards an ethnic cleansing and moreover, it was going towards genocide that the international society intervened not to see another Bosnia. Again, in Kosovo, as in Bosnia, or going

backwards it was similar to the scene in Kosovo of the post-Balkan Wars. Again, the justifications of the Serbs were historical and cultural.

In such a context, the international society, under the lack of clear approval of UN but a clear common understanding of all and under the NATO auspices, intervened and ended the violence in Kosovo. Russia, in this process, at times seemed opposed but such opposition always was in rhetoric without any legitimate or serious challenge. While it was a fact that Russia had its own internal political, social and economic problems to tackle, it is also a fact that Russia was in favor of an international society with order rather than one in which disorder and massacres were a reality. It was non-negotiable that the misery in Kosovo had to be put an end to. This proved that boxes and nationalist narratives would not really matter when the issue is human rights, order and justice.

## **CHAPTER VI**

### **CONCLUSION**

The world of international relations is open to the pluralism of theories and the evolution of the concepts, norms and values. This thesis had been finalized during the humanitarian crisis in Somalia and there were campaigns throughout Turkey to collect aid packages for the people of Somalia. Concurrently, the people in Syria had been rebelling against the Al-Assad regime and the talks of boycotting, sanctions and intervention were ubiquitous. Turkish Prime Minister and Foreign Minister had been pushing for an end to the oppression by Bashal Al-Assad regime and the initiation of reforms in Syria. And these current events were another indication of the pluralism and evolution.

Kosovo Crisis, as this thesis argued, had set an important example that sovereignty is no more the guiding principle of international relations. Cold War ended, the world is no more bipolar and there are no blocs anymore. The international society, as always, tended towards the balance, the order. Russia, with its own internal problems, showed a stance that fit well with the West. While at times the stance of Russia seemed inconsistent or surprising because of being acquiescent, the Theory of

International Society is verified in its idea that the great powers act for the prevalence of order.

The Theory of International Society is not the sacrosanct guide of international relations and there are points when the theory seems weak in explaining the aberrations of the developments. There is no theory, however, that is a true guide to the world of international relations. The aim of this thesis was to give an account of the Russian stance towards the Kosovo Crisis. The stance of Russia is important because Russia's stance is important to understand whether order is really the main value of the international society, even to understand whether a single international society existed. One would expect Russia, the former superpower of the bipolar world order to challenge West to the end, especially when NATO troops are deployed in a place where Russia's natural ally Serbia had historical and religious ties. Such expectations make Russian stance important to test an international relations theory like English School.

Russian stance, although at times seeming inconsistent, was unitary and was in compliance with the West. The order was the main value along side the global basic rights and humanitarian concerns. Russia, as in Somalia and Haiti, was willing not to challenge the West, especially when the economic crisis was a harsh reality for the Russian people. There was no place for adventurous or old school foreign policy standing. It was simply impossible for Russia to challenge the West even if it was assumed that it had desired. It was a fact that the Cold War ended, the order must prevail from the whims and adventures of a leader like Milosevic and the world

required tougher conditions to survive. Religious and cultural values did no good against the economic and financial woes.

Yeltsin, against the old school politicians and those yearning for the communist past, did know how to handle the Kosovo Crisis through his timely and adequate appointments and declarations. The absence of Russia in UNSC decision making processes were successful movements for Russia in its contribution to the legitimacy of the intervention because although the intervention took place without UNSC authorization, there was also no clear-cut veto of the decision to intervene. Plus, UN stance was for the intervention, especially when the statements and the views of the world leaders are analyzed. Moreover, it was a fact that UN itself was not sufficient to intervene without NATO.

The intervention, although criticized in its method and the aftermath of peace and state building, was successful in putting an end to Balkan conflicts and starting a new era for the Balkan region. The intervention proved that all the myths, ghosts, falcons and stories were nothing more than the remnants of the past. Nowadays, Bosnia is working to be part of the EU and Kosovo and Albania in the future would also be on their way to the EU. As the criteria of joining the EU is common knowledge, it means that these states adapt the values of globalization, democracy, free market and human rights and freedoms. Again, the Theory of International Society is verified with its view that the international society is built upon the norms and values that these norms and values would always prevail thanks to the great powers.

The end of the Cold War started to question the *raison d'être* of NATO since there was no Warsaw Pact anymore. But this time, a more significant threat to the lives and freedom of the peoples around the world. Sovereignty started to become questioned because when people find themselves inside the borders where there is oppression, and when history and cultural facts point to some stalemate, the international society, of which NATO is a tool, comes to rescue. The norms and values of the international society are getting converged around the world every day and the Russian Federation is a part this international society, which especially became undeniable with the collapse of communism and the preference of Westernization starting from Yeltsin onwards.

The intervention, with its criticisms and complexity of the crisis, show that balance and order in international relations cannot be reached easily. They have to be worked on and endeavored. Otherwise, the crises that may seem inevitable because of historical, religious or cultural roots, would not be solved to preserve justice within order.

## SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

### *Books:*

- Beitz, Charles R. and Robert Goodin (eds.) 2010. *Global Basic Rights*. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Bellamy, Alex J. 2002. *Kosovo and International Society*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Bellamy, Alex J (ed.) 2005. *International Society and Its Critics*. Oxford University Press.
- Benson, Leslie. 2001. *Yugoslavia: A Concise History*. New York: Palgrave.
- Bideleux, Robert and Ian Jeffries. 2007. *The Balkans: A Post-Communist History* London: Routledge.
- Bull, Hedley. 1995. *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. London: MacMillan.
- Bull, Hedley and Adam Watson. 1984. *The Expansion of International Society*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Carpenter, Ted Galen (ed.) 2000. *NATO's Empty Victory: A Post-Mortem on the Balkan War*. Washington D.C.: Cato Institute, 2000.
- Cox, John K. 2002. *The History of Serbia*. Westport, Cincinnati.
- Doder, Dusko and Louise Branson. 2000. *Milosevic: Portrait of a Tyrant*. New York: The Free Press.
- Duijzings, Ger. 2000. *Religion and Politics of Identity in Kosovo*. London: Hurst and Company.
- Dunne, Tim. 1998. *Inventing International Society: A History of the English School*. London: MacMillan Press.
- Dunne, Tim, M. Kurki and Smith (eds.) 2007. *International Relations Theories*. Oxford University Press.

