



Naučna konferencija

**ZAPADNI BALKAN
KAO „OSTATAK”
UJEDINJENE EVROPE:
SVAČJA I NIČJA ZEMLJA?**

Zbornik apstrakata

Zbornik apstrakata sa naučne konferencije
ZAPADNI BALKAN KAO „OSTATAK“ UJEDINJENE EVROPE:
SVAČJA I NIČJA ZEMLJA?

Institut za međunarodnu politiku i privredu
Beograd, 6. decembar 2018. godine

Izdavač:

Institut za međunarodnu politiku i privredu
Beograd, 2018.

Za izdavača:

Prof. dr Branislav Đorđević

Urednik:

Dr Srđan T. Korać

Kompjuterska obrada:

Sanja Balović

ISBN 978-86-7067-258-1

Izradu ove publikacije i organizaciju konferencije podržala je Kancelarija Fondacije Hans Zajdel
u Srbiji i u Crnoj Gori.

The publication and conference were funded by the Hanns Seidel Stiftung
– Office for Serbia and for Montenegro.

SADRŽAJ

UVODNA REČ:

Zapadni Balkan kao „ostatak“ Ujedinjene Evrope:
svačija i ničija zemlja?

Srđan KORAC

7

UVODNO IZLAGANJE:

Velika kriza Evropske unije promenila je funkciju
i sadržaj politike proširenja

Slobodan SAMARDŽIĆ

12

PANEL 1:

ZAPADNI BALKAN U NADNACIONALNIM DILEMAMA EVROPSKE UNIJE

Spoljna politika Evropske unije i Zapadni Balkan:
ograničenja transformativne moći

Maja KOVAČEVIĆ

16

Problemi odnosa Evropske unije i država kandidata
za članstvo i fleksibilno pristupanje kao mogući način
oživljavanja politike proširenja

Ivana RADIĆ MILOSAVLJEVIĆ

18

Neizvestan proces proširenja Evropske unije i dalja periferizacija Balkana:
tri aktuelna trenda

Milan IGRUTINOVIĆ

20

3

Pridruživanje Evropskoj uniji zemalja Zapadnog Balkana iz perspektive energetike Petar STANOJEVIĆ, Zoran JEFTIĆ	22
--	----

PANEL 2:

DA LI JE NA POMOLU NOVO POGLAVLJE
U ISTORIJU BALKANSKOG KLJENTELIZMA?

„Evropa izvan EU“: Zapadni Balkan i nova britanska spoljna politika Dejan JOVIĆ	26
--	----

Britanska politika prema Zapadnom Balkanu posle Bregzita u kontekstu proširenja Evropske unije na države regiona Miloš PAUNOVIĆ	28
--	----

Američka velika strategija uzdržavanja, transatlantski odnosi i budućnost Zapadnog Balkana Mladen LIŠANIN	30
--	----

Velika igra u „dvorištu“ Zapada: spoljna politika Rusije na Balkanu Siniša ATLAGIĆ	32
---	----

Manipulisanje <i>Drugošću</i> na Balkanu: turski uticaj u Bosni i Hercegovini i Srbiji Vladimir AJZENHAMER	34
---	----

Kina kao novi „igrač“ na Zapadnom Balkanu Ivona LAĐEVAC	36
--	----

PANEL 3:

ZAPADNI BALKAN PRED OGLEDALOM:
LUTANJE STAZAMA TRANZICIJE I EVROPEIZACIJE

Zapadni Balkan na kraju 2018. godine: konfuzija ili stabilizacija Dragan ĐUKANOVIĆ	40
---	----

Freeing a captured state: What role for EU accession? – The case of the Republic of Macedonia Simonida KAČARSKA	42
Tamo gdje se proces evropske integracije sukobljava s nedosljednostima međunarodnog kriznog menadžmenta: slučaj Bosne i Hercegovine Lejla RAMIĆ-MESIHOVIĆ	44
Crna Gora između autokratije i demokratije: slabosti EU politike uslovljavanja Jovana MAROVIĆ	46
Izazovi politike proširenja u svetlu transformacije Evropske unije: da li je porast evroskepticizma u Srbiji neizbežan? Jelena TODOROVIĆ LAZIĆ	48

ZAPADNI BALKAN KAO „OSTATAK“ UJEDINJENE EVROPE: SVAČIJA I NIČIJA ZEMLJA?

Institut za međunarodnu politiku i privredu (IMPP) organizovao je 6. decembra 2018. godine u Beogradu jednodnevni naučni skup „Zapadni Balkan kao ‘ostatak’ ujedinjene Evrope: svačija i ničija zemlja?“, uz podršku Kancelarije Fondacije Hans Zajdel za Srbiju i za Crnu Goru. Osnovna ideja Programskog odbora konferencije bila je da okupi članove akademske zajednice iz Srbije i susednih zemalja u zajedničkom poduhvatu otkrivanja kako aktuelni problemi funkcionisanja nadnacionalnog političkog okvira Evropske unije u spoju sa dosadašnjim skromnim postignućima na planu evroatlantskih integracija regiona mogu da uzdrmaju bezbednosnu potporu stabilnosti Zapadnog Balkana. Konferencija je poslužila kao prostor za raspravu zasnovanu na rezultatima svežih naučnih istraživanja o novim promenama dinamike moći velikih i regionalnih sila podstaknutih turbulencijama u svetskoj politici. Posebno težište stavljeno je na sagledavanje načina na koje izmenjena dinamika moći oblikuje sadržaj spoljnih politika najvažnijih međunarodnih aktera prema zemljama regiona koje nisu članice EU, odnosno kako akteri nastoje da osnaže uticaj ili prisustvo na tlu Zapadnog Balkana i popune „vakuum“ nastao usled zastoja u procesu evrointegracija.

Institut za međunarodnu politiku i privredu je ovim skupom nastojao da ukaže na brojna pitanja koja za zemlje Zapadnog Balkana otvara neizvesna budućnost priključenja Evropskoj uniji, prvenstveno uslovljena višeslojnim unutrašnjim turbulencijama u nadnacionalnom političkom procesu. Prvo, i dalje su javnim raspravama unutar zemalja članica EU prisutne brojne kontroverze u pogledu demokratskog legitimiteta složenog sistema odlučivanja evrokrate, adekvatnog institucionalnog odgovora na aktuelne krize (poput npr. migrantske), te načelnih razlika u viđenju daljeg razvoja evropske integracije nakon Brexit-a produbljenih mogućim prelivanjem usled povećane podrške građana desničarskim političkim strankama. Drugo, mada su dosadašnji pokušaji rešavanja migrantske krize ukazali da je na ovaj ozbiljni izazov moguće delotvorno odgovoriti jedino unutar pouzdanog evropskog institucionalnog okvira, populističke i ekstremističke političke

snage uspele su da osiguraju porast popularnosti u biračkom telu zbog neodlučnog i, ponekada, paralisnog nadnacionalnog odlučivanja koje je uzdrmalo reputaciju EU. Treće, Evropska unija može da povrati poštovanje svojih građana jedino razvijanjem efikasnih mehanizama odlučivanja u oblasti odbrambene, bezbednosne i spoljne politike, što je od vitalnog značaja zbog stalnih previranja u susednom Sredozemlju, nedavnih napetosti u transatlantskom partnerstvu, komplikovanih odnosa sa Turskom i zaoštavanja politike sankcija prema Rusiji.

Buduća uloga Evropske unije kao delotvornog aktera u bližem i širem okruženju mora prvo da se proverí na primeru ponovnog osmišljavanja evropske perspektive za preostale balkanske zemlje. Premda je Berlinski proces oživeo regionalnu saradnju i potvrdio ulogu EU kao međunarodnog aktera koji se stara o bezbednosti neposrednog okruženja, kratkovidost pojedinih nacionalnih vlada zemalja članica Unije slala je tokom poslednjih par godina oprečne poruke i podrila poverenje građana Zapadnog Balkana u realističnost perspektive pridruživanja ujedinjenom delu Evrope. Nasuprot tome, samit NATO-a održan u Briselu 11. i 12. jula 2018. godine iznova je naglasio da je reč o regionu od „strateške važnosti“, te da ova organizacija ostaje „u potpunosti privržena stabilnosti i bezbednosti“ regiona i to tako što nastavlja da podržava evroatlantske aspiracije zemalja van Unije, a posebno očuvanjem prisustva na Kosovu i Metohiji i jačanjem odnosa sa Srbijom. Uprkos stalnim tremorima u Trampovoj spoljnoj politici, čini se da američki spoljnopolitički odlučioi nameravaju da ozbiljno odgovore na opasnost od spirale rizika u pojedinim delovima regiona koja se može lako zavrteti sa nadolazećim antizapadnim uticajem Rusije, Kine i Turske.

Očekivalo bi se da je tesna isprepletanost balkanskih naroda jemac mira i skladnih susedskih odnosa, a ne uzrok razaranja i razjedinjenosti. Doduše, zemlje regiona spaja rastuća stopa siromaštva, depopulacija uslovljena povećanim iseljavanjem na Zapad, te sunovrat u uživanju ekonomskih i socijalnih prava. Svi navedeni činioi deluju lako zapaljivo na uvek plamteća pitanja etnopolitike, poput nedovršenog procesa razgraničenja, osporavane nezavisnosti tzv. Kosova, te disfunkcionalne države i segregisanih zajednica u Bosni i Hercegovini i Makedoniji. Pored brojnih strukturnih problema u pogledu ugradnje *acquis communautaire*-a u nacionalna zakonodavstva i sprovođenja evropskih standarda u radu javnih institucija, premeštanje težišta političke debate unutar Unije sa njenog međunarodnog delovanja na supstancijalna pitanja reforme nadnacionalnog institucionalnog okvira učinilo je vlade zemalja regiona podložnijim klijentelističkom položaju u međunarodnim odnosima. Reč je zapravo o tradicionalnom obeležju istorije regiona kao poprišta stalnih etničkih tenzija između „slabih“/„neuspelih“ država ukrštenih sa strategijskim spoljnopolitičkim projekcijama velikih i regionalnih sila. Dok na početku

21. veka SAD nastoje da očuvaju kontrolu nad ovim delom Evrope, Rusija, Kina i Turska se pojavljuju kao novi/stari takmaci i pokušavaju da iskoriste brojna nerešena pitanja susedskih odnosa tako da većim spojem vojno-političkih, ekonomskih i kulturnih instrumenata pojedinim zemljama Zapadnog Balkana ponude stratešku spoljnopolitičku alternativu u okolnostima produžene ekonomske krize i trenutno neizvesne perspektive evropske integracije.

Debata učesnika konferencije bila je zasnovana na 16 predstavljenih izlaganja koja su pokušala da pruže odgovor na neko od sledećih pitanja:

- Otvorena pitanja dalje politike proširenja Evropske unije na Zapadni Balkan u okolnostima nedoslednog sprovođenja tranzicione reforme u zemljama regiona, te unutrašnjih legitimacijskih kontroverzi i disfunkcionalnosti nadnacionalnog političkog sistema
- Da li i kako klijentelizam i „mržnja malih razlika“ kao „sudbina“ balkanskih nacija usporavaju priključenje Evropskoj uniji?
- Spoljnopolitičko delovanje velikih i regionalnih sila na Zapadnom Balkanu – „odraz u ogledalu“ nove dinamike globalnih odnosa moći?
- Kako velike i regionalne sile koriste spoljnopolitički instrumentarijum radi istiskivanja uticaja Evropske unije sa Zapadnog Balkana? Koliko delotvorno Evropska unija koristi svoj spoljnopolitički instrumentarijum da očuva uticaj u regionu?

Bez obzira na to da li su učesnici ovog skupa uspeli da pruže valjane odgovore, važnost razmotrenih pitanja ogleđa se u ukazivanju na mogućnost zatvaranja perspektive zajedničke izgradnje trajnog mira na ovom odvajkada trusnom području. U regionu zahvaćenom pratećim pošastima sada već decenijske globalne recesije, uspostavljanje strateškog uticaja kao instrumenta partikularističke spoljne politike koja zanemaruje dugoročnu viziju zajedničke budućnosti zemalja Zapadnog Balkana može da zavede privlačnim ali površnim i trenutnim obećanjima, te predstavlja opasnu zamenu za perspektivu ujedinjene Evrope – ma koliko ona u sadašnjem trenutku delovala daleko i neizvesno.