- Felkay, Andrew. 2002. *Yeltsin's Russia and the West*. Connecticut, Westport: Praeger.
- Gokay, Bulent. May 2002. "Oil, War and Geopolitics from Kosovo to Afghanistan" *Journal of Balkan and Near Eastern Studies*, 4(1).
- Griffiths, Martin. 1999. *Fifty Key Thinkers in International Relations*. London: Routledge.
- Headley, James. 2008. *Russia and the Balkans: Foreign Policy from Yeltsin to Putin*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Holbrooke, Richard. 1998. *To End a War*. New York: Random House, 1998.
- Hollis, Martin and Steve Smith. 1990. *Explaining and Understanding International Relations*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Hosmer, Stephen T. 2001. *Why Milosevic Decided to Settle When He Did*. California: Santa Monica: RAND.
- Jacques, Edwin E. 2009. *The Albanians: An Ethnic History from Prehistoric Times to the Present*. Vol. 1. London: Mc Farland and Company.
- Judah, Tim. 2000. *Kosovo: War and Revenge*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Keene, Edward. 2002. *Beyond the Anarchical Society: Grotius, Colonialism and Order in World Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Kola, Paulin. 2003. *The Search for Greater Albania*. London: Hurst and Company.
- Lampe, John R. 2003. *Yugoslavia as History: Twice There was a Country*. (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Linklater, Andrew and Hidemi Suganami. 2006. *The English School of International Relations: A Contemporary Reassessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Logoreci, Anton. 1977. *The Albanians: Europe's Forgotten Survivors*. London: Victor Gollancz Ltd.
- Mac Kenzie, David. 1996. *The Serbs and Russians*, Eastern Europe Monographs, Boulder: Columbia University Press.
- Malcolm, Noel. 1998. *Kosovo: A Short History*. London: MacMillan.
- Miller, J. D. B. and J. Vincent (eds.) 1990. *Order and Violence: Hedley Bull and International Relations*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Naimark, Norman M. and Holly Case (eds.) 2003. *Yugoslavia and Its Historians*.

- Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2003.
- Nexon, Daniel H. 2009. *The Struggle for Power in Early Modern Europe*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Neuman, W. Lawrence. 1991. *Social Research Methods*. Boston: Pearson, 1991.
- Nimni, Ephraim. 1991. *Marxism and Nationalism: Theoretical Origins of Political Crisis*. Colorado: Pluto Press.
- Pavlowitch, Stevan K. 2002. *Serbia: The History of an Idea*. New York: New York University Press.
- Pettifer, James. 2005. *Kosova Express: A Journey in Wartime*. London: Hurst and Company.
- Pouliot, Vincent. 2010. *International Security in Practice: The Politics of NATO-Russia Diplomacy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rogel, Carole. 2004. *The Breakup of Yugoslavia*. Revised Ed. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press.
- Schwandner-Sievers, Stephanie and Bernd Fischer. *Albanian Identities: Myth and History*. London: Hurst and Company.
- Sell, Louis. 2002. *Milosevic and Destruction of Yugoslavia*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Smith, Steve, A. Hadfield and Dunne (eds.) 2008. *Foreign Policy: Theories, Actors, Cases* eds., Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sterling-Folker, Jennifer (ed.) 2006. *Making Sense of International Relations Theory*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner.
- Stevanovic, Vidosav. 2004. *Milosevic: The People's Tyrant*. Translated by: Zlata Filipovic. London: I.B. Tauris.
- Vickers, Miranda and James Pettifer. 1997. *From Anarchy to a Balkan Identity*. London: C. Hurst & Co.
- Wellington, Jerry and Marcin Szczerbinski. 2007. *Research Methods for the Social Sciences*. London: Continuum.
- Wight, Martin. 1991. *International Theory: The Three Traditions*. Leicester.
- Yeltsin, Boris. 2000. *Midnight Diaries*. Catherine A. Fitzpatrick (trans.). New York: Public Affairs.

**Articles:**

- Baev, Pavel K. 1999. "Russia's stance against secessions: From Chechnya to Kosovo", *International Peacekeeping*, 6(3).
- Bain, William. 2003. "The Political Theory of Trusteeship and the Twilight of International Equality", *International Relations*, 17(1), 59-77.
- Bleiker, Roland. 2005. "Order and Disorder in World Politics." Alex J. Bellamy, *International Society and Its Critics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Devetak, Richard. 2005. "Violence, Order and Terror" in Alex J. Bellamy, *International Society and Its Critics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Djordjevic, Dusan J. 2003. "Clio Amid Ruins." In Norman M. Naimark and Holly Case, eds., *Yugoslavia and Its Historians*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Dunne, Tim. 2007. "The English School." In Tim Dunne, Kurki and Smith, eds., *International Relations Theories* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Danreuther, Donald. 2001. "War in Kosovo: History, Development and Aftermath." In Mary Buckley and Sally M. Cummings, eds., *Kosovo: Perceptions of War and Its Aftermath*. London: Continuum.
- Emmert, Thomas A. 2003. "A Crisis of Identity: Serbia at the End of the Century." In Norman M. Naimark and Holly Case, eds., *Yugoslavia and Its Historians*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Hellman, Gunther. 2003. "Are Dialogue and Synthesis Possible in International Relations?" *International Studies Review*, 5(1) (March).
- Grix, Jonathan. 2002. "Introducing Students to the Generic Terminology of Social Research," *Politics* 22(3).
- Knudsen, Tonny Brems. 2006. "The English School: Sovereignty and International Law." In Jennifer Sterling-Folker, ed., *Making Sense of International Relations Theory*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner.
- Little, Richard . 2000. "English School's Contribution to the Study of International Relations," *European Journal of International Relations* 6(3).
- Little, Richard. 2003. "The English School vs. American Realism: A Meeting Minds or Divided by a Common Language?" *Review of International Studies* 29.
- Makinda, Samuel M. 2001. "International Society and Global Governance," *Cooperation and Conflict* 36.

- Miller, Benjamin and Korina Kagan. March 1997. "The Great Powers and Regional Conflicts: Eastern Europe and the Balkans from the Post- Napoleonic Era to the Post-Cold War Era", *International Studies Quarterly*, 41 (1).
- Morris, Justin. 2005. "Normative Innovation and the Great Powers." In Bellamy, Alex J., ed., *International Society and its Critics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nardin, Terry. 2005. "Justice and Coercion." In Alex J. Bellamy, ed., *International Society and its Critics*, Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Clark, Ian. 2003. " Legitimacy in Global Order", *Review of International Studies* 29.
- Pavehouse, Jon J. and Joshua Goldstein. August 1999. "Serbian Compliance or Defiance in Kosovo?: Statistical Analysis and Real-Time Predictions" *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 43(4).
- Posen, Barry R. Spring 2000. "The War for Kosovo: Serbia's Political-Military Strategy" *International Security* 24(4).
- Ramet, Sabrina P. 2001. "The Kingdom of God or the Kingdom of Ends: Kosovo in Serbian Perception" Mary Buckley and Sally Cummings, eds., *Kosovo: Perceptions of War and Its Aftermath*. London: Continuum.
- Richardson, James L. 1990. "Academic Study of International Relations." In Miller, J. D. B. and J. Vincent, eds., *Order and Violence: Hedley Bull and International Relations*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Russell, Peter. December 2009. "The Exclusion of Kosovo from the Dayton Negotiations", *Journal of Genocide Research* 11(4).
- Tsygankov, Andrei P. 2001. "The Final Triumph of Pax-Americana? Western Intervention in Yugoslavia and Russia's Debate on the post-Cold War Order", *Communist and Post-Communist Studies* 34.
- Vincent, R. J. 1990. "Grotius, Human Rights, and Intervention." In Bull, Hedley, Kingsbury and Roberts, eds., *Hugo Grotius and International Relations*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Weller, Marc. April 1999. "The Rambouillet Conference on Kosovo", *International Affairs* 75(2).

***Other Sources:***

"Balkanların Huzuru için Gerekeni Yaparız," *Zaman*, 5.11.2010, p. 19.

Bird, Chris. "War looms as Serbs defy NATO", 24 March 1999, *The Guardian*,

[www.guardian.co.uk](http://www.guardian.co.uk)

“Blair Declares NATO cause ‘just’” 20 April 1999, [www.guardian.co.uk](http://www.guardian.co.uk)

“Do the Serbs have a historical case for their occupation of Kosovo?”, 1 April 1999, <http://guardian.co.uk>

“English School: A Biography” access from <http://www.polis.leeds.ac.uk/research/international-relations-security/english-school/resources.php>, (last access: 18.7.2011).

Gall, Carlotta. “For Villages of Kosovo, War is Part of Everyday Life” 16 March 1999, *The New York Times*, [www.NYTimes.com](http://www.NYTimes.com)

Healy, Langdon T. 1997. *Serbian Elites, Kosovo and the Kosovo Albanians, 1889-1912: Representations and Politics*. Unpublished Master’s Thesis. Indiana: Indiana University.

International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (report). December 2001. “The Responsibility to Protect”. The report can be reached at: <http://www.iciss.ca/report2-en.asp>, (last access: 24.8.2011).

“NATO Enters Kosovo”, 12 June 1999, *BBC News*, [news.bbc.co.uk](http://news.bbc.co.uk)

Redd, Steven Blake. 2000. “The Influence of Advisers on Decision Strategies and Choice in Foreign Policy Decision Making” Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation. Texas: A&M University.

“Richard Holbrooke”, *The Economist*, 18 December 2010.

“Russian troops enter Kosovo; Moscow orders them to leave”, 11 June 1999, *CNN*, [www.cnn.com](http://www.cnn.com)

Schemo, Diana Jean. 16 May 1999. “The World; Kosovo War Doesn’t Do Much for U.S. Recruitment” *The New York Times*, [www.NYTimes.com](http://www.NYTimes.com)

Sylvester, Rachel and John Davison. “War in Europe: Serbs use ‘slave labor’ to hide mass slaughter” 18 April 1999, *The Independent*, [www.independent.co.uk](http://www.independent.co.uk)

“To Prevent a Wider War in Kosovo”, 10 May 1998, *The New York Times*, [www.NYTimes.com](http://www.NYTimes.com)

“Villagers Hope Kosovo Peace Arrives Before the War”, 15 March 1999, *The New York Times*, [www.NYTimes.com](http://www.NYTimes.com)

“War in the Balkans: Capitol Hill-US Congress splits on Kosovo”, 30 April 1999, *The Independent*, [www.independent.co.uk](http://www.independent.co.uk)

“Where Piety Meets Power”, *The Economist*, December 19<sup>th</sup> 2009.

“With Better Arms, Kosovo Separatists Turn Tide in War” 11 July 1998, *The New York Times*, [www.NYTimes.com](http://www.NYTimes.com)

## APPENDICES

### A. UN Security Council Resolutions Regarding Kosovo

#### **A.1. UNSCR 855; August 9, 1993: On refusal of the authorities of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) to allow CSCE special missions in Kosovo.**

Taking note of the letters of 20 July 1993 (S/26121) and 23 July 1993 (S/26148) from the Chairman-in-Office of the Council of Ministers of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE),

Further taking note of the letters of 28 July 1993 (S/26210) and 3 August 1993 (S/26234) circulated by the authorities of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro),

Deeply concerned at the refusal of the authorities in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) to allow the CSCE missions of long duration to continue their activities,

Bearing in mind that the CSCE missions of long duration are an example of preventive diplomacy undertaken within the framework of the CSCE, and have greatly contributed to promoting stability and counteracting the risk of violence in Kosovo, Sandjak and Vojvodina, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro),

Reaffirming its relevant resolutions aimed at putting an end to conflict in former Yugoslavia,

Determined to avoid any extension of the conflict in the former Yugoslavia and, in this context, attaching great importance to the work of the CSCE missions and to the continued ability of the international community to monitor the situation in Kosovo, Sandjak and Vojvodina, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro),

Stressing its commitment to the territorial integrity and political independence of all States in the region,

1. Endorses the efforts of the CSCE as described in the letters noted above from the Chairman-in-Office of the Council of Ministers of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE);

2. Calls upon the authorities in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) to reconsider their refusal to allow the continuation of the activities of

the CSCE missions in Kosovo, Sandjak and Vojvodina, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro), to cooperate with the CSCE by taking the practical steps needed for the resumption of the activities of these missions and to agree to an increase in the number of monitors as decided by the CSCE;

3. Further calls upon the authorities in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) to assure the monitors' safety and security, and to allow them free and unimpeded access necessary to accomplish their mission in full;