Dr Srđan T. Korać
Predsednik Programskog odbora konferencije

UVODNO IZLAGANJE:

Prof. dr Slobodan SAMARDŽIĆ

Fakultet političkih nauka Univerziteta u Beogradu

Velika kriza Evropske unije promenila je funkciju i sadržaj politike proširenja

Velika kriza Evropske unije (EU) je već desetogodišnji proces uslovljen isključivo unutrašnjim razlozima. Osnovni pokretač krize je razlika između visokih ciljeva integracionih projekata i neodgovarajućih institucionalnih, pravnih i političkih sposobnosti da se ovi ciljevi ostvare. U realnom životu ova razlika, koja je strukturne prirode, iskazuje se u disfunkcionalnosti novijih integracionih zahvata – monetarna unija, zajednička spoljna i bezbednosna politika, pravosudna i policijska saradnja – što vodi, kao što se pokazalo tokom krize, u disfunkcionalnost mnogih oblasti prethodno dostignutog stepena integracije. Najdublja kriza EU nalazi se u oblasti monetarne unije. Ona se izražava u obliku dužničke krize većeg broja država članica evro zone kao posledice visokih problema u javnim finansijama ovih zemalja. Antikrizni mehanizam koji je u Uniji uveden u periodu od 2011. do 2014. godine duboko je izmenio institucionalnu sliku kako pogođenih država članica tako i Unije kao celine. Obe strane su znatno izmenile način funkcionisanja, bar kada je o rešavanju kriznih pitanja reč, uvodeći u postupke odlučivanja i sprovođenja odluka poprilično autoritarne postupke. Takve mere možda bi bile prihvaćene kao legitimne u faktički vanrednom stanju, kada bi one davale pozitivne rezultate i nagoveštavale realna očekivanja njihovih povlačenja. Ali, u većini pogođenih država članica stanje nije poboljšano, a neke nove ulaze u orbitu antikrizne politike. Izlaz iz krize još nije na vidiku. U ovakvim okolnostima politički akteri u EU svesni su potrebe njene dubinske reforme, ali nemaju snagu niti dovoljnu političku volju da je pokrenu. Politika proširenja EU nije mogla a da ne pretrpi velike promene usled ovih unutrašnjih procesa. Veliko proširenje 2004. i 2007. godine nije uzrokovalo krizu, ali je loše koincidiralo sa njenim izbijanjem i tokom. Sama kriza svojom dubinom,

dugim tokom i neizvesnim okončanjem skinula je sa dnevnog reda temu o proširenju, ali nije formalno izmenila ovu politiku. Poznato je da su države tzv. zapadnog Balkana još 2003. godine ušle u okvir tadašnje politike proširenja EU. Sve do izbijanja krize EU usporeni tempo ove politike mogao se pripisivati isključivo teškoćama ovih država da ispunjavaju tehničke i političke uslove Unije. Posle 2008. godine, a posebno posle 2011. godine, bilo je sasvim vidljivo da se osnovni uzrok odlaganja preselio u sferu strukturnih problema Unije, premda ni države kandidati nisu znatnije napredovale u oblasti kvalitativnih ekonomskih, pravnih i političkih kriterijuma. Danas i na rečima štedljivi funkcioneri Unije govore da će se proširenje nastaviti posle reformisanja same Unije. Reč je o nepoznato dugom periodu. U međuvremenu osnovna funkcija, pa i sadržaj, politike proširenja se promenio. Ono nema svrhu da integracioni proces Unije proširi na druge države Evrope, jer sam taj proces je neizvestan, već da u novoj bezbednosnoj i geopolitičkoj konstelaciji osigura ostanak tih država u sferi zapadnog uticaja i dominacije. Za države kandidate ostaje otvoreno, inače politički nepostavljeno, pitanje: zašto ne revidirati, zajedno sa EU, proces stabilizacije i pridruživanja koji zemlju treba da pripremi za punopravno članstvo, u pravcu bolje opšte adaptacije na promenjene okolnosti.

Ključne reči: Kriza EU, antikrizna politika, nemogućnost reformi, politika proširenja, promenjene okolnosti, proširenje bez članstva.

Dr Slobodan Samardžić je redovni profesor Fakulteta političkih nauka Univerziteta u Beogradu, gde kao osnivač Evropskih studija predaje više predmeta vezanih za proučavanje Evropske unije. Osnovna oblast njegovog naučnog istraživanja su savremene političke ideje i institucije, teorija i praksa federalizma i konstitucionalizma i politički sistem Evropske unije.

slobodan.samardzic@fpn.bg.ac.rs

PANEL 1:

**ZAPADNI BALKAN
U NADNACIONALNIM
DILEMAMA
EVROPSKE UNIJE**

Prof. dr Maja KOVAČEVIĆ

Fakultet političkih nauka Univerziteta u Beogradu

Spoljna politika Evropske unije i Zapadni Balkan: ograničenja transformativne moći

Evropska unija je jedinstven akter u regionu Zapadnog Balkana gde je od početka devedesetih godina prošlog veka primenjivala širok spektar spoljnopolitičkih instrumenata: diplomatske i trgovinske mere, finansijsku pomoć, civilne i vojne misije, kao i politiku proširenja koja je njeno najuspešnije spoljnopolitičko sredstvo. Iz tih razloga, Zapadni Balkan je inspirativan za izučavanje transformativne moći Evropske unije. Neosporan uspeh koji je politika proširenja Evropske unije imala vršeći uticaj na proces tranzicije zemalja Centralne i Istočne Evrope je podstakao istraživanja tzv. evropeizacije, odnosno transformativne moći Evropske unije u odnosu na treće zemlje i njen uticaj na političke i ekonomske reforme tokom procesa pristupanja. Istraživanja transformativne moći Evropske unije su utvrdila nekoliko faktora od kojih zavisi delotvornost ove moći. Najvažniji od ovih faktora su troškovi prilagođavanja treće zemlje i spoljni pritisak same Evropske unije na vlade trećih zemalja da ispune njene zahteve, što se u najvećoj meri zasniva na doslednoj primeni uslovljavanja. Na delotvornost transformativne moći utiču i domaći faktori kao što su veto igrači, promoteri normi i formalne i neformalne institucije. Relativno uspešna evropeizacija zemalja Centralne i Istočne Evrope tokom procesa pristupanja se, uprkos visokim troškovima prilagođavanja, u velikoj meri objašnjava kombinacijom snažnog pritiska koji je vršen uslovljavanjem od strane Evropske unije i slabošću veto igrača. Zašto ovaj uspeh nije ponovljen u slučaju zemalja Zapadnog Balkana? Osnovna teza ovog rada je da je, uprkos primeni niza spoljnopolitičkih instrumenata Evropske unije, njena transformativna moć pokazala ozbiljna ograničenja u ovom regionu. Brojni faktori su doprineli usporenoj evropeizaciji zemalja Zapadnog Balkana: postkonfliktna društva, slabe države koje karakterišu

nedostatak pravne države, razvijeni organizovani kriminal i korupcija, nelegitimne institucije, slabi upravljački kapaciteti, osporavanje državnosti. Ne umanjujući značaj navedenih faktora, ovaj rad ističe globalnu krizu transformativne moći Evropske unije i uticaj tzv. bezbednost-demokratizacija dileme na nedoslednost politike uslovljavanja kao ključne činioce stagnacije zemalja regiona u procesu evropeizacije. Od samog početka primene Politike stabilizacije i pridruživanja, Evropska unija je imala dvojne ciljeve u regionu: prvo stabilnost, a potom integraciju, što je produbilo dilemu „stabilizacija i izgradnja države ili demokratizacija i izgradnja institucija“. Dajući prioritet efektivnoj vlasti umesto demokratskoj vladavini, Evropska unija je doprinela da se u regionu uspostave tzv. stabilitokratije. Na delu je paradoks koji se ogleda u tome da zemlje regiona, iako obuhvaćene politikom proširenja Evropske unije i već gotovo 20 godina podvrgnute procesu evropeizacije, od 2010. godine beleže pad u Indeksu demokratije organizacije *Freedom House*. Paradoks je tim veći što pad od 2014. godine beleže i neke zemlje članice Evropske unije, što osporava tezu da članstvo u Evropskoj uniji garantuje stabilnost demokratskih institucija.

Ključne reči: Evropska unija, spoljna politika, evropeizacija, transformativna moć, Zapadni Balkan, dilema „stabilnost-demokratija“.

Dr Maja Kovačević je vanredni profesor Evropskih studija Fakulteta političkih nauka Univerziteta u Beogradu. Ranije je bila istraživač na Institutu ekonomskih nauka (1995–2001) i šef Kancelarije za evropske integracije SRJ (2001–2003). Predaje istoriju evropskih integracija, EU kao globalni akter i Pravosuđe i unutrašnje poslove u EU. Bavi se istraživanjem upravljanja u EU, spoljnog delovanja EU, proširenja, odnosa EU i Zapadnog Balkana, ZSBP EU. Objavila je veći broj poglavlja u knjigama i članaka iz oblasti evropske integracije, a njena poslednja objavljena knjiga je *Gospodari evropske integracije* (2016).

maja.kovacevic@fpn.bg.ac.rs

Dr Ivana RADIĆ MILOSAVLJEVIĆ

Fakultet političkih nauka Univerziteta u Beogradu

Problemi odnosa Evropske unije i država kandidata za članstvo i fleksibilno pristupanje kao moguć način oživljavanja politike proširenja

Proces pristupanja, pokazalo se, sadrži brojne nedostatke čiji koren leži kako u samom ustrojstvu politike proširenja, tako i u prirodi međusobnih odnosa Evropske unije i njenih država članica, s jedne strane, i zemalja kandidata za članstvo, s druge. Proces stabilizacije i pridruživanja kreiran za države Zapadnog Balkana pre skoro dve decenije, od početka je ostavljao prostora Evropskoj uniji da unilateralno, po sopstvenom nahođenju i potrebama, definiše uslove za prijem. Unija je to činila najčešće vođena geopolitičkim i bezbednosnim interesima umesto objektivnim kriterijumima proisteklim iz pojedinih sektora politike. Ovakav odnos Unije i njenih država članica, zajedno sa slabo razvijenom demokratskom političkom kulturom i iskustvom državnosti na strani zemalja kandidata, vodio je do neviđenog mešanja Unije u unutrašnja politička i ustavna pitanja zemalja kandidatkinja, pa i procese stvaranja država regiona. Očigledna proizvoljnost u politici uslovljavanja, preambiciozno zamišljena ideja stabilizacije i demokratske konsolidacije, tutorski i hegemonski odnos Unije prema zemljama kandidatima, kao i sada već jasno prolongiranje procesa doveli su do gubitka njegove kredibilitnosti i zamora na obe strane. Održavanje ovakvog manjkavog odnosa i politike pristupanja potpomognuto je idejom da članstvo u EU nema alternativu. Javnu, pa i naučnu debatu o ovom pitanju onemogućio je jedan vladajući narativ bezizlaznosti, odnosno nepostojanja alternativa koji je toliko prevladao da, osim što se put u EU ne dovodi u pitanje, i svaka ideja preoblikovanja tog puta proglašava se nepoželjnom. Pitanje da li je politika ostvarivanja totalnog i što bržeg članstva najbolja za aktuelne kandidate, pa i samu Evropsku uniju odavno je moralo da bude predmet rasprave. Izlagačica nudi ideju preoblikovanja procesa ka fleksibilnom

procesu pristupanja zasnovanom najpre na redefinisaniu međusobnih odnosa Srbije i Evropske unije. Umesto dosadašnje politike totalnog članstva koje podrazumeva da država kandidat bezuslovno prihvati obavezu harmonizacije u svim sferama *acquis communautaire*-a, fleksibilno pristupanje bi podrazumevalo da država kandidat sama utvrdi u kojim oblastima ima interesa i stvarnih sposobnosti da se integriše, a da to za nju ne predstavlja troškove veće od potencijalnih koristi. Evropska unija bi morala da ograniči politiku uslovljavanja samo na izabrane oblasti definisanjem specifičnih kriterijuma za svaku od njih, što znači da napredak u nekoj oblasti ne bi mogao da zavisi od uslova koji nisu unapred poznati i usko vezani samo za konkretnu oblast. Sa ovako preoblikovanim procesom pristupanja, pod uslovom da se na obe strane, u demokratskoj proceduri donesu odgovarajuće političke odluke, mogao bi da se prevaziđe dosadašnji zastoj. Fleksibilnim članstvom nevoljne države članice EU dobile bi priliku da održe obećanje perspektive članstva dato pre petnaest godina i tako povrate kredibilitet politike proširenja. Za države kandidate, fleksibilno pristupanje i članstvo u EU, iako bi podrazumevalo oprezniji pristup, omogućilo bi lakšu i bržu integraciju fokusiranu na manji broj oblasti i okončanje arbitrernog i hegemonskog odnosa u kojem učestvuju kao slabija strana.

Ključne reči: pristupanje, zastoj, Evropska unija, fleksibilnost, odnosi hegemonije.

Dr Ivana Radić Milosavljević zaposlena je na Fakultetu političkih nauka Univerziteta u Beogradu kao asistent za užu naučnu oblast Evropske studije. Osnovne i posle diplomске studije završila je na istom fakultetu i gde je odbranila i doktorsku tezu. Oblasti interesovanja su joj funkcionisanje političkog sistema EU, teorije evropske integracije, problem demokratije u EU i dr. U oblasti evropskih studija, učestvovala je u brojnim naučnim i stručnim skupovima u zemlji i inostranstvu, objavila radove u časopisima, zbornicima kao i monografske publikacije. Učestvovala je u kreiranju i izvođenju nastavno-istraživačkih projekata za unapređenje evropskih studija (npr. u okviru programa Evropske unije *Jean Monnet*, *Tempus*, odnosno *Erasmus+*). Ima radno iskustvo u državnim organima, nevladinim organizacijama i samostalno konsultantsko radno iskustvo.

ivana.radic@fpn.bg.ac.rs

Dr Milan IGRUTINOVIĆ
Institut za evropske studije, Beograd

Neizvestan proces proširenja Evropske unije i dalja periferizacija Balkana: tri aktuelna trenda

Nova strategija proširenja Evropske unije iz februara 2018. godine donela je, ako ništa drugo, niz taktičkih koraka za naredni period kojima će se vlasti zemalja u regionu i administracija Unije aktivno baviti. Tematike vladavine prava i građanskih sloboda, infrastrukturnog povezivanja, digitalizacije, jačanja zajedničke bezbednosti kao potrebe u odnosu na pitanje masovnih izbegličkih talasa sa područja južno i jugoistočno od Evrope, dominiraće u svakodnevnim poslovima na polju ispunjavanja formalnih uslova za priključenje Uniji. Isticanje 2025. godine kao najranije moguće za članstvo Srbije i Crne Gore, čini da je ta godina dovoljno daleko da niko ne mora ozbiljno da sada računa sa samom tematikom članstva, nego samo sa trajanjem tog procesa. U zajedničkom kominikeu sa majskog samita EU–Zapadni Balkan održanog u Sofiji izostala je reč „proširenje“. Samo su praktične teme iz domena procesa proširenja konkretizovane i istaknute, dok je pitanje političke volje ostalo u pozadini budući da u Evropskoj uniji nema interne kohezije za javno podsticanje proširenja pred javnosti zemalja članica. Imajući ovo u vidu, pokušaćemo da krokiramo tri politička trenda koji u ovom trenutku u širem smislu utiču na proces proširenja Evropske unije na ostatak Balkana, a koji ne ishode iz tog procesa niti su direktno vezani za njega. To su promene u spoljnoj politici Evropske unije, kao rezultanti složenih dogovora država članica i briselske administracije; tekuće teme o unutrašnjim reformama Unije; i još uvek nepotpuno jasna politika SAD pod vođstvom Donalda Trampa prema Evropi i EU. Prvi trend je baziran na logici sekuritizovanog pogleda na prostor Zapadnog Balkana, koji je utemeljen u političkom strahu od migrantske krize, širem sukobu sa Rusijom i odnosu prema sukobima i nestabilnosti na Bliskom istoku. Drugi trend je vezan za klinički mrtav

proces unutrašnjih reformi Unije, sa jedne strane, a sa druge strane za eksplicitnu vezanost procesa proširenja za taj proces nejasnih, neizvesnih i nepredvidivih unutrašnjih reformi. Treći trend se oslanja na jasnije profilisanu politiku SAD koja traži saveznike pre svega u Istočnoj Evropi za svoj glavni cilj – političko suzbijanje ruskog uticaja uključujući i onaj na Balkanu, uz sada jasna razmimoilaženja sa EU po nizu ostalih pitanja. Ova tri trenda natkrivljuju proces proširenja, čine ga politički neizvesnijim, a Zapadni Balkan (i Srbiju unutar njega) sve više definišu kao prostor bezbednosne brige a ne područje koje je poželjno i korisno integrisati u EU. Time oni pojačavaju negativnu perspektivu ovog prostora da ostane periferija, čekaonica, predstraža, i polje geopolitičke igre velikih sila bez smislenih prilika za socio-ekonomski razvoj lokalnih društava.

Ključne reči: Evropska unija, reforma, Donald Tramp, Zapadni Balkan, proširenje, periferija.

Dr Milan Igrutinović je istraživač u Institutu za evropske studije i doktor istorijskih nauka. U sklopu svog naučnog rada obrađuje teme iz oblasti međunarodnih odnosa, spoljne politike Evropske unije i Srbije, te istorije Jugoslavije. Objavio je jednu monografiju (*Izbeglištvo u učionici: srpski studenti i đaci u Velikoj Britaniji za vreme Prvog svetskog rata* (2016), kao koautor), uredio dva zbornika radova (*Zajednička spoljna i bezbednosna politika Evropske unije: aktuelni izazovi* (2016) i *Kriza Evropske unije: okviri, dometi, trendovi* (2013)) i objavio više od dvadeset naučnih članaka u časopisima i zbornicima radova, na srpskom i engleskom jeziku.

milan.igrutinovic@ies.rs

Pridruživanje Evropskoj uniji zemalja Zapadnog Balkana iz perspektive energetike

Sve zemlje i teritorije na Zapadnom Balkanu članice su Energetske zajednice Jugoistočne Evrope. Preko tog mehanizma je njihov proces pridruživanja EU već otpočeo. Dodatni mehanizam podsticaja je veliki broj projekata od zajedničkog interesa (PCI) na području energetike čije finansiranje pomaže EU iz različitih fondova. Predmet izučavanja ovog rada je situacija u energetske sistemima zemalja Zapadnog Balkana iz aspekta ispunjenosti kriterijuma za pridruživanje EU, kao i sistem mera koje EU preduzima prema zemljama budućim članicama u procesu pristupanja. S obzirom na različite istorijsko-političke i društveno-ekonomske okolnosti, zemlje posmatranog regiona su u različitom, često skromnom, obimu ispunile neophodne uslove za uključivanje svojih nacionalnih energetske sistema u energetske sistem EU. Najnovije izmene u evropskoj energetske strategiji i trendovima komplikuju situaciju na Zapadnom Balkanu. Bitno je različita situacija u sektorima nafte, gasa, električne energije, obnovljivih izvora i energetske efikasnosti. Kod nekih zemalja taj proces je dodatno usložen uticajem zemalja van EU. Da su procesi često u zastoju, govori i činjenica da su protiv nekih od zemalja pokrenute mere iz domena sankcija Energetske zajednice. Cilj rada je da se analizira situacija u zemljama Zapadnog Balkana i uz pomoć komparativne analize, kao i uzimajući u obzir tehno-ekonomska ograničenja odredi realan rok za ispunjenje kriterijuma iz domena energetike koji bi omogućili njihov prijem u EU. Prva radna hipoteza je stoga definisana u vidu tvrdnje da „ako bi „danas“ bila doneta odluka o pristupanju svih zemalja Zapadnog Balkana EU većina zemalja ne bi ispunjavala nužne pokazatelje (nivo) kriterijuma“ i druga „da je za ispunjavanje svih kriterijuma iz oblasti energetike cilj koji neke od zemalja ne mogu da ispune ni za 10 godina od danas“, odnosno da li su zahtevi i predpristupne mere EU stimulative i ohrabrujuće za zemlje Zapadnog Balkana ili naprotiv nameću se zahtevi kako bi se usporio proces evrointegracija ovog regiona. Treća hipoteza postavlja pitanje da li EU može da odoli političkim pritiscima i oslanja se na ekonomske parametre u procesu primanja novih članova ili je proširenje EU još jedna prelomna tačka oko koje velike sile ostvaruju svoje interese. Kriterijumi za pristupanje EU sa stanovišta energetike definisani su i svrstani u sledeće grupe: regulativne, organizacione i fizičko-tehničke. Za svaki od kriterijuma određen je neophodni

minimum pokazatelja. Situacija u svim zemljama Zapadnog Balkana je analizirana je sa stanovišta ispunjenosti navedenih kriterijuma. Analizirani su pojedinačno sektori nafte, gasa, električne energije, obnovljivih izvora i energetske efikasnosti. Posebno je analizirana vlasnička struktura u energetsom sektoru i njen uticaj na ispunjavanje kriterijuma za pristupanje, upravo da bi se opovrgle-dokazale teze političkog uticaja na ostvarivanje strategije proširenja EU. Komparativnom analizom sa zemljama regiona koje su već pristupile EU i međusobnom komparativnom analizom zemalja Zapadnog Balkana određeni su mogući rokovi za ispunjenje pojedinih i celine obaveza svake od zemalja Zapadnog Balkana. Ove prognoze korigovane su pokazateljima tehno-ekonomskih ograničenja. Analizirana je i mogućnost da se procesi ubrzaju preko pokrenutih mera iz domena sankcija Energetske zajednice, ali i preko aktivnosti finansijsko-tehničke podrške na realizaciji projekata koji bi trebali da doprinesu ubrzanju integracije i ispunjavanju preduslova ili kriterijuma.

Ključne reči: Zapadni Balkan, EU, energetika, kriterijumi pristupanja EU, ispunjenost kriterijuma, prognoza pristupanja EU.

Dr Petar Stanojević je vanredni profesor Fakulteta bezbednosti Univerziteta u Beogradu, predavač na Univerzitetu Stajnbajs u Berlinu i član Akademije inženjerskih nauka Srbije. Vršio je dužnosti državnog sekretara zaduženog za infrastrukturu i pomoćnika ministra energetike za naftu i gas, a bio je i zamenik izvršnog direktora Ministarstva odbrane Republike Srbije. Profesor Stanojević je bio generalni direktor Jugopetrola i direktor za razvoj, investicije i nabavke NIS Petrol Promet – deo grupe Gazpromnjeft. Polja njegovog akademskog interesovanja su izučavanje rizika, energetske bezbednosti i logistike.

petstano45@gmail.com

Dr Zoran Jeftić je vanredni profesor i šef Katedre studija odbrane Fakulteta bezbednosti Univerziteta u Beogradu. Od 1986. do 2012. godine bio je zaposlen u Ministarstvu odbrane Republike Srbije, a u periodu od 2005. do 2012. godine u Ministarstvu odbrane obavljao je funkciju pomoćnika ministra i državnog sekretara. Predsednik je Upravnog odbora Instituta za međunarodnu politiku i privredu iz Beograda. Ključne oblasti njegovog akademskog interesovanja su bezbednost, sistem odbrane, civilno-vojni odnosi i vanredne situacije.

jefticz@ymail.com

PANEL 2:

**DA LI JE NA POMOLU
NOVO POGLAVLJE U ISTORIJI
BALKANSKOG KLIJENTELIZMA?**

Prof. dr Dejan JOVIĆ

Fakultet političkih znanosti Sveučilišta u Zagrebu

„Evropa izvan EU“: Zapadni Balkan i nova britanska spoljna politika

Nakon što je odlučila izaći iz Evropske unije, Velika Britanija se nalazi u procesu rekonstruiranja svoje spoljne politike. Ona je dosad bila oslonjena na tri stuba: 1) „specijalne odnose“ sa Sjedinjenim Američkim Državama, 2) utjecaj na zemlje *Commonwealth-a*, i 3) članstvo u Evropskoj uniji. No, dok se u prva dva područja pojavljuju vrlo ozbiljni izazovi, izlazak iz EU otvara pitanje – kakav će biti novi britanski pristup ne samo Evropskoj uniji, nego i Evropi u cjelini. Britanija je odmah po referendumu o *Brexit-u* počela naglašavati da pojmovi *Evropa* i *EU* nisu istoznačni, i da ona želi voditi politiku prisustva u Evropi ali ne kao članica EU. Time se konstruira nova regija: „Evropa izvan EU“, u kojoj britanska spoljna i bezbednosna politika vidi moguće polje svog intenzivnog djelovanja u neposrednoj budućnosti. Taj novi region uključuje Zapadni Balkan kao i zemlje između EU i Rusije (Ukrajinu, Bjelorusiju) i eventualno Tursku. S obzirom na kontinuirano oklijevanje EU da Zapadni Balkan u potpunosti integrira u Uniju, britanska vanjska politika ima prostora da se na Zapadnom Balkanu pojavi kao izvanjska sila. Time bi se pridružila kompeticiji koja na izvanjskoj periferiji EU već postoji, i u kojoj sudjeluju SAD, Rusija, Turska i Kina, uz slabije prisustvo nekih drugih zemalja. Dok je prije *Brexit-a* Britanija bila snažna zagovornica proširenja Evropske unije i integracije Zapadnog Balkana u evroatlantski krug, nakon *Brexit-a* ona se okreće prema kreiranju multipolarnosti na izvanjskim periferijama EU-a. Ona, također, traži novu potvrdu da je velika sila – posebno stoga što je *Brexit* bio posljedica pobjede britanskog suverenizma (nacionalizma) i osjećanja da se kroz članstvo u EU umanjila moć Ujedinjenog Kraljevstva. To bi moglo imati posljedice i za karakter NATO-a i njegovu poziciju u Evropi, posebno stoga što su tri članice

NATO-a s najvećim vojnim potencijalom (SAD, Turska i UK) ne samo izvan EU-e, nego su i skeptične prema samom konceptu Evropske unije.

Ključne riječi: Britanska spoljna politika, Evropa izvan EU, Zapadni Balkan, multipolarnost na evropskim periferijama, NATO, *Brexit*.

Dr Dejan Jović je redovni profesor Fakulteta političkih znanosti Sveučilišta u Zagrebu i gostujući profesor Fakulteta političkih nauka Univerziteta u Beogradu. On je i glavni i odgovorni urednik politološkog časopisa *Politička misao*. Autor je knjiga *Jugoslavija: država koja je odumrla* i *Rat i mit*, te urednik četiri knjige iz područja teorija međunarodnih odnosa objavljenih između 2013. i 2018. Doktorirao je na London School of Economics, a bio je i predsjednik Upravnog vijeća Instituta za razvoj i međunarodne odnose u Zagrebu, te glavni analitičar Predsjednika Republike Hrvatske (2010-2014).

dejan.jovic@fpzg.hr

Dr Miloš PAUNOVIĆ

Centar za primenjene evropske studije, Beograd

Britanska politika prema Zapadnom Balkanu posle Bregzita u kontekstu proširenja Evropske unije na države regiona

Imajući u vidu pristup britanske diplomatije proširenju EU na region Zapadnog Balkana pre referenduma o ostanku/izlasku iz EU održanog 2016. godine, ispituje se da li je došlo do promena politike zvaničnog Londona prema ovom pitanju. Bivajući sve do svog zvaničnog izlaska iz Evropske unije 2019. punopravnom članicom ovog bloka, ali ipak u znatno izmenjenim postreferendumskim političkim okolnostima, očekivalo bi se da se Velika Britanija na prostoru Zapadnog Balkana sve intenzivnije profilise kao samostalan spoljnopolitički faktor. Prirodno je pretpostaviti i da se ovo profilisanje ne odigrava u političkom vakuumu, već i u kontekstu izmenjenih međunarodnih okolnosti u Evropi, ali i unutarpolitičkih prilika u samoj Velikoj Britaniji, čiju dinamiku u ogromnoj meri određuju pregovori o *Brexit-u*, a time i o njenom budućem mestu u evropskoj politici generalno. Pod izmenjenim međunarodnim okolnostima pre svega mislimo na dalje zaoštavanje u odnosima između Zapada i Rusije, sve veće ekonomske uloge Kine na celom prostoru Istočne i Jugoistočne Evrope i na sve samostalniji nastup Turske u međunarodnim odnosima, posebno na prostoru jugoistočne Evrope. Velika Britanija je i dalje jedna od vodećih zemalja NATO-a koji se upravo na jugoistoku Evrope nalazi u novoj fazi, nastaloj kako približavanjem Turske i Rusije, tako ulaskom Crne Gore u ovaj savez, a i mogućim ulaskom BJRM/Republike Makedonije (uslovljeno primenom Prespanskog sporazuma). Takođe, masovne migracije stanovništva sa Bliskog istoka i Afrike ka Evropi od 2015. godine su još jedan značajan činilac koji utiče na bezbednosne prilike u Evropi, te su imale ulogu i u kampanji povodom referenduma o *Brexit-u*. Unutrašnja politička dinamika uglavnom povezana sa pozicioniranjem najvećih stranaka prema tekućem procesu izlaska Britanije iz EU, ali i unutarpartijskim

prekompozicijama u vezi sa tim procesom takođe utiče na britansku politiku prema dogovoru o *Brexit*-u, budućem odnosu sa EU27, a time u izvesnoj meri i na ulogu u procesu proširenja EU. Uticaj ove dinamike je već bio vidljiv tokom petog godišnjeg Zapadnobalkanskog samita u julu 2018. koji je kao deo Berlinskog procesa održan upravo u Londonu. Iz uvida u deklarisanu spoljnopolitičku ciljevu Velike Britanije, diplomatsku praksu, parlamentarne debate, medije, ali i već nastale akademske radove o ovoj problematici, zaključuje se da će politika Londona prema perspektivi članstva zemalja Zapadnog Balkana u EU ostati u okvirima generalne podrške uključivanju država regiona u evroatlantske integracije. Izvesne promene će se, prirodom promene odnosa između Londona i Brisela, ticati stavljanja naglaska na ponešto drugačije prioritete u procesu ovih integracija.