4. Decides to remain seized of the matter.

**A.2. UNSCR 1160; March 31, 1998: On the imposition of an arms embargo against Yugoslavia.**

Noting with appreciation the statements of the Foreign Ministers of France, Germany, Italy, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America (the Contact Group) of 9 and 25 March 1998 (S/1998/223 and S/1998/272), including the proposal on a comprehensive arms embargo on the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, including Kosovo,

Welcoming the decision of the Special Session of the Permanent Council of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) of 11 March 1998 (S/1998/246),

Condemning the use of excessive force by Serbian police forces against civilians and peaceful demonstrators in Kosovo, as well as all acts of terrorism by the Kosovo Liberation Army or any other group or individual and all external support for terrorist activity in Kosovo, including finance, arms and training,

Noting the declaration of 18 March 1998 by the President of the Republic of Serbia on the political process in Kosovo and Metohija (S/1998/250),

Noting also the clear commitment of senior representatives of the Kosovar Albanian community to non-violence,

Noting that there has been some progress in implementing the actions indicated in the Contact Group statement of 9 March 1998, but stressing that further progress is required,

Affirming the commitment of all Member States to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia,

Acting under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations,

1. Calls upon the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia immediately to take the further necessary steps to achieve a political solution to the issue of Kosovo through dialogue and to implement the actions indicated in the Contact Group statements of 9 and 25 March 1998;

2. Calls also upon the Kosovar Albanian leadership to condemn all terrorist action, and emphasizes that all elements in the Kosovar Albanian community should pursue their goals by peaceful means only;
3. Underlines that the way to defeat violence and terrorism in Kosovo is for the authorities in Belgrade to offer the Kosovar Albanian community a genuine political process;
4. Calls upon the authorities in Belgrade and the leadership of the Kosovar Albanian community urgently to enter without preconditions into a meaningful dialogue on political status issues, and notes the readiness of the Contact Group to facilitate such a dialogue;
5. Agrees, without prejudging the outcome of that dialogue, with the proposal in the Contact Group statements of 9 and 25 March 1998 that the principles for a solution of the Kosovo problem should be based on the territorial integrity of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and should be in accordance with OSCE standards, including those set out in the Helsinki Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe of 1975, and the Charter of the United Nations, and that such a solution must also take into account the rights of the Kosovar Albanians and all who live in Kosovo, and expresses its support for an enhanced status for Kosovo which would include a substantially greater degree of autonomy and meaningful self-administration;
6. Welcomes the signature on 23 March 1998 of an agreement on measures to implement the 1996 Education Agreement, calls upon all parties to ensure that its implementation proceeds smoothly and without delay according to the agreed timetable and expresses its readiness to consider measures if either party blocks implementation;
7. Expresses its support for the efforts of the OSCE for a peaceful resolution of the crisis in Kosovo, including through the Personal Representative of the Chairman-in-Office for the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, who is also the Special Representative of the European Union, and the return of the OSCE long-term missions;
8. Decides that all States shall, for the purposes of fostering peace and stability in Kosovo, prevent the sale or supply to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, including Kosovo, by their nationals or from their territories or using their flag vessels and aircraft, of arms and related matériel of all types, such as weapons and ammunition, military vehicles and equipment and spare parts for the aforementioned, and shall prevent arming and training for terrorist activities there;
9. Decides to establish, in accordance with rule 28 of its provisional rules of procedure, a committee of the Security Council, consisting of all the members of the Council, to undertake the following tasks and to report on its work to the Council with its observations and recommendations:

(a) to seek from all States information regarding the action taken by them concerning the effective implementation of the prohibitions imposed by this resolution;

(b) to consider any information brought to its attention by any State concerning violations of the prohibitions imposed by this resolution and to recommend appropriate measures in response thereto;

(c) to make periodic reports to the Security Council on information submitted to it regarding alleged violations of the prohibitions imposed by this resolution;

(d) to promulgate such guidelines as may be necessary to facilitate the implementation of the prohibitions imposed by this resolution;

(e) to examine the reports submitted pursuant to paragraph 12 below;

10. Calls upon all States and all international and regional organizations to act strictly in conformity with this resolution, notwithstanding the existence of any rights granted or obligations conferred or imposed by any international agreement or of any contract entered into or any license or permit granted prior to the entry into force of the prohibitions imposed by this resolution, and stresses in this context the importance of continuing implementation of the Agreement on Subregional Arms Control signed in Florence on 14 June 1996;

11. Requests the Secretary-General to provide all necessary assistance to the committee established by paragraph 9 above and to make the necessary arrangements in the Secretariat for this purpose;

12. Requests States to report to the committee established by paragraph 9 above within 30 days of adoption of this resolution on the steps they have taken to give effect to the prohibitions imposed by this resolution;

13. Invites the OSCE to keep the Secretary-General informed on the situation in Kosovo and on measures taken by that organization in this regard;

14. Requests the Secretary-General to keep the Council regularly informed and to report on the situation in Kosovo and the implementation of this resolution no later than 30 days following the adoption of this resolution and every 30 days thereafter;

15. Further requests that the Secretary-General, in consultation with appropriate regional organizations, include in his first report recommendations for the establishment of a comprehensive regime to monitor the implementation of the prohibitions imposed by this resolution, and calls upon all States, in particular neighbouring States, to extend full cooperation in this regard;

16. Decides to review the situation on the basis of the reports of the Secretary-General, which will take into account the assessments of, inter alia, the Contact Group, the OSCE and the European Union, and decides also to reconsider the prohibitions imposed by this resolution, including action to terminate them, following receipt of the assessment of the Secretary-General that the Government of

the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, cooperating in a constructive manner with the Contact Group, have:

- (a) begun a substantive dialogue in accordance with paragraph 4 above, including the participation of an outside representative or representatives, unless any failure to do so is not because of the position of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia or Serbian authorities;
- (b) withdrawn the special police units and ceased action by the security forces affecting the civilian population;
- (c) allowed access to Kosovo by humanitarian organizations as well as representatives of Contact Group and other embassies;
- (d) accepted a mission by the Personal Representative of the OSCE Chairman-in-Office for the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia that would include a new and specific mandate for addressing the problems in Kosovo, as well as the return of the OSCE long-term missions;
- (e) facilitated a mission to Kosovo by the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights;

17. Urges the Office of the Prosecutor of the International Tribunal established pursuant to resolution 827 (1993) of 25 May 1993 to begin gathering information related to the violence in Kosovo that may fall within its jurisdiction, and notes that the authorities of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia have an obligation to cooperate with the Tribunal and that the Contact Group countries will make available to the Tribunal substantiated relevant information in their possession;