Ključne reči: EU, proširenje, Brexit, Zapadni Balkan, Velika Britanija.

Dr Miloš Paunović je istraživač u Centru za primenjene evropske studije. Doktorirao je na Filozofskom fakultetu Univerziteta u Beogradu na temu „Balkanski horizonti britanske politike i Kraljevina SHS 1920–1929“, a magistrirao sa tezom „Lord Kurzon i Balkan 1919–1924“. Glavna polja njegovog naučnog i profesionalnog interesovanja su istorija Balkana tokom međuratnog perioda i Prvog svetskog rata, britansko-srpski/jugoslovenski odnosi i savremena politička kretanja na postjugoslovenskom prostoru. Miloš je koautor dve monografije o britansko-srpskim društveno-sportskim vezama tokom Prvog svetskog rata.

paunovic.milos@gmail.com

Msr Mladen LIŠANIN

Institut za političke studije, Beograd

Američka velika strategija uzdržavanja, transatlantski odnosi i budućnost Zapadnog Balkana

Dolazak Donalda Trampa na čelo američke administracije dodatno je podstakao debatu o potrebi ponovnog osmišljavanja velike strategije Sjedinjenih Američkih Država, i njenog potencijalnog otklona od višedecenijskog dominantnog pristupa „prvenstva“ ili „dubokog angažovanja“, a u pravcu „uzdržavanja“ ili „umanjivanja“. Na teorijskom planu, ovo znači da realistički pristupi proučavanju međunarodnih odnosa nastavljaju, deceniju i po nakon invazije na Irak, svoju transformaciju od deskriptivno-eksplikativne ka sve više normativnoj grupi teorija. Na praktično-političkom planu, potencijalno usvajanje velike strategije uzdržavanja značilo bi suštinsku promenu vrste i obima američkog angažovanja u različitim regionima, uključujući Evropu. Transatlantski odnosi pretrpeli bi dubinsku rekonfiguraciju, iako ne nužno i potpuno urušavanje. Takav razvoj bi mogao dvojako da se odrazi na položaj jugoistočne Evrope u celini, a posebno Zapadnog Balkana kao njenog politički najkrhkijeg dela. Sa jedne strane, usvajanje velike strategije kojom bi značajno ograničile delovanje u regionima koji nisu od vrhunskog bezbednosnog prioriteta (a Zapadni Balkan to svakako nije) moglo bi da podrazumeva da Sjedinjene Američke Države ovaj prostor prepuštaju bezbednosnom prekivanju Evropske unije i njenih najmoćnijih članica, koje bi se, suočene sa sopstvenim unutrašnjim problemima, tada sa više ili manje uspeha nadmetale za uticaj sa drugim regionalnim i globalnim akterima poput Rusije, Turske ili Kine. Sa druge strane, ovo bi moglo da podrazumeva da Sjedinjene Američke Države smanjuju uticaj i materijalno prisustvo na Zapadnom Balkanu, ali prevashodno u sklopu multilateralnih institucija i aranžmana, te njihovih misija i operacija, zadržavajući značajan stepen samostalnog prisustva i uključujući se, na taj način, u strateško

nadmetanje sa drugim regionalnim i globalnim akterima – od kojih bi neki mogli biti i dojučerašnji američki partneri. Dve godine nakon Trampove pobjede na izborima, sudeći po držanju njegove administracije, kao i po američkim personalnim rešenjima u sferi diplomatskog opštenja sa zapadnobalkanskim akterima, drugonavedeni scenario deluje kao izvesnija opcija. Koristeći se savremenom literaturom o američkoj velikoj strategiji, posebno iz korpusa realističkih teorija međunarodnih odnosa, kao i primarnim i sekundarnim izvorima iz oblasti savremenih političko-bezbednosnih procesa na Zapadnom Balkanu, izlagač pokušava da predvidi posledice eventualnog američkog strateškog preusmeravanja po region, uz poseban osvrt na položaj Srbije u kontekstu nadmetanja spoljnih aktera za uticaj na ovom prostoru. Zaključak je da, u slučaju adekvatnog, što će reći restriktivnog a ne ekspanzivnog pristupa svih aktera pitanju određenja sopstvenih bezbednosnih interesa, preoblikovanje američke velike strategije ne mora nužno da predstavlja izazov i rizik, već može da bude i potencijalan podsticaj za preispitivanje dosadašnjih spoljnopolitičkih neuspeha u regionalnom i širem kontekstu.

Ključne reči: Zapadni Balkan, Evropa, Srbija, Sjedinjene Američke Države, velika strategija.

Msr Mladen Lišanin je istraživač saradnik u Institutu za političke studije. Bavi se istraživanjima međunarodnih odnosa (naročito teorijama međunarodnih odnosa), međunarodne bezbednosti i spoljne politike Srbije, a radove iz tih oblasti predstavljao je na domaćim i međunarodnim konferencijama i objavljivao u zbornicima i časopisima u Srbiji i inostranstvu. Profesionalno se usavršavao na evropskom odeljenju Škole za napredne međunarodne studije Univerziteta Džons Hopkins (Johns Hopkins University – School of Advanced International Studies) u Bolonji, Italija. Sekretar je redakcije naučnog časopisa *Serbian Political Thought*.

mladen.lisanin@ips.ac.rs

Prof. dr Siniša ATLAGIĆ

Fakultet političkih nauka Univerziteta u Beogradu

Velika igra u „dvorištu“ Zapada: spoljna politika Rusije na Balkanu

Ruska Federacija svojom spoljnom politikom, u širem smislu posmatrano, nastoji da obezbedi konsolidaciju položaja zemlje kao jednog od tri najuticajnije centra savremenog sveta – uz SAD i Kinu. Prema *Koncepciji spoljne politike Ruske Federacije* usvojene 2016. godine strateški prioritet zemlje je „jačanje pozicija Ruske Federacije kao jednog od uticajnijih centara savremenog sveta“, kome će se stremiti prevashodno „jačanjem pozicija u sistemu ekonomskih odnosa, sprečavanjem diskriminacije ruske robe, usluga, investicija, korišćenjem, u ove svrhe, mogućnosti međunarodnih i regionalnih ekonomskih i finansijskih organizacija“. Osnovni proklamovani cilj Ruske Federacije je promocija trgovinsko-ekonomskih interesa i, u tesnoj vezi s ovim, zaštita nacionalne bezbednosti. U skladu s ovim, Ruska Federacija i na Zapadnom Balkanu nastoji da deluje na planu ekonomske saradnje, a uticaj dopunjuje i na diplomatskom, javno-diplomatskom i na planu vojno-tehničke saradnje. Ukoliko se iz javno-diplomatskog okvira izuzme ekonomska saradnja (koja teorijski potpada pod ovu delatnost) reč je o razvoju odnosa na humanitarnom planu, to jest na planu kulturne i religijske bliskosti. Najpovoljniji scenario za Rusiju bio bi stvaranje grupe vojno neutralnih zemalja na Balkanu, a to su bivše jugoslovenske republike sa Srbijom na prvom mestu. Pod pretpostavkom da se na Evropsku Uniju gleda samo kao na deo *Pax Americana*-e (globalne trgovinske imperije poduprte snagom NATO vojnog saveza) s malim mogućnostima da samoinicijativno rešava geopolitičke probleme i imajući u vidu još uvek neizvesnu evropsku budućnost zemalja Zapadnog Balkana Rusiji bi ovim bila učvršćena pozicija na jugoistoku Evrope. Ovo se prevashodno odnosi na Srbiju koju u Rusiji uzimaju za jedinstvenu bivšu jugoslovensku zemlju sa državotvornom tradicijom i integracionim potencijalom, a koja bi kulturnom i istorijskom bliskošću, podrškom

u javnom mnenju, nerešenim pitanjem Kosova i Metohije i neizvesnom evropskom budućnošću bila relativno čvrsto uporište sa koga bi Ruska Federacija branila svoje interese u Evropi i učinila „zamrznutim“ konflikt na prostoru jugoistočne Evrope čije bi rešenje moglo, u značajnoj meri, da zavisi od odnosa Sjedinjenih Država i Kine. Zaključak je da je Balkan za Rusiju i dalje zona od geostrateškog, političkog i ekonomskog – rečju, nacionalnog interesa. U odbrani ovog interesa, fokus njene spoljne politike biće usmeren ka Srbiji zbog resursa koji druge sile u Srbiji nemaju – podrške u javnom mnenju i teritorijalnog položaja Srbije u „dvorištu“ Evropske Unije i NATO-a. Jačanje svoje pozicije u Srbiji vršiće prevashodno diplomatskim (podrškom Srbiji u odbrani teritorijalnog integriteta) i javnodiplomatskim sredstvima. U slučaju značajnije promene odnosa na globalnom planu i eventualnog kolapsa Evropske unije, Rusija bi mogla intenzivirati aktivnosti na Balkanu podsticanjem pitanja unifikacije srpskog nacionalnog prostora.

Ključne reči: spoljna politika, nacionalni interes, Rusija, Srbija.

Dr Siniša Atlagić je vanredni profesor Fakulteta političkih nauka Univerziteta u Beogradu, gde predaje na osnovnim studijama (Političko komuniciranje, Politički marketing), master (modul Izbori i izborne kampanje) i doktorskim studijama. Rukovodilac je Centra za ruske studije FPN-a. Diplomirao je na istom fakultetu (smer novinarstvo i komunikologija) na kome je magistrirao (politička sociologija) i doktorirao (političko komuniciranje – politička propaganda). Oblasti naučnog interesovanja su mu politička komunikacija (politička propaganda, politički marketing, međunarodno komuniciranje), socijalna psihologija (psihologija političke komunikacije i izborna motivacija) i ruske studije (savremeni politički procesi u Ruskoj Federaciji).

sinisa.atlagic@fpn.bg.ac.rs

Doc. dr Vladimir AJZENHAMER
Fakultet bezbednosti Univerziteta u Beogradu

Manipulisanje *Drugošću* na Balkanu: turski uticaj u Bosni i Hercegovini i Srbiji

Upotreba/proizvodnja *Drugosti* često je korišćeni instrument spoljne politike država koje svoju unutrašnju koheziju, ali i međunarodni uticaj žele da uvećaju igrajući na identitetsku kartu. Pospešivanje osećaja jedinstva unutar jedne zajednice tj. njeno „slepljivanje“ (kako je ovaj proces slikovito opisao Iver Nojman) lako se može posteći potenciranjem ideacione dijade *Mi* i *Oni* koja, prema konstruktivističkom tumačenju, igra presudnu ulogu u formiranju kolektivnih identiteta. Ovo izlaganje ima za cilj da pokaže kako se isti „recept“ može iskoristiti i za suprotan cilj – onda kada pojedine zajednice treba „razjediniti“. Stoga će nam koncept *Drugog*, njegova proizvodnja i upotreba, biti od velike pomoću prilikom analize turske spoljnopolitičke prakse, pre svega instrumentalizacije etno-religijskih tenzija u Bosni i Hercegovini i Srbiji. Aktualna turska spoljna politika veliku pažnju posvećuje prostoru Zapadnog Balkana. Za Ankaru uvećan uticaj u ovom regionu predstavlja odskočnu dasku za čvršće ukorenjivanje njenog prisustva u Evropi. Ne napuštajući Davutogluov koncept istorijske dubine (čiju srž čini ideja državnog kontinuiteta sa nekadašnjom Osmanskom imperijom), Turska nastoji da uveća politički, ekonomski i kulturni uticaj u balkanskim državama koje su nekada ulazile u sastav Osmanskog carstva. Balkanske aktivnosti Ankare usmerene su na države sa dominantno muslimanskim stanovništvom i na države u kojima živi značajna manjina koja pripada ovoj veroispovesti (Bosna i Hercegovina, Albanija, Makedonija i Srbija). Pritom se, kao ključni oslonac revitalizacije turske moći na ovim prostorima, apostrofiraju Bošnjaci i Albanci kao baštinici osmanskog nasleđa. U izlaganju će, na osnovu teorijskog koncepta *Drugosti* (predočenog tumačenjima Aleksandra Venta, Fredrika Barta i Ivera Nojmana) i njene uloge u konfliktima zasnovanim na identitetskim antagonizmima, biti analizirana politika Turske prema Bosni i

Hercegovini i Srbiji (prevashodno Sandžaku i Kosovu i Metohiji). Na osnovu ove analize, pokazaćemo kako spoljno tj. inostrano manipulisanje *Drugošću* na prostoru Zapadnog Balkana može destabilisati krhke multietničke i multireligijske zajednice koje se još uvek nisu oporavile od konflikata od devedesetih godina prošlog veka. Akcenat će biti stavljen na vezu između turskih regionalnih ambicija i permanentnog podsticanja razvoja etno-religijske *Drugosti* kod Bošnjaka i Albanaca.

Ključne reči: spoljna politika, drugost, manipulacija, Turska, Bošnjaci, Srbi, Albanci, Ahmet Davutoglu, Aleksandar Vent, Fredrik Bart, Iver Nojman.

Dr Vladimir Ajzenhamer je docent na Fakultetu bezbednosti Univerziteta u Beogradu, na predmetu Međunarodni odnosi. Oblasti njegovog akademskog interesovanja su međunarodni odnosi, geopolitika, teorije međunarodnih odnosa, spoljna politika, regionalne studije (Turska i Bliski istok) i teorija sekuritizacije.

ajzenhamer@fb.bg.ac.rs

Dr Ivona LAĐEVAC

Institut za međunarodnu politiku i privredu, Beograd

Kina kao novi „igrač“ na Zapadnom Balkanu

Područje Balkana kroz celu svoju burnu istoriju privlači pažnju globalnih sila. „Tradicionalno zainteresovanim“ silama se jačanjem svoje političke i ekonomske pozicije početkom 21. veka pridružila i Narodna Republika Kina. Kina svoje interesovanje za Balkan, odnosno Zapadni Balkan, počinje da ispoljava u vreme naznake stabilizacije političke situacije u zemljama regiona. U pozadini kineskog rastućeg interesovanja leži snažan ekonomski rast ove zemlje i potreba za ostvarenjem dugoročnih planova ekonomskog i političkog razvoja. Saradnju sa zemljama Zapadnog Balkana Kina, uglavnom, ostvaruje u okviru platforme „16+1“, odnosno foruma za saradnju zemalja centralne i istočne Evrope i Kine, koja predstavlja samo jednu komponentu šire inicijative Pojasa i puta. Saradnja sa zemljama centralne i istočne Evrope je pretežno orijentisana na ekonomiju, dok se u domenu politike uglavnom radi na izgradnji poverenja i jačanju kulturne razmene. U oblasti ekonomije posebno mesto zauzimaju železnička infrastruktura i tehnološki projekti koje mnogi smatraju delom koherentne kineske strategije za stvaranje distributivne infrastrukture koja će omogućiti kretanje kineske robe iz nekoliko luka u južnoj Evropi – Pirej, Solun i Bar – preko Balkana do severne Evrope. Izuzetak u stepenu razvoja političkih odnosa, predstavlja odnos koji NR Kina ima sa Republikom Srbijom i činjenica da dve zemlje imaju potpisan sporazum o strateškom partnerstvu. Ovaj vid saradnje Kine i zemalja centralne i istočne Evrope, kao i samog Zapadnog Balkana, ne nailazi na blagonakloni stav Evropske unije. Raširena je bojazan da Kina na ovaj način, jačanjem svog ekonomskog, a potom i političkog uticaja, želi da naruši odnose u EU i oslabi je iznutra. Zbog povećanog priliva kineskih stranih direktnih investicija u Evropi, došlo je i do insistiranja Evropske komisije da se sve tenderske procedure obavljaju transparentno i uz strogo

poštovanje propisa Evropske unije. S druge strane, Kina insistira na tome da je politička stabilnost i pravna sigurnost u njenom interesu, te da iz tih razloga podržava potpunu integraciju regiona Zapadnog Balkana u Evropsku uniju, a time i evropsko jedinstveno tržište. Posmatrano iz ovog ugla, rastuća uloga Kine ne bi trebalo da predstavlja pretnju za integracione procese. Međutim, pojedini evropski lideri izrazili su bojazan da će prisustvo Kine ugroziti napore Evropske unije za demokratizacijom regiona.

Ključne reči: Kina, Zapadni Balkan, Evropska unija, Inicijativa „16+1“, „Pojas i put“.

Dr Ivona Lađevac zaposlena je u Institutu za međunarodnu politiku i privredu, gde obavlja dužnost načelnice Centra za studije „Pojasa i Puta svile“ i koordinatora za međunarodnu saradnju. Ivona je i sekretar naučnog časopisa *Međunarodni problemi*. Osnovne i magistarske studije završila je na Fakultetu političkih nauka Univerziteta u Beogradu (Odeljenje za međunarodne odnose), a doktorirala na Fakultetu bezbednosti Univerziteta u Beogradu. Glavne oblasti njenog akademskog interesovanja su savremeni međunarodni odnosi, sa težištem na odnosima Kine i Rusije, inicijativi „Pojasa i puta“ i saradnji u formatu „16+1“.

ivona@diplomacy.bg.ac.rs

PANEL 3:

**ZAPADNI BALKAN
PRED OGLEDALOM:
LUTANJE STAZAMA
TRANZICIJE I EVROPEIZACIJE**

Prof. dr Dragan ĐUKANOVIĆ
Fakultet političkih nauka Univerziteta u Beogradu

Zapadni Balkan na kraju 2018. godine: konfuzija ili stabilizacija

Evropske integracije država Zapadnog Balkana i dalje su na „čekanju“. Naredne, 2019. godine biće održani izbori u Evropskoj uniji i formiraće se nove njene institucije, uz realnu i značajnu opasnost da desne političke opcije, inače poprilično evroskeptične unutar država članica Evropske unije, postanu zastupljenije u briselskim institucijama. Sa druge strane, 2018. godinu okarakterisala su tri dominantna zbivanja na Zapadnom Balkanu. To se prevashodno odnosi na oscilacije u procesu normalizacije odnosa između Beograda i Prištine, ali i pokušaju okončanja dvadeset sedam godina dugog spora između Makedonije i Grčke potpisivanjem Prespanskog sporazuma (17. jun 2018). Dijalog na relaciji Beograd-Priština doživeo je nekoliko izazova, ali je sasvim jasno da su Sjedinjene Američke Države u ovom trenutku veoma intenzivirale napore da do uspešnog okončanja ovog procesa dođe. Unutrašnji dijalog o Kosovu, koji je u Srbiji bio vođen tokom 2017. i 2018. godine pokazao je da dominiraju snage koje bi zamrzle postojeći konflikt i ne bi dale jasnu perspektivu normalizaciji odnosa između Beograda i Prištine. Takođe, ideje o korekciji granica ili razmeni teritorija između Kosova i delova središnje Srbije stvarale su različite napetosti unutar javnosti dveju strana, a to se odrazilo i na intenzitet dijaloga. Opređenost pre svega Sjedinjenih Američkih Država, ali i Evropske unije, da dođe do okončanja spora koji traje između Grčke i Makedonije još od 1991. godine, pokazala je koliko je nužna diplomatska akcija da do toga dođe. Sporazum koji je potpisan polovinom 2018. godine bio je doveden u pitanje više puta, kako u Makedoniji, tako i u Grčkoj. I pored neuspeha savetodavnog referenduma o sprovođenju ovog sporazuma, koji je u Makedoniji bio održan 30. septembra 2018. godine, osigurana je dvotrećinska većina u Saboranju da se započne proces izmena i dopuna Ustava Makedonije. Sa druge

strane, postoje brojni izazovi da li će i kako ovaj sporazum biti ratifikovan i u grčkom parlamentu. U svakom slučaju od svega navedenog će zavisiti ubrzanje prijema Makedonije u NATO, ali i otvaranje pregovora sa Evropskom unijom. Treći događaj koji je zasigurno obeležio tekuću godinu jesu izbori u Bosni i Hercegovini, koji su *via facti* samo potvrdili dosadašnje negativne trendove i tendencije unutar zemlje. Iako su brojne izborne nepravilnosti bile uočene 7. oktobra 2018. godine, jasno je da opozicione snage u Bosni i Hercegovini i njenim entitetima nemaju snage da ponude jasnu alternativu razvoja ove države. Zato će i perspektiva članstva Bosne i Hercegovine u NATO-u i Evropskoj uniji i dalje biti u senci evidentnog jačanja uticaja određenih aktera, poput Ruske Federacije i Turske.

Ključne reči: Zapadni Balkan, Evropska unija, Makedonija, Bosna i Hercegovina, Srbija, Kosovo i Metohija.

Dr Dragan Đukanović je vanredni profesor Fakulteta političkih nauka Univerziteta u Beogradu. Od 2001. do 2017. godine bio je zaposlen u Institutu za međunarodnu politiku i privredu, gde je bio i glavni i odgovorni urednik naučnog časopisa *Međunarodna politika* (2008–2017). Predsednik je nevladine organizacije Centar za spoljnu politiku iz Beograda i potpredsednik Foruma za međunarodne odnose Evropskog pokreta u Srbiji. Ključne oblasti njegovog akademskog interesovanja su spoljna politika država Zapadnog Balkana, balkanske studije, studije Jugoistočne Evrope, mediteranske i evropske studije.

dragandjuk@yahoo.com

Dr. Simonida KAČARSKA
European Policy Institute, Skopje

Freeing a captured state: What role for EU accession? The case of the Republic of Macedonia

In 2017 the Republic of Macedonia experienced the most difficult turnover of power in its history with a government formed six months after the December 2016 elections. The change of government came after a wiretapping scandal in early 2015 had revealed large-scale, high-level corruption, and a lack of control over the state intelligence and security agencies. In response, the European Commission raised concerns about state capture in its annual “progress report” – “The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia 2016 Report” (9 November 2016) – claiming that the Assembly had failed to provide an effective oversight to the executive power, the justice system was not independent, and the authorities showed no willingness to resolve these issues. A later (much-praised) assessment conducted – published in “2017 Report of the Senior Experts’ Group on systemic Rule of Law issues in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia”, described the circumstances in the country as “capture of the judiciary and prosecution by the executive power”. The new government committed to bring the country back to the European accession by resolving thorny bilateral disputes, freeing captured institutions and regaining the trust of citizens. Thus, it is expected that the EU drive will help the reestablishment of checks and balances between the various branches of government. The question remains, however, whether this is too heavy a lift for what is now a relatively weak enlargement process. At the same time, experience from the previous enlargement clearly highlights that accession is an executive led process, which largely sidelines and even overshadows all other branches of power. In light of these expectations and the specificities, this presentation examines how and whether the EU accession process is fit for re-instating checks and balances between various branches of power. The presentation will be based on qualitative methodology, including desk

analysis as well as data from interviews and focus groups with stakeholders, including policy makers, civil society representatives, members of parliament and judges in the course of 2018.

Key words: state capture, EU accession, rule of law, the European Union, Macedonia.

Simonida Kačarska is the director of the European Policy Institute in Skopje, Republic of Macedonia. She holds a PhD in Politics and International Studies from the University of Leeds in the United Kingdom. Her research examines the relationship between political conditionality and democratisation focusing on the European Union accession processes, including visa liberalisation. She has held research positions at the Central European University, University of Oxford, the College of Europe, and the University of Edinburgh.

skacarska@gmail.com

Dr Lejla RAMIĆ-MESIHOVIĆ

Vanjskopolitička inicijativa BH, Sarajevo

Tamo gdje se proces evropske integracije sukobljava s nedosljednostima međunarodnog kriznog menadžmenta: slučaj Bosne i Hercegovine

Dvadesetdvije godine poslije rata Bosna i Hercegovina je sve više objekt nego subjekt međunarodnih odnosa, prvenstveno zahvaljujući nedosljednostima međunarodnog kriznog menadžmenta. Od prvog i posljednjeg ozbiljnog pokušaja ustavne reforme koji je propao u aprilu 2006. godine, Bosna i Hercegovina se permanentno suočava sa unutrašnjim dnevnopolitičkim blokadama koje se pravdaju navodnim uporištima unutar Opšteg okvirnog mirovnog sporazuma za BiH potpisanog u Parizu 14. decembra 1995. Kao zemlja koja aspirira da postane članicom Evropske unije od 1997. godine, Bosna i Hercegovina više od deceniju trpi posljedice rastuće nedosljednosti međunarodnog kriznog menadžmenta, što ozbiljno ugrožava kako integrativne procese, tako i perspektivu. U Bosni i Hercegovini djeluju dva mehanizma kriznog menadžmenta – Ured visokog predstavnika i Ured Specijalnog predstavnika Evropske unije. Odmah po potpisivanju akta poznatijeg kao Dejtonski mirovni sporazum, osnovano je Vijeće za provedbu mira od preko 55 članica. Upravni odbor Vijeća koje treba da daje političke smjernice Visokom predstavniku uključuje države i organizacije koje sve dinamičnije mijenjaju vlastite interese i međusobne odnose. U Vijeću članice imaju obavezu doprinosti mirovnom procesu u implementaciji Dejtonskog sporazuma, bez jasne ideje o tome kako treba da izgleda kontekst u kojem će se provedba proglasiti okončanom. Sam tok implementacije Dejtonskog sporazuma, kao i društveni i politički odnosi koju on generiše, ukazuju na to da je sve jasnije da nema praktično ishodište u funkcionalnoj demokratiji, već da je, baš suprotno, generator sistemskih anomalija koje produkuju sve veći broj simptoma primjerenih zamrznutom sukobu. Jedna od članica Vijeća za provedbu mira je i Evropska unija,

zastupljena putem Evropske komisije, te osobe koja je istovremeno i uposlenik Komisije i pod mandatom Evropskog vijeća. Specijalni predstavnik EU ima obavezu da vodi i podstiče zemlju na putu za članstvo, ali i da podržava implementaciju Dejtonskog mirovnog sporazuma. Budući da su ova dva procesa sve češće suštinski i provedbeno suprotstavljena, ovako postavljen mandat čini se otjelovljenjem kontradiktornosti međunarodnog kriznog menadžmenta u Bosni i Hercegovini. Suštinski suprotstavljena priroda ove dvije uloge predstavnika Evropske unije dalje otupljuje oštricu integrativnog procesa, narušava njen kredibilitet i opseg djelovanja u Bosni i Hercegovini, što ostavlja veliki prostor kako za dalje razvijanje nekonstruktivnih procesa unutar zemlje, tako i za sve bahatiji i patronizirajući odnos susjedstva, te druge neželjene vanjske utjecaje.