18. Affirms that concrete progress to resolve the serious political and human rights issues in Kosovo will improve the international position of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and prospects for normalization of its international relationships and full participation in international institutions;

19. Emphasizes that failure to make constructive progress towards the peaceful resolution of the situation in Kosovo will lead to the consideration of additional measures;

20. Decides to remain seized of the matter.

### **A.3. UNSCR 1199; September 23, 1998: On the situation in Kosovo.**

Recalling its resolution 1160 (1998) of 31 March 1998,

Having considered the reports of the Secretary-General pursuant to that resolution, and in particular his report of 4 September 1998 (S/1998/834 and Add.1),

Noting with appreciation the statement of the Foreign Ministers of France, Germany, Italy, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern

Ireland and the United States of America (the Contact Group) of 12 June 1998 at the conclusion of the Contact Group's meeting with the Foreign Ministers of Canada and Japan (S/1998/567, annex), and the further statement of the Contact Group made in Bonn on 8 July 1998 (S/1998/657),

Noting also with appreciation the joint statement by the Presidents of the Russian Federation and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia of 16 June 1998 (S/1998/526),

Noting further the communication by the Prosecutor of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia to the Contact Group on 7 July 1998, expressing the view that the situation in Kosovo represents an armed conflict within the terms of the mandate of the Tribunal,

Gravely concerned at the recent intense fighting in Kosovo and in particular the excessive and indiscriminate use of force by Serbian security forces and the Yugoslav Army which have resulted in numerous civilian casualties and, according to the estimate of the Secretary-General, the displacement of over 230,000 persons from their homes,

Deeply concerned by the flow of refugees into northern Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina and other European countries as a result of the use of force in Kosovo, as well as by the increasing numbers of displaced persons within Kosovo, and other parts of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, up to 50,000 of whom the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees has estimated are without shelter and other basic necessities,

Reaffirming the right of all refugees and displaced persons to return to their homes in safety, and underlining the responsibility of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia for creating the conditions which allow them to do so,

Condemning all acts of violence by any party, as well as terrorism in pursuit of political goals by any group or individual, and all external support for such activities in Kosovo, including the supply of arms and training for terrorist activities in Kosovo and expressing concern at the reports of continuing violations of the prohibitions imposed by resolution 1160 (1998),

Deeply concerned by the rapid deterioration in the humanitarian situation throughout Kosovo, alarmed at the impending humanitarian catastrophe as described in the report of the Secretary-General, and emphasizing the need to prevent this from happening,

Deeply concerned also by reports of increasing violations of human rights and of international humanitarian law, and emphasizing the need to ensure that the rights of all inhabitants of Kosovo are respected,

Reaffirming the objectives of resolution 1160 (1998), in which the Council expressed support for a peaceful resolution of the Kosovo problem which would include an enhanced status for Kosovo, a substantially greater degree of autonomy, and meaningful self-administration,

Reaffirming also the commitment of all Member States to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia,

Affirming that the deterioration of the situation in Kosovo, Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, constitutes a threat to peace and security in the region,

Acting under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations,

1. Demands that all parties, groups and individuals immediately cease hostilities and maintain a ceasefire in Kosovo, Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, which would enhance the prospects for a meaningful dialogue between the authorities of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the Kosovo Albanian leadership and reduce the risks of a humanitarian catastrophe;

2. Demands also that the authorities of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the Kosovo Albanian leadership take immediate steps to improve the humanitarian situation and to avert the impending humanitarian catastrophe;

3. Calls upon the authorities in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the Kosovo Albanian leadership to enter immediately into a meaningful dialogue without preconditions and with international involvement, and to a clear timetable, leading to an end of the crisis and to a negotiated political solution to the issue of Kosovo, and welcomes the current efforts aimed at facilitating such a dialogue;

4. Demands further that the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, in addition to the measures called for under resolution 1160 (1998), implement immediately the following concrete measures towards achieving a political solution to the situation in Kosovo as contained in the Contact Group statement of 12 June 1998:

(a) cease all action by the security forces affecting the civilian population and order the withdrawal of security units used for civilian repression;

(b) enable effective and continuous international monitoring in Kosovo by the European Community Monitoring Mission and diplomatic missions accredited to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, including access and complete freedom of movement of such monitors to, from and within Kosovo unimpeded by government authorities, and expeditious issuance of appropriate travel documents to international personnel contributing to the monitoring;

(c) facilitate, in agreement with the UNHCR and the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), the safe return of refugees and displaced persons to their homes and allow free and unimpeded access for humanitarian organizations and supplies to Kosovo;

(d) make rapid progress to a clear timetable, in the dialogue referred to in paragraph 3 with the Kosovo Albanian community called for in resolution 1160 (1998), with the aim of agreeing confidence-building measures and finding a political solution to the problems of Kosovo;

5. Notes, in this connection, the commitments of the President of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, in his joint statement with the President of the Russian Federation of 16 June 1998:

(a) to resolve existing problems by political means on the basis of equality for all citizens and ethnic communities in Kosovo;

(b) not to carry out any repressive actions against the peaceful population;

(c) to provide full freedom of movement for and ensure that there will be no restrictions on representatives of foreign States and international institutions accredited to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia monitoring the situation in Kosovo;

(d) to ensure full and unimpeded access for humanitarian organizations, the ICRC and the UNHCR, and delivery of humanitarian supplies;

(e) to facilitate the unimpeded return of refugees and displaced persons under programmes agreed with the UNHCR and the ICRC, providing State aid for the reconstruction of destroyed homes,

and calls for the full implementation of these commitments;

6. Insists that the Kosovo Albanian leadership condemn all terrorist action, and emphasizes that all elements in the Kosovo Albanian community should pursue their goals by peaceful means only;

7. Recalls the obligations of all States to implement fully the prohibitions imposed by resolution 1160 (1998);

8. Endorses the steps taken to establish effective international monitoring of the situation in Kosovo, and in this connection welcomes the establishment of the Kosovo Diplomatic Observer Mission;

9. Urges States and international organizations represented in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to make available personnel to fulfil the responsibility of carrying out effective and continuous international monitoring in Kosovo until the objectives of this resolution and those of resolution 1160 (1998) are achieved;