Ključne riječi: Bosna i Hercegovina, Evropska unija, međunarodni krizni menadžment, Dejtonski mirovni sporazum, evropske integracije, vanjski utjecaji.

Dr Lejla Ramić-Mesihović je direktorica Vanjskopolitičke inicijative BH, a profesionalno se bavi procesom evropskih integracija već dvije decenije. Poslije nekoliko godina provedenih u novinarstvu, deceniju i pol je radila u institucijama Evropske unije u Bosni i Hercegovini u službeničkom i savjetodavnom svojstvu, prateći, te dijelom i usmjeravajući evoluciju odnosa EU prema BiH i spremnost BiH na strukturalnu prilagodbu. Osnovna oblast njenog akademskog interesovanja je geopolitika južnog Balkana, budući da je magistrirala na temu makedonske vanjske politike i doktorirala na uticaju albanske etničke svijesti na stabilnost južnog Balkana.

lejla@vpi.ba

Dr Jovana MAROVIĆ
Politikon mreža, Podgorica

Crna Gora između autokratije i demokratije: slabosti politike uslovljavanja Evropske unije

Iako u različitim fazama procesa evropske integracije, sve države zapadnog Balkana su formalno i tehnički postigle određeni napredak u ispunjavanju kriterijuma definisanih od strane Evropske unije (EU). Ipak, sve države regiona su opterećene različitim problemima: od manjka slobode medija, politizovanih institucija, korumpiranih službenika, slabih preduslova za održavanje slobodnih i demokratskih izbora i čestih zloupotreba javnih resursa. Uprkos kontekstu koji bi trebalo da bude podsticajan za demokratizaciju, demokratija zapravo stagnira i/ili nazaduje. Evropska unija nije dovoljno posvećena reformama, ignorišući čak i flagrantna kršenja zakona i ljudskih prava "podržavajući" na taj način "autokratske elite" na vlasti. Kada je riječ o Crnoj Gori, državi koja se najčešće kvalifikuje kao lider u procesu integracije zapadnog Balkana, uz duboku polarizaciju društva, svi navedeni problemi su izraženi. Štaviše, Crna Gora je u odnosu na ostale države regiona specifična po tome što nikada nije promijenila vlast na demokratskim izborima pa su otuda nedemokratske prakse još značajnije pustile korijenje. U Crnoj Gori su gotovo trideset godina isti ljudi istovremeno i nosioci reformi i glavni uzročnici zarobljenosti države. Ova neprekidna vlast uzrokovala je isprepletenost države i partije i nepostojanje odgovornosti na svim nivoima. Manjak demokratije se manifestuje u najmanje tri pravca: unaprijeđene norme ne utiču na napredak u praksi budući da se ne sprovode dosledno; izražavanje slobodne volje na izborima je upitno, jer su svi dosadašnji izbori praćeni neregularnostima i zloupotrebama; iako su institucije reformisane i dalje su visoko politizovane i ne funkcionišu po standardima koje propisuju savremene demokratije. Jedini uspjeh kojim Crna Gora može da se pohvali za više od šest godina pregovaranja o punopravnom članstvu

u EU je otvaranje pregovaračkih poglavlja i ispunjavanje tehničkih preduslova za integraciju koji istovremeno ne znače i izgradnju institucija i jačanje vladavine prava. Otuda, reforme imaju ograničen uticaj na demokratiju. Neki od problema u pristupu EU podrazumijevaju manjak transparentnosti, fokus koji je sa suštinskih pomjeren na tehničke aspekte procesa, neprecizno i uopšteno izvještavanje i ocjenjivanje reformi. Polazimo od sledećih pretpostavki: Dalje udaljavanje EU sa zapadnog Balkana, ili zadržavanje procesa integracije na sadašnjem nivou, znači dalje nazadovanje demokratije. Političke elite u regionu ovim tempom reformi ne mogu iskorijeniti nedemokratske prakse. Manjak volje/želje za ozbiljnijim rezovima dolazi od činjenice da su nedemokratske prakse osnov moći partija na vlasti. Uzimajući u obzir probleme koje EU ima u sopstvenom dvorištu, njena demokratska transformacija, demokratizacija država članica, kao i onih na zapadnom Balkanu su procesi koji su neodvojivi i moraju ići ruku pod ruku. Integracioni okvir zahtijeva značajna unapređenja što podrazumijeva promjenu u procjeni sprovedenih reformi, preciznije povezivanje zahtjeva i smjernica, kao i prioritizaciju reformi u cilju izbjegavanja kompletno tehničkog pristupa.

Ključne riječi: demokratizacija, integracija, klijentelizam, korupcija, monitoring, izvještavanje, reforme.

Dr Jovana Marović je izvršna direktorka Politikon mreže, nezavisnog istraživačkog centra iz Podgorice, članica BiEPAG-a i radne grupe za poglavlje 23 u pregovorima za pristupanje Crne Gore Evropskoj uniji. Jovana je doktorirala na Fakultetu političkih nauka Univerziteta u Beogradu. Oblasti njenog istraživačkog interesovanja obuhvataju vladavinu prava, demokratiju, federalizam, Zapadni Balkan, politički sistem EU i politiku proširenja.

jovana@politikon.me

Dr Jelena TODOROVIĆ LAZIĆ
Institut za političke studije, Beograd

Izazovi politike proširenja u svetlu transformacije Evropske unije: da li je porast evroskepticizma u Srbiji neizbežan?

Tokom šest decenija postojanja, Evropska unija (odnosno ranije Evropske zajednice) više puta se nalazila na raskršću, ali nikada ranije nije bila istovremeno na meti toliko različitih kriza (finansijske, krize evra, migrantske, Bregzita, krize identiteta) koje gotovo sinergijski tresu njene temelje. Dok se razmatraju različiti scenariji budućeg izgleda Unije, ono što je važno za Srbiju, jednu od država Zapadnog Balkana, jeste gde se nalazi pitanje proširenje u transformisanoj Uniji. Politika proširenja je kao relativno „mlada“ evropska politika doživela veliki uspeh poslednjih decenija. Preovlađujući činilac koji je ovu politiku učinio tako uspešnom je obostrana spremnost (apsorpcioni/integracioni kapacitet) kako Unije da primi države kandidate, tako i (administrativni) kapacitet država kandidata da ispune postavljene uslove i postanu članice „evropske porodice“. Ne treba zaobići ni uticaj političke volje koja je uvek bila prateći element politike proširenja, pa zato pojedine države Zapadnog Balkana često ukazuju na „nejednak tretman“, što je posebno postalo uočljivo nakon ulaska Bugarske i Rumunije u EU. Iako iz Brisela dolaze uveravanja da se od proširenja neće odustati, očigledno je da se ovo pitanje trenutno ne nalazi na listi prioriteta Unije. Ne samo da se usled mnogobrojnih aktuelnih izazova sa kojima se Unija suočava, na staklenim nogama drži njena rešenost da razmatra proširenje na Zapadni Balkan, već ovakav pad zainteresovanosti vodi i padu interesovanja kod država pomenutog regiona koje se nalaze u procesu pristupanja. To dalje vodi porastu evroskepticizma koji u regionu Zapadnog Balkana ima plodno tlo. Razlozi za evroskepticizam su postojali i pre nego što je proširenje skrajnuto sa agende Unije (to su uglavnom razlozi u vezi sa pretpriputnom strategijom Unije prema državama kandidatima/potencijalnim kandidatima i bili su uočljivi i kod

država Centralne i Istočne Evrope, mada postoje i razlozi koji su specifični za svaku državu pojednično), ali su oni, čini se, pojačani novim razvojem događaja u Uniji. Neizvesnost članstva utiče na porast negativnih stavova u javnosti ovih država prema Uniji što se može pratiti kroz mnogobrojna Istraživanja javnog mnjenja. U fokusu ovog izlaganja biće tumačenje rezultata Istraživanja koje jednom godišnje od 2015. godine, zaključno sa 2018. godinom, sprovodi Institut za političke studije (kroz analizu odgovora na sledeća pitanja da li ste za u članjenje Srbije u EU, kakvo je mišljenje građana o EU, da li mislite da tokom pregovora o članstvu u EU, Srbija treba da ispuni sve postavljene uslove?). Cilj je videti da li i kako se menjaju stavovi građana Srbije u vezi sa evropskim integracijama, uzevši u obzir izazove koji se postavljaju pred Uniju u posmatranom periodu.

Ključne reči: politika proširenja, evroskepticizam, Evropska unija, Zapadni Balkan, Srbija.

Dr Jelena Todorović Lazić je naučni saradnik u Institutu za političke studije, Beograd. Jelena je doktor političkih nauka, a disertaciju pod nazivom „Uticaj procesa pristupanja Evropskoj uniji na kreiranje ekološke politike u Srbiji“ odbranila je 2016. godine na Fakultetu političkih nauka Univerziteta u Beogradu. Oblasti njenog akademskog interesovanja su odnos Srbije i Evropske unije, politika proširenja, evroskepticizam, evropska ekološka politika.

todorovic.j82@gmail.com

Programski odbor

Dr Srđan T. Korać, Institut za međunarodnu politiku i privredu, Beograd, *predsednik*

Prof. dr Dragan R. Simić, Fakultet političkih nauka Univerziteta u Beogradu

Prof. dr Slobodan Samardžić, Fakultet političkih nauka Univerziteta u Beogradu

Prof. dr Ivo Visković, Fakultet političkih nauka Univerziteta u Beogradu

Prof. dr Siniša Tatalović, Fakultet političkih znanosti Sveučilišta u Zagrebu

Dr Sandro Knezović, Institut za razvoj i međunarodne odnose, Zagreb

Dr Duško Lopandić, Ministarstvo spoljnih poslova Republike Srbije

Dr Miša Đurković, Institut za evropske studije, Beograd

Dr Milomir Stepić, Institut za političke studije, Beograd

Dr Ana Jović Lazić, Institut za međunarodnu politiku i privredu, Beograd

Organizacioni odbor

Dr Vladimir Trapara, Institut za međunarodnu politiku i privredu, Beograd, *predsednik*

Msr Nenad Stekić, Institut za međunarodnu politiku i privredu, Beograd

Jelena Đurović, Kancelarija Fondacije Hanns Seidel za Srbiju i za Crnu Goru



Conference

**THE WESTERN BALKANS
AS "RESIDUE"
OF THE UNITED EUROPE:
"NO MAN'S LAND" AGAIN?**

Book of abstracts

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL NOTE

The Western Balkans as "residue" of the United Europe:
"No man's land" again?

Srđan KORAĆ

57

KEYNOTE SPEECH:

Great crisis of the European Union has changed the function
and content of the Enlargement Policy

Slobodan SAMARDŽIĆ

62

PANEL 1:

WESTERN BALKANS IN THE EU'S SUPRANATIONAL DILEMMAS

Foreign policy of the European Union and the Western Balkans:
Transformative power limitations

Maja KOVAČEVIĆ

66

Problems of the European Union and the EU candidate countries'
mutual relations and flexible accession as a possible way of reviving
the Enlargement Policy

Ivana RADIĆ MILOSAVLJEVIĆ

68

Uncertain enlargement process of the European Union
and further periferisation of the Balkans: Three current trends

Milan IGRUTINOVIĆ

70

53

The accession of the Western Balkan countries to the European Union from the perspective of energy Petar STANOJEVIĆ, Zoran JEFTIĆ	72
--	----

PANEL 2:

IS A NEW CHAPTER IN THE HISTORY OF BALKAN CLIENTELISM EMERGING?

“Europe out of the EU”: Western Balkans and new British foreign policy Dejan JOVIĆ	76
--	----

British policy towards the Western Balkans after Brexit in the context of the European Union enlargement to the countries of the region Miloš PAUNOVIĆ	78
---	----

The US Grand Strategy of restraint, transatlantic relations and future of the Western Balkans Mladen LIŠANIN	80
---	----

Great game in the “backyard” of the West: Russia’s foreign policy in the Balkans Siniša ATLAGIĆ	82
---	----

Manipulation with “Otherness” in the Balkans: Turkish influence in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Serbia Vladimir AJZENHAMER	84
--	----

China as a new “actor” in the Western Balkans Ivona LAĐEVAC	86
--	----

PANEL 3:

WESTERN BALKANS AGAINST THE MIRROR:
WANDERING THE PATHS TOWARDS TRANSITION AND EUROPEANISATION

Western Balkans at the end of 2018: Confusion and stabilisation Dragan ĐUKANOVIĆ	90
---	----

Freeing a captured state: What role for EU accession? – The case of the Republic of Macedonia Simonida KAČARSKA	92
Where does the process of EU integration come into conflict with inconsistencies of international crisis management: The case of Bosnia and Herzegovina Lejla RAMIĆ-MESIHOVIĆ	94
Montenegro between autocracy and democracy: Weaknesses of the EU Conditionality Policy Jovana MAROVIĆ	96
Challenges of Enlargement Policy in the light of European Union transformation: Is the rise of Euroscepticism in Serbia inevitable? Jelena TODOROVIĆ LAZIĆ	98

THE WESTERN BALKANS AS “RESIDUE” OF THE UNITED EUROPE: “NO MAN’S LAND” AGAIN?

Institute of International Politics and Economics (IPE) organised conference “The Western Balkans as ‘residue’ of the United Europe: ‘No man’s land’ again?” in Belgrade on 6 December 2018, with support of the Hanns Seidel Stiftung – Office for Serbia and for Montenegro. The main objective of the Conference Programme Committee was to gather academicians and scholars from Serbia and neighbouring countries to discuss how the recent changes in geopolitical environment and the existing problems in the politics of the European Union can undermine the security and wider stability of the Western Balkans as well as the ambiguous results of Euro-Atlantic integration of the region. The conference was to provide a research-based debate about various aspects of the emerging brand-new power dynamics that is likely to shape foreign policies of the most important international actors who are striving to enhance their influence and/or presence in the Western Balkans, so that they can fill the vacuum created by the on-the-ground neglect of the region by the EU in the last decade.

IPE wished to provide an academic platform on the future of the Western Balkans with a view to the unprecedented turbulence faced by the EU in the form of a multifaceted crisis. Firstly, there are many controversies about democratic legitimacy of the complex decision-making of Eurocrats, the principles and future of the European integration process, and the increased risk of spilling over of the Brexit dynamic to other member countries, particularly to those with right-wing governments. Secondly, although dealing with the migration crisis has shown so far that this serious challenge can only be solved within a solid European framework, populist and extremist forces are brought to power or strengthened because of the indecisive and paralysed decision-making on the EU level caused reputational damage. Thirdly, the EU can return the respect of its citizens only by developing effective mechanisms to take swift decisions particularly in the fields of defence, security and foreign policy, which importance raise due to permanent turmoil in the Mediterranean neighbourhood, “anxiety” and tensions in the transatlantic partnership, EU-Turkey relations, and policy towards Russia.

The future role of the European Union as an effective actor in its closer and wider neighbourhood has to be tested first in reconceiving the European perspective for the remaining Balkan countries. Although the Berlin Process triggered a new dynamic to regional cooperation and bring the Western Balkans closer towards the EU, the short-sightedness of a divided EU national governments has sent contradictory messages and no longer offers a fair and realistic prospect of joining. On the contrary, the latest NATO Summit (Brussels, 11–12 July 2018) emphasised once again that the Western Balkans is “a region of strategic importance”, and that the organisation remains “fully committed to the stability and security” of the region by supporting the Euro-Atlantic aspirations in the region, and particularly through its presence in Kosovo and strengthening its relations with Serbia. It seems that the United States clearly understands the risk of downward spiral in parts of the region that can be deepened by an emerging and growing anti-Western Russian, Chinese and Turkish influence.

One has to bear in mind that oftentimes in its history the Balkans was a battlefield for clash of civilisations motivated by ancient hatreds destined to be in eternal conflict. A web of interconnectedness between the Balkan nations would be expected whereby peace and harmony would reign instead of war and disunity. Yet, the lack of politically-stable multicultural societies combined with the well-rooted tradition of clientelistic relation with great powers may contribute to opening loopholes for exploitation by Russia, China, Turkey, and the United States (only in a scenario of worsening relations with the EU due to President Trump clumsy foreign policy). Moreover, the countries of the region are heavily affected by growing rate of poverty, depopulation trend caused by increasing emigration to the West, decline of social and economic rights. All those factors can fuel smouldering issues of ethnopolitics, such as non-demarcated borderlines, contested Kosovo independence, dysfunctional state and segregated communities in Bosnia and Herzegovina, ethnic segregation in Macedonia etc. Global and regional powers with vested strategic foreign policy interests in the Western Balkans have used various tools in the last decade – China only economic, Turkey mostly economic and cultural, the United States political, military and economic, while Russia has used mostly political tools. In the crisis-stricken Western Balkans, building the strategic influence as a part of particularistic foreign policies without a long-term vision for the region can be seductive, but false and, therefore, dangerous replacement for the European perspective.

The conference debate anchored in 16 presentations aimed at answering to the following batches of questions:

- Open issues of the future EU Enlargement policy towards the Western Balkans regarding the incoherent and sluggish implementation of transitional reforms in the region, as well as the contested legitimization of the European Union and a dysfunctional supranational political system;
- Do and how clientelism and the “hatred of small differences” as “destiny” of the Balkan nations slow down their accession to the European Union?
- Are recent changes in foreign policies of great and regional powers towards the Western Balkans countries mirroring new global power dynamics?
- How great and regional powers utilise their foreign policy tools when it comes to marginalising the European Union’s influence in the Western Balkans? How effectively does the European Union use the CFSP’s tools to maintain its influence in this region?

Regardless of whether the conference participants would have managed to provide valid and reliable answers to these questions, the selected issues were important because they underlined a grim possibility of closing the perspective of joint building of lasting peace in this area of high conflict hazard. In the region plagued by the already decade-long global recession, the establishment of vested strategic impact as an instrument of a particularistic foreign policy that ignores the long-term vision of the common future of the Western Balkan countries can entice attractive, but superficial and immediate promises, and thus represents a dangerous substitute for the perspective of a united Europe – no matter how much at the present it seems to be far and uncertain.

Dr. Srđan T. Korać
The Chair of the Conference Programme Committee

KEYNOTE SPEECH:

Professor Slobodan SAMARDŽIĆ
Faculty of Political Science, University of Belgrade

Great crisis of the European Union has changed the function and content of the Enlargement Policy

The great crisis of the European Union (EU) is already a ten-year long process stipulated only by internal reasons. The main incentive of the crisis is the difference between the high goals of integration projects and inadequate institutional, legal and political abilities to achieve these goals. In real life, this difference, which is structural by its nature, manifests itself in dysfunctionality of the latest integration procedures – monetary union, the Common Foreign and Security Policy, judicial and police cooperation – which, as it turned out during the crisis, leads to the dysfunctionality of various fields of the previously achieved level of integration. The deepest EU crisis lies in the field of monetary union. It is expressed in the form of the debt crisis of a number of the Eurozone member states as the consequence of huge problems in public finance of these countries. The anti-crisis mechanism introduced in the Union in the period 2011–2014 deeply changed the institutional picture of both crisis-stricken member states and the Union as a whole. Both parties have significantly changed the way of functioning, at least when it comes to solving the critical issues, introducing some rather authoritarian methods in the decision-making and implementation procedures. Such measures might be accepted as legitimate in actual emergency, if they had positive results and suggested realistic expectations for their withdrawal. But, the condition in the majority of the crisis-stricken member states has not been improved, while some new ones are getting into the orbit of the anti-crisis policy. The way out of the crisis is not on the horizon yet. Under such circumstances, the political actors in the EU are aware of the need for its in-depth reform, but they have neither strength nor enough political will to move. The EU Enlargement Policy could not but suffer huge changes due to these

internal processes. The great 2004 and 2007 enlargements did not cause the crisis, but they badly coincided with its eruption and course. Because of its depth, long duration and uncertain termination, the crisis itself removed the topic of enlargement from the agenda, but it has not formally changed this policy. It is well known that as long ago as 2003 the states of the so-called Western Balkans got into the framework of the EU enlargement policy of that time. Until the EU crisis eruption, the slow pace of this policy could be attributed only to the difficulties of these states to fulfil the technical and political conditions of the EU. After 2008, and particularly after 2011, it was quite apparent that the basic cause of the postponement moved into the sphere of structural problems of the Union, although the member states themselves did not make any substantial progress in the fields of qualitative economic, legal or political criteria. Today, the word-prudent officials of the Union say that the enlargement process will continue after the reform of the Union itself, which is an obscurely long period. In the meantime, the basic function and even the content of the enlargement policy has changed. Its purpose is not to extend the integration process of the Union to other European states, because the process itself is uncertain, but to ensure that these countries would remain in the sphere of Western influence and domination under the new security and geopolitical constellation. A politically unpropounded question for the candidate countries remains open: whether the stabilisation and accession process, which has to prepare a country for full membership, should be revised together with the EU toward better adaptation to the changed circumstances.

Key words: The EU Crisis, anti-crisis policy, impossibility of the reforms, enlargement policy, changed circumstances, enlargement without membership.

Dr. Slobodan Samardžić is a Full Professor at the Faculty of Political Science, University of Belgrade, where he teaches several courses related to various aspects of the European Union. Professor Samardžić is the founder of European Studies at this faculty. Main areas of his research are contemporary political ideas and institutions, theory and practice of federalism and constitutionalism, and political system of the European Union.

slobodan.samardzic@fpn.bg.ac.rs

PANEL 1:

**WESTERN BALKANS
IN THE EU`S
SUPRANATIONAL
DILEMMAS**

Dr. Maja KOVAČEVIĆ

Faculty of Political Science, University of Belgrade

Foreign policy of the European Union and the Western Balkans: Transformative power limitations

The European Union is a unique actor in the Western Balkans region where it has implemented a broad array of foreign policy instruments since the beginning of the 1990's: diplomatic and trade measures, financial aid, civilian and military missions, as well as the enlargement policy, which is its most successful foreign trade tool. Hence, the Western Balkans is inspiring for research of the European Union transformative power. An obvious success that the EU Enlargement Policy had, exerting influence on the transition processes in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe, prompted a research of the so-called Europeanisation and/or transformative power of the European Union in relation to third countries and its impact on the political and economic reforms during the accession process. The research of the European Union transformative power established several factors that affect the efficacy of this power. The most important of these factors are adaptation costs of a third country and foreign pressure of the European Union itself on the governments of third countries to meet its requirements, which depend to the greatest extent on consistent implementation of the conditionality policy. The consistency of the transformative power is also affected by domestic factors such as veto players, norm promoters and formal and informal institutions. A relatively successful Europeanisation of the Central and Eastern European countries during the accession process, despite high adaptation costs, is widely explained through a combination of strong pressure made by the European Union conditionality policy and weakness of veto players. Why wasn't this success repeated in case of the Western Balkan countries? The fundamental thesis of this presentation is that the EU transformative power showed serious limitations in this region, although a whole array of its foreign trade instruments was applied. Numerous factors contributed to

slow-paced Europeanisation of the Western Balkan countries: post-conflict societies, weak states characteristic for the lack of the rule of law, developed organized crime and corruption, illegitimate institutions, weak governing capacities, statehood contestation. Without diminishing the importance of the aforementioned factors, this presentation emphasizes the global crisis of the European Union transformative power and impact of the so-called democratisation-stability dilemma on inconsistency of the conditionality policy as the key factors for stagnation of the countries of the region in the Europeanisation process. From the very beginning of the implementation of the Stabilisation and Association Process, the European Union had dual goals in the region: first, the stability and then integration, which deepened the dilemma “stabilisation and building of a state or democratisation and building of institutions”. Prioritizing effective government to the rule of democracy, the European Union contributed to establishment of the so-called stabilocracy in the region. There is an obvious paradox which reflects in that the countries of the region, although involved in the European Union enlargement policy and subdued to the Europeanisation process for almost 20 years, have marked ever since 2010 a decline in *Freedom House Democracy Index*. The paradox is even greater as this decline has been recorded in some of the European Union member states since 2014, which disputes a thesis that the European Union membership means a guarantee for the democratic institutions stability.

Key words: European Union, foreign policy, Europeanisation, transformative power, the Western Balkans, the “democratisation-stability” dilemma.

Dr. Maja Kovačević is an Associate Professor of European Studies at the Faculty of Political Science, University of Belgrade (International Studies Department). Previously, she had been researcher at the Institute of Economic Sciences (1995–2001), and the head of the European Integration Office of the FRY (2001–2003). She teaches History of European Integration, the EU as a Global Actor and the EU Justice and Home Affairs. Her main research areas include governance of the EU, EU enlargement, EU and the Western Balkans, EU CFSP. She has published a number of book chapters and articles on European Integration. Her most recent book is *European Integration Principals* (2016).

maja.kovacevic@fpn.bg.ac.rs

Dr. Ivana RADIĆ MILOSAVLJEVIĆ

Faculty of Political Science, University of Belgrade

Problems of the European Union and the EU candidate countries' mutual relations and flexible accession as a possible way of reviving the Enlargement Policy

The EU accession process has been found to contain numerous shortcomings whose roots lie both in the very structure of the Enlargement policy and in the nature of the mutual relations between the European Union and its member states, on the one hand, and the candidate countries, on the other. The Stabilisation and Association Process created for the Western Balkans nearly two decades ago, has enabled the EU to define unilaterally, at its own discretion and needs, the conditions for admission. The EU did it most often guided by geopolitical and security interests instead of objective criteria derived from certain policy sectors. This attitude of the EU and its member states, along with the poorly developed democratic political culture and the weak statehood of the candidate countries, led to the unprecedented interference of the Union in the internal political and constitutional issues of the candidate countries, and even in the state building process in the Western Balkans. The apparent arbitrariness in the conditionality policy, the overly ambiguous idea of stabilisation and democratic consolidation, the tutorial and hegemonic attitude of the Union towards the candidate countries, and the now clear prolongation of the process have led to the loss of its credibility and fatigue on both sides. Maintaining such inadequate relations and accession policy is supported by the idea that membership in the European Union has no alternative. Public and even academic debate on this issue has been suppressed by one ruling narrative of deadlock, that is, the absence of alternatives that prevailed so much that not only the road to the EU is not questioned, but any idea of transformation of that road is declared unwelcome. However, whether the achieving full and faster membership in the EU is the best option for current candidate countries or even for the EU itself, it

is the question that had to be debated long time ago. To support this discussion, the author offers the idea of transforming the process towards a flexible accession based primarily on the redefinition of mutual relations between Serbia and the EU. The current politics of full membership implies that the candidate country *unconditionally accepts* the obligation of harmonisation in all areas of the *acquis communautaire*. Flexible accession would imply that the candidate country itself determines in which fields it has the interests and real abilities to integrate without the cost of it being greater than potential benefits. For its part, the European Union should limit its conditionality policy only to selected areas by defining specific criteria for each of them. In other words, progress in an area could not depend on conditions that are not previously known and closely related only to the specific area. Such a redesigned process of accession, provided that appropriate political decisions are made in a democratic procedure on both sides, could overcome the actual impasse. By offering a flexible instead of membership in all areas of integration, the reluctant EU Member States would have the opportunity to maintain the promise of membership prospects given 15 years ago and thus restore the credibility of the EU Enlargement policy. For candidate countries, although it would involve a more cautious approach, flexible accession and membership would allow easier and faster integration focused on reforms in a smaller number of areas. Also, it would end the arbitrary and hegemonic relationship in which the candidate countries participate as a weaker party.

Key words: accession, impasse, European Union, flexibility, hegemony.

Dr. Ivana Radić Milosavljević is a teaching assistant within the field of European Studies at the Faculty of Political Science, University of Belgrade. She deals with the functioning of the EU's political system, European integration theory, problem of democracy in the EU. She completed her BA, magister studies, and PhD at the Faculty of Political Science, University of Belgrade. She has participated in creating and conducting of several teaching and research projects aimed at modernizing the Faculty's European Studies programme (e.g. University's Jean Monnet and Tempus projects). Ivana has the working experience in Serbian state institutions, NGOs as well as an independent consultant.

ivana.radic@fpn.bg.ac.rs

Dr. Milan IGRUTINOVIĆ
Institute of European Studies, Belgrade

Uncertain enlargement process of the European Union and further periferisation of the Balkans: Three current trends

New European Union Enlargement Strategy adopted in February 2018 brought about a series of tactical steps for the upcoming period which would be actively dealt by the governments of the countries in the region and the EU administration. The subjects such as the rule of law and civil liberties, infrastructural connections, digitalisation, common security strengthening as the need connected with the issue of mass refugee waves from the areas in the south and south east part of Europe, will be dominating in daily operations in order to meet the formal requirements for joining the EU. Picking the year 2025 as the earliest possible time for membership of Serbia and Montenegro makes the year seem far enough so that no one has to reckon seriously on the very subject of membership, only on the process duration. In the joint communique from the EU and Western Balkans summit held in Sofia in May 2018, the word "enlargement" was omitted. Only practical subjects from the domain of the enlargement process were concretised and underlined, while the issue of political will remained in the backyard, since there is no internal cohesion in the European Union for public solicitation of the enlargement in front of the public audience of the member states. Having that in mind, the author will try to draft three political trends in his presentation which are currently affecting in a broad sense the process of the European Union enlargement to the rest of the Balkans and which neither originate from that process nor seem to be directly connected with it. These are: the changes in the European Union's foreign policy as the result of complex agreements between the member states and the Brussels administration; the current topics on the Union's internal reforms; and the policy of the USA towards Europe and the EU under the leadership of Donald Trump, which is still not quite clear. The first trend is based on the logic of securitised view to the region of the

Western Balkans which is founded in the political fear from the migrant crisis, wider conflict with Russia and attitude towards the conflicts and instability in the Middle East. The second trend is connected with the clinically dead process of internal reforms of the Union itself, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, the explicit relationship of the enlargement process with that process of unclear, uncertain and unpredictable internal reforms. The third trend relies on a more clearly profiled policy of the United States that is looking for the allies, in the first place in Eastern Europe, for their main objective – political suppression of the Russian influence, including the one in the Balkans, with obvious disagreements with the EU in regard to a series of other issues. These three trends overhang the enlargement process making it more politically uncertain, whereas the Western Balkans (and Serbia within it) is evermore defined as the area of security concerns and not as the area whose integration into the EU is desirable and useful. Thus, they strengthen the negative perspective of this region to make it remain a periphery, a waiting room, an *Avant-garde*, and the field of geopolitical game of the Great Powers without significant opportunities for social and economic development of local societies.

Key words: European Union, reform, Donald Trump, Western Balkans, enlargement, periphery.

Milan Igrutinović holds a PhD in history and is working as a researcher at the Institute of European Studies, Belgrade. In his academic work he deals with the topics of international relations, foreign, security and defence policies of the European Union and Serbia, and of history of Yugoslavia. He has published one monograph (*Exile in the Classroom: Serbian Students and Pupils in Great Britain during the First World War* (2016), as a co-author), edited two collections (*Crisis of the European Union: Limits, Reach, Trends* (2013) and *Common Foreign and Security Policy of the European Union: Current Challenges* (2016)), and published more than twenty articles in journals and edited volumes.

milan.igrutinovic@ies.rs

Dr. Petar STANOJEVIĆ, Dr. Zoran JEFTIĆ
Faculty of Security Studies, University of Belgrade

The accession of the Western Balkan countries to the European Union from the perspective of energy

All countries and territories of the Western Balkans are members of the Energy Community of South East Europe, and their accession process to the EU has already started through that mechanism as well. An additional stimulation mechanism is a great number of Projects of Common Interest in the sphere of energy financed by the various EU funds. This presentation examines the situation in the energy systems of the Western Balkan countries from the aspect of fulfilment of the EU accession criteria as well as the system of measures that the EU takes towards the future member states in the accession process. Having in mind various historical-political and social-economic backgrounds, the countries from the given region have fulfilled the necessary accession conditions for inclusion of their national energy systems into the energy system of the EU in different, often modest scales. The latest changes in the European Energy Strategy and the trends complicate the situation in the Western Balkans. That the processes often stagnate is also confirmed by the fact that measures from the domain of the Energy Community sanctions were taken against some countries. In this presentation, the authors analyse the situation in the Western Balkan countries and, by means of comparative analysis as well as by taking into consideration techno-economic limitations, to establish a reasonable deadline for fulfilment of the criteria from the energy sector that would enable their admission into the EU. The first hypothesis is defined in the form of an assumption that "were the decision on the accession of all Western Balkan countries to the EU taken 'today', the majority countries would not fulfil the necessary criteria indicators (levels)"; the second one claims that "fulfilment of all criteria in the field of energy is the goal that some of the countries cannot accomplish in another 10 years from today", in other words, whether the requirements and pre-accession EU measures are stimulative and encouraging for the Western Balkan countries or, to the contrary, whether the requirements are imposed to slow down the Euro-integration process of this region. The third hypothesis puts the question whether the EU can resist the political pressures and rely on economic parameters in the admittance process of new members or whether the EU enlargement is another crucial point where the Great Powers pursue their interests. The EU accession criteria from the point of energy are defined and classified in the following groups: regulatory, organisational and physical-technical criteria. The necessary minimum indicators were determined for each of the criteria. The situation in all countries

of the Western Balkans has been analysed from the point of fulfilment of all specified criteria. The sectors of oil, gas, electricity, renewable sources and energy efficiency were analysed separately. The ownership structure in the energy sector and its impact on the fulfilment of the accession criteria was particularly analysed in order to refute/prove the thesis of political influence to the accomplishment of the EU enlargement strategy. By comparative analysis with the countries of the region that had already joined the EU and mutual comparative analysis of the Western Balkan countries, the possible deadlines for fulfilment of specific or of all obligations of each country from the Western Balkans were established. These forecasts were updated with the indicators of techno-economic limitations. It analysed the possibilities for acceleration of the processes through initiated measures from the domain of sanctions of the Energy Community as well as through the activities of the financial-technical support in realisation of the project that should contribute to the acceleration of the integration and fulfilment of preconditions or criteria.

Key words: Western Balkans, European Union, energy, EU accession criteria, fulfilment of criteria, EU accession forecast.

Dr. Petar Stanojević is an Associate Professor at the Faculty of Security Studies, University of Belgrade, a visiting lecturer at the Steinbeis University (Berlin), and member of the Academy of Engineering Sciences of Serbia. He was the State Secretary for Infrastructure and Assistant Minister of Energy for Oil and Gas, as well as the Deputy Executive Director of the Ministry of Defence of the Republic of Serbia. Professor Stanojević was General Director of "Jugopetrol" and Director for Development, Investments and Procurement of "NIS Petrol Promet" – a part of "Gazpromneft Group". The fields of his academic interest are risk management, energy security and logistics.

petstano45@gmail.com

Dr. Zoran Jeftić is an Associate Professor and Head of the Department of Defence Studies at the Faculty of Security Studies, University of Belgrade. From 1986 to 2012 he was employed by the Ministry of Defence of the Republic of Serbia, and in the period 2005–2012 he served as Assistant Minister and State Secretary Ministry of Defence. He is the Chairman of the Governing Board of the Institute of International Politics and Economics, Belgrade. The key areas of his academic interest include security, defence systems, civil-military relations, and emergency situations.

jefticz@ymail.com

PANEL 2:

**IS A NEW CHAPTER
IN THE HISTORY OF BALKAN
CLIENTELISM EMERGING?**

Professor Dejan JOVIĆ
Faculty of Political Science, University of Zagreb

“Europe out of the EU”: Western Balkans and new British foreign policy

After the decision to exit the European Union, Great Britain is in the process of its foreign policy reconstruction. This policy has stood so far on three pillars: 1) “special relationship” with the United States of America; 2) influence on the countries of Commonwealth; and 3) membership in the European Union. But, while very serious challenges are emerging in the first two areas, the exit from the EU opens a question: what the new British approach to not just the European Union but to the Europe as a whole will be. Immediately after the referendum on Brexit, Britain started emphasising that the terms Europe and the EU do not have the same meaning and that Britain wanted to lead the policy of presence in Europe, but not as a member of the EU. Thus, a new region has been designed: “Europe out of the EU”, which the British foreign and security policy perceives as a potential field of its intensive activity in the near future. That new region includes the Western Balkans and the countries between the EU and Russia (Ukraine, Belorussia) and, possibly, Turkey. With a view to continual hesitation of the EU to fully integrate the Western Balkans into the Union, the British foreign policy has room to appear in the Western Balkans as a foreign power. Thereby, it would join the competition that already exists on the EU external peripherals and where the USA, Russia, Turkey and China participate with insignificant presence of some other countries. While before Brexit Britain was a strong proponent of the European Union enlargement and integration of the Western Balkans into the Euro-Atlantic circle, after Brexit it is turning towards creation of multipolarity on the EU external peripherals. It is also looking for re-affirmation of Britain as a Great Power – especially because Brexit was the consequence of the victory of British sovereignty (nationalism) and the feeling that the membership in the EU diminished the power of the United Kingdom. This could

also have the consequences in regard to the character of NATO and its position in Europe, particularly because three member countries of NATO with the biggest military potentials (USA, Turkey and UK) are not only out of the EU, what's more, they are sceptical about the very concept of the European Union.

Key words: British foreign policy, Europe out of the EU, the Western Balkans, multipolarity on the European peripherals, NATO, *Brexit*.

Dr. Dejan Jović is a Full Professor of International Relations at Faculty of Political Science, University of Zagreb, and Visiting Professor at Faculty of Political Science, University of Belgrade. He is the Editor-in-Chief of *Croatian Political Science Review* (in Web of Science and Scopus). He authored *Yugoslavia: A state that withered away* and *War and Myth: Politics of Identity in Croatia*. Professor Jović has edited four books on Theories of International Relations, published in 2013–2018. He holds PhD from London School of Economics, and was President of the Managing board of the Institute for Development and International Relations in Zagreb. In 2010–2014 he was Chief Political Analyst in the Office of President of the Republic of Croatia.

dejan.jovic@fpzg.hr

Dr. Miloš PAUNOVIĆ

Centre for Applied European Studies, Belgrade

British policy towards the Western Balkans after Brexit in the context of the European Union enlargement to the countries of the region

Having in mind the attitude of the British diplomacy about the EU enlargement to the Western Balkan region before the referendum on remain/leave the EU held in 2016, this presentation examines if the policy of the official London toward this issues has changed. Being a full member of the European Union until its official exit in 2019, but still under significantly changed post-referendum political circumstances, Great Britain was expected to be profiling more intensively as an independent foreign political factor in the area of the Western Balkans. This profiling does not take place in a political vacuum, but in the context of changed international circumstances in Europe as well as domestic political scene in Great Britain itself, whose dynamics is determined up to a great extent by the negotiations on Brexit and, consequently, on its future status in the European politics in general. When talking about the changed international circumstances we think in the first place of further worsening in the relations between Russia and the West, the growing economic role of China in the entire area of Eastern and Southeast Europe and more and more independent acting of Turkey in international relations, especially in the region of Southeast Europe. Great Britain is still one of the leading countries of NATO which is right in the Southeast Europe experiencing a new phase that developed owing to the approachment of Turkey and Russia, entrance of Montenegro into the Alliance as well as possible entrance of FYRM/Republic of Macedonia (stipulated by the implementation of the Prespan Agreement). Furthermore, mass migrations of the population from Middle East and Africa to Europe since 2015 is another important factor affecting the security circumstances in Europe with a role in the campaign for referendum on Brexit. The internal political dynamics mainly connected with positioning of the greatest parties toward the current process of

Britain's exit from the EU as well as intra-party transpositions relative to that process also affect the British foreign policy regarding the agreement on Brexit, future relationship with EU27 and, thereby, up to an extent, to its role in the EU enlargement process. The impact of this dynamics was already visible during the Fifth annual Western Balkans Summit held in London in July 2018 as a part of the Berlin process. Having an insight into the declared foreign political goals of Great Britain, diplomatic practice, parliamentary debates, media, as well as the already written academic works on this subject, it can be concluded that the British policy towards the perspective of the membership of Western Balkan countries in the EU shall remain in the scope of general support to inclusion of those countries into the Euro-Atlantic integrations. Because of the very nature of the change of relations between London and Brussels, certain changes will affect the stress put on somewhat different priorities in the process of these integrations.

Key words: European Union, enlargement, Brexit, the Western Balkans, Great Britain.

Dr. Miloš Paunović is a researcher at the Centre for Applied European Studies, Belgrade. He defended his PhD dissertation "Balkan Horizons of the British Foreign Policy and the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes 1920–1929" at the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade (2016). Dr. Paunović co-authored two monographs on Anglo-Serbian social and sport ties during the First World War. His main research interests cover the history of the Balkans/Yugoslavia during the First World War and interwar period, especially the Anglo-Yugoslav aspect, but also recent political developments in the post-Yugoslav countries, as well as history of sport.

paunovic.milos@gmail.com

Mladen LIŠANIN