10. Reminds the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia that it has the primary responsibility for the security of all diplomatic personnel accredited to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia as well as the safety and security of all international and non-governmental humanitarian personnel in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and calls upon the authorities of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and all others concerned in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to take all appropriate steps to ensure that monitoring personnel performing functions under this resolution are not subject to the threat or use of force or interference of any kind;

11. Requests States to pursue all means consistent with their domestic legislation and relevant international law to prevent funds collected on their territory being used to contravene resolution 1160 (1998);

12. Calls upon Member States and others concerned to provide adequate resources for humanitarian assistance in the region and to respond promptly and generously to the United Nations Consolidated Inter-Agency Appeal for Humanitarian Assistance Related to the Kosovo Crisis;

13. Calls upon the authorities of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, the leaders of the Kosovo Albanian community and all others concerned to cooperate fully with the Prosecutor of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia in the investigation of possible violations within the jurisdiction of the Tribunal;

14. Underlines also the need for the authorities of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to bring to justice those members of the security forces who have been involved in the mistreatment of civilians and the deliberate destruction of property;

15. Requests the Secretary-General to provide regular reports to the Council as necessary on his assessment of compliance with this resolution by the authorities of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and all elements in the Kosovo Albanian community, including through his regular reports on compliance with resolution 1160 (1998);

16. Decides, should the concrete measures demanded in this resolution and resolution 1160 (1998) not be taken, to consider further action and additional measures to maintain or restore peace and stability in the region;

17. Decides to remain seized of the matter.

#### **A.4. UNSCR 1203, October 24, 1998: On agreements for the verification of compliance with the provisions of resolution 1199.**

Recalling its resolutions 1160 (1998) of 31 March 1998 and 1199 (1998) of 23 September 1998, and the importance of the peaceful resolution of the problem of Kosovo, Federal Republic of Yugoslavia,

Having considered the reports of the Secretary-General pursuant to those resolutions, in particular his report of 5 October 1998 (S/1998/912),

Welcoming the agreement signed in Belgrade on 16 October 1998 by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the Chairman-in-Office of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) providing for the OSCE to establish a verification mission in Kosovo (S/1998/978), including the undertaking of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to comply with resolutions 1160 (1998) and 1199 (1998),

Welcoming also the agreement signed in Belgrade on 15 October 1998 by the Chief of General Staff of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) providing for the establishment of an air verification mission over Kosovo (S/1998/991, annex), complementing the OSCE Verification Mission,

Welcoming also the decision of the Permanent Council of the OSCE of 15 October 1998 (S/1998/959, annex),

Welcoming the decision of the Secretary-General to send a mission to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to establish a first-hand capacity to assess developments on the ground in Kosovo,

Reaffirming that, under the Charter of the United Nations, primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security is conferred on the Security Council,

Recalling the objectives of resolution 1160 (1998), in which the Council expressed support for a peaceful resolution of the Kosovo problem which would include an enhanced status for Kosovo, a substantially greater degree of autonomy, and meaningful self-administration,

Condemning all acts of violence by any party, as well as terrorism in pursuit of political goals by any group or individual, and all external support for such activities in Kosovo, including the supply of arms and training for terrorist activities in Kosovo, and expressing concern at the reports of continuing violations of the prohibitions imposed by resolution 1160 (1998),

Deeply concerned at the recent closure by the authorities of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia of independent media outlets in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, and emphasizing the need for these to be allowed freely to resume their operations,

Deeply alarmed and concerned at the continuing grave humanitarian situation throughout Kosovo and the impending humanitarian catastrophe, and re-emphasizing the need to prevent this from happening,

Stressing the importance of proper coordination of humanitarian initiatives undertaken by States, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and international organizations in Kosovo,

Emphasizing the need to ensure the safety and security of members of the Verification Mission in Kosovo and the Air Verification Mission over Kosovo,

Reaffirming the commitment of all Member States to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia,

Affirming that the unresolved situation in Kosovo, Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, constitutes a continuing threat to peace and security in the region,

Acting under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations,

1. Endorses and supports the agreements signed in Belgrade on 16 October 1998 between the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the OSCE, and on 15 October 1998 between the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and NATO, concerning the verification of compliance by the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and all others concerned in Kosovo with the requirements of its resolution 1199 (1998), and demands the full

and prompt implementation of these agreements by the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia;

2. Notes the endorsement by the Government of Serbia of the accord reached by the President of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the United States Special Envoy (S/1998/953, annex), and the public commitment of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to complete negotiations on a framework for a political settlement by 2 November 1998, and calls for the full implementation of these commitments;

3. Demands that the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia comply fully and swiftly with resolutions 1160 (1998) and 1199 (1998) and cooperate fully with the OSCE Verification Mission in Kosovo and the NATO Air Verification Mission over Kosovo according to the terms of the agreements referred to in paragraph 1 above;

4. Demands also that the Kosovo Albanian leadership and all other elements of the Kosovo Albanian community comply fully and swiftly with resolutions 1160 (1998) and 1199 (1998) and cooperate fully with the OSCE Verification Mission in Kosovo;

5. Stresses the urgent need for the authorities in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the Kosovo Albanian leadership to enter immediately into a meaningful dialogue without preconditions and with international involvement, and to a clear timetable, leading to an end of the crisis and to a negotiated political solution to the issue of Kosovo;

6. Demands that the authorities of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, the Kosovo Albanian leadership and all others concerned respect the freedom of movement of the OSCE Verification Mission and other international personnel;

7. Urges States and international organizations to make available personnel to the OSCE Verification Mission in Kosovo;

8. Reminds the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia that it has the primary responsibility for the safety and security of all diplomatic personnel accredited to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, including members of the OSCE Verification Mission, as well as the safety and security of all international and non-governmental humanitarian personnel in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, and calls upon the authorities of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, and all others concerned throughout the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia including the Kosovo Albanian leadership, to take all appropriate steps to ensure that personnel performing functions under this resolution and the agreements referred to in paragraph 1 above are not subject to the threat or use of force or interference of any kind;

9. Welcomes in this context the commitment of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to guarantee the safety and security of the Verification Missions as contained in the agreements referred to in paragraph 1 above, notes that, to this end, the OSCE is considering arrangements to be implemented in cooperation with other organizations, and affirms that, in the event of an emergency, action may be needed to ensure their safety and freedom of movement as envisaged in the agreements referred to in paragraph 1 above;

10. Insists that the Kosovo Albanian leadership condemn all terrorist actions, demands that such actions cease immediately and emphasizes that all elements in the Kosovo Albanian community should pursue their goals by peaceful means only;

11. Demands immediate action from the authorities of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the Kosovo Albanian leadership to cooperate with international efforts to improve the humanitarian situation and to avert the impending humanitarian catastrophe;

12. Reaffirms the right of all refugees and displaced persons to return to their homes in safety, and underlines the responsibility of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia for creating the conditions which allow them to do so;

13. Urges Member States and others concerned to provide adequate resources for humanitarian assistance in the region and to respond promptly and generously to the United Nations Consolidated Inter-Agency Appeal for Humanitarian Assistance Related to the Kosovo crisis;

14. Calls for prompt and complete investigation, including international supervision and participation, of all atrocities committed against civilians and full cooperation with the International Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, including compliance with its orders, requests for information and investigations;

15. Decides that the prohibitions imposed by paragraph 8 of resolution 1160 (1998) shall not apply to relevant equipment for the sole use of the Verification Missions in accordance with the agreements referred to in paragraph 1 above;

16. Requests the Secretary-General, acting in consultation with the parties concerned with the agreements referred to in paragraph 1 above, to report regularly to the Council regarding implementation of this resolution;

17. Decides to remain seized of the matter.

**A.5. UNSCR 1207; November 17, 1998: On the failure of Yugoslavia to execute arrest warrants issued by the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia.**

Recalling all its previous relevant resolutions concerning the conflicts in the former Yugoslavia, in particular resolution 827 (1993) of 25 May 1993,

Recalling also the statement by its President of 8 May 1996 (S/PRST/1996/23),

Recalling further the General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Annexes thereto (S/1995/999, annex), in particular its Article IX and its Annex 1-A, Article X,

Having considered the letters of the President of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia to the President of the Security Council of 8 September 1998 (S/1998/839), 22 October 1998 (S/1998/990) and 6 November 1998 (S/1998/1040),

Deploring the continued failure of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to cooperate fully with the Tribunal, as described in those letters,

Reaffirming the commitment of all Member States to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia,

Acting under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations,

1. Reiterates its decision that all States shall cooperate fully with the Tribunal and its organs in accordance with resolution 827 (1993) and the Statute of the Tribunal, including the obligation of States to comply with requests for assistance or orders issued by a Trial Chamber under Article 29 of the Statute, to execute arrest warrants transmitted to them by the Tribunal, and to comply with its requests for information and investigations;

2. Calls again upon the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, and all other States which have not already done so, to take any measures necessary under their domestic law to implement the provisions of resolution 827 (1993) and the Statute of the Tribunal, and affirms that a State may not invoke provisions of its domestic law as justification for its failure to perform binding obligations under international law;

3. Condemns the failure to date of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to execute the arrest warrants issued by the Tribunal against the three individuals referred to in the letter of 8 September 1998, and demands the immediate and unconditional execution of those arrest warrants, including the transfer to the custody of the Tribunal of those individuals;

4. Reiterates its call upon the authorities of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, the leaders of the Kosovo Albanian community and all others concerned to cooperate fully with the Prosecutor in the investigation of all possible violations within the jurisdiction of the Tribunal;

5. Requests the President of the Tribunal to keep the Council informed about the implementation of this resolution for the Council's further consideration;

6. Decides to remain seized of the matter.

**A.6. UNSCR 1239; May 14, 1999: On relief assistance to Kosovo refugees and internally displaced persons in Kosovo, the Republic of Montenegro and other parts of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.**

Recalling its resolutions 1160 (1998) of 31 March 1998, 1199 (1998) of 23 September 1998, and 1203 (1998) of 24 October 1998, and the statements of its President of 24 August 1998 (S/PRST/1998/25), 19 January 1999 (S/PRST/1999/2), and 29 January 1999 (S/PRST/1999/5),

Bearing in mind the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and guided by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the international covenants and conventions on human rights, the Conventions and Protocol relating to the Status of

Refugees, the Geneva Conventions of 1949 and the Additional Protocols thereto of 1977, as well as other instruments of international humanitarian law,

Expressing grave concern at the humanitarian catastrophe in and around Kosovo, Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, as a result of the continuing crisis,

Deeply concerned by the enormous influx of Kosovo refugees into Albania, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and other countries, as well as by the increasing numbers of displaced persons within Kosovo, the Republic of Montenegro and other parts of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia,

Stressing the importance of effective coordination of humanitarian relief activities undertaken by States, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and international organizations in alleviating the plight and suffering of refugees and internally displaced persons,

Noting with interest the intention of the Secretary-General to send a humanitarian needs assessment mission to Kosovo and other parts of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia,

Reaffirming the territorial integrity and sovereignty of all States in the region,

1. Commends the efforts that have been taken by Member States, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and other international humanitarian relief organizations in providing the urgently needed relief assistance to the Kosovo refugees in Albania, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Bosnia and Herzegovina, and urges them and others in a position to do so to contribute resources for humanitarian assistance to the refugees and internally displaced persons;
2. Invites the UNHCR and other international humanitarian relief organizations to extend relief assistance to the internally displaced persons in Kosovo, the Republic of Montenegro and other parts of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, as well as to other civilians being affected by the ongoing crisis;
3. Calls for access for United Nations and all other humanitarian personnel operating in Kosovo and other parts of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia;
4. Reaffirms the right of all refugees and displaced persons to return to their homes in safety and in dignity;
5. Emphasizes that the humanitarian situation will continue to deteriorate in the absence of a political solution to the crisis consistent with the principles adopted by the Foreign Ministers of Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America on 6 May 1999 (S/1999/516), and urges all concerned to work towards this aim;
6. Decides to remain actively seized of the matter.

**A.7. UNSCR 1244; June 10, 1999: On the deployment of international civil and security presences in Kosovo.**

Bearing in mind the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, and the primary responsibility of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security,

Recalling its resolutions 1160 (1998) of 31 March 1998, 1199 (1998) of 23 September 1998, 1203 (1998) of 24 October 1998 and 1239 (1999) of 14 May 1999,

Regretting that there has not been full compliance with the requirements of these resolutions,

Determined to resolve the grave humanitarian situation in Kosovo, Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, and to provide for the safe and free return of all refugees and displaced persons to their homes,

Condemning all acts of violence against the Kosovo population as well as all terrorist acts by any party,

Recalling the statement made by the Secretary-General on 9 April 1999, expressing concern at the humanitarian tragedy taking place in Kosovo,

Reaffirming the right of all refugees and displaced persons to return to their homes in safety,

Recalling the jurisdiction and the mandate of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia,

Welcoming the general principles on a political solution to the Kosovo crisis adopted on 6 May 1999 (S/1999/516, annex 1 to this resolution) and welcoming also the acceptance by the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia of the principles set forth in points 1 to 9 of the paper presented in Belgrade on 2 June 1999 (S/1999/649, annex 2 to this resolution), and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia's agreement to that paper,

Reaffirming the commitment of all Member States to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the other States of the region, as set out in the Helsinki Final Act and annex 2,

Reaffirming the call in previous resolutions for substantial autonomy and meaningful self-administration for Kosovo,

Determining that the situation in the region continues to constitute a threat to international peace and security,

Determined to ensure the safety and security of international personnel and the implementation by all concerned of their responsibilities under the present resolution, and acting for these purposes under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations,

Decides that a political solution to the Kosovo crisis shall be based on the general principles in annex 1 and as further elaborated in the principles and other required elements in annex 2;

Welcomes the acceptance by the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia of the principles and other required elements referred to in paragraph 1 above, and demands the full cooperation of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in their rapid implementation;

Demands in particular that the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia put an immediate and verifiable end to violence and repression in Kosovo, and begin and complete verifiable phased withdrawal from Kosovo of all military, police and paramilitary forces according to a rapid timetable, with which the deployment of the international security presence in Kosovo will be synchronized;

Confirms that after the withdrawal an agreed number of Yugoslav and Serb military and police personnel will be permitted to return to Kosovo to perform the functions in accordance with annex 2;

Decides on the deployment in Kosovo, under United Nations auspices, of international civil and security presences, with appropriate equipment and personnel as required, and welcomes the agreement of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to such presences;

Requests the Secretary-General to appoint, in consultation with the Security Council, a Special Representative to control the implementation of the international civil presence, and further requests the Secretary-General to instruct his Special Representative to coordinate closely with the international security presence to ensure that both presences operate towards the same goals and in a mutually supportive manner;

Authorizes Member States and relevant international organizations to establish the international security presence in Kosovo as set out in point 4 of annex 2 with all necessary means to fulfil its responsibilities under paragraph 9 below;

Affirms the need for the rapid early deployment of effective international civil and security presences to Kosovo, and demands that the parties cooperate fully in their deployment;

Decides that the responsibilities of the international security presence to be deployed and acting in Kosovo will include:

Deterring renewed hostilities, maintaining and where necessary enforcing a ceasefire, and ensuring the withdrawal and preventing the return into Kosovo of Federal and Republic military, police and paramilitary forces, except as provided in point 6 of annex 2;

Demilitarizing the Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA) and other armed Kosovo Albanian groups as required in paragraph 15 below;

Establishing a secure environment in which refugees and displaced persons can return home in safety, the international civil presence can operate, a transitional administration can be established, and humanitarian aid can be delivered;

Ensuring public safety and order until the international civil presence can take responsibility for this task;

Supervising demining until the international civil presence can, as appropriate, take over responsibility for this task;

Supporting, as appropriate, and coordinating closely with the work of the international civil presence;

Conducting border monitoring duties as required;

Ensuring the protection and freedom of movement of itself, the international civil presence, and other international organizations;

Authorizes the Secretary-General, with the assistance of relevant international organizations, to establish an international civil presence in Kosovo in order to provide an interim administration for Kosovo under which the people of Kosovo can enjoy substantial autonomy within the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, and which will provide transitional administration while establishing and overseeing the development of provisional democratic self-governing institutions to ensure conditions for a peaceful and normal life for all inhabitants of Kosovo;

Decides that the main responsibilities of the international civil presence will include:

Promoting the establishment, pending a final settlement, of substantial autonomy and self-government in Kosovo, taking full account of annex 2 and of the Rambouillet accords (S/1999/648);

Performing basic civilian administrative functions where and as long as required;

Organizing and overseeing the development of provisional institutions for democratic and autonomous self-government pending a political settlement, including the holding of elections;

Transferring, as these institutions are established, its administrative responsibilities while overseeing and supporting the consolidation of Kosovo's local provisional institutions and other peace-building activities;

Facilitating a political process designed to determine Kosovo's future status, taking into account the Rambouillet accords (S/1999/648);

In a final stage, overseeing the transfer of authority from Kosovo's provisional institutions to institutions established under a political settlement;

Supporting the reconstruction of key infrastructure and other economic reconstruction;

Supporting, in coordination with international humanitarian organizations, humanitarian and disaster relief aid;

Maintaining civil law and order, including establishing local police forces and meanwhile through the deployment of international police personnel to serve in Kosovo;

Protecting and promoting human rights;

Assuring the safe and unimpeded return of all refugees and displaced persons to their homes in Kosovo;

Emphasizes the need for coordinated humanitarian relief operations, and for the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to allow unimpeded access to Kosovo by humanitarian aid organizations and to cooperate with such organizations so as to ensure the fast and effective delivery of international aid;

Encourages all Member States and international organizations to contribute to economic and social reconstruction as well as to the safe return of refugees and displaced persons, and emphasizes in this context the importance of convening an international donors' conference, particularly for the purposes set out in paragraph 11 (g) above, at the earliest possible date;

Demands full cooperation by all concerned, including the international security presence, with the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia;

Demands that the KLA and other armed Kosovo Albanian groups end immediately all offensive actions and comply with the requirements for demilitarization as laid down by the head of the international security presence in consultation with the Special Representative of the Secretary-General;

Decides that the prohibitions imposed by paragraph 8 of resolution 1160 (1998) shall not apply to arms and related matériel for the use of the international civil and security presences;

Welcomes the work in hand in the European Union and other international organizations to develop a comprehensive approach to the economic development and stabilization of the region affected by the Kosovo crisis, including the implementation of a Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe with broad international participation in order to further the promotion of democracy, economic prosperity, stability and regional cooperation;

Demands that all States in the region cooperate fully in the implementation of all aspects of this resolution;

Decides that the international civil and security presences are established for an initial period of 12 months, to continue thereafter unless the Security Council decides otherwise;

Requests the Secretary-General to report to the Council at regular intervals on the implementation of this resolution, including reports from the leaderships of the international civil and security presences, the first reports to be submitted within 30 days of the adoption of this resolution;

Decides to remain actively seized of the matter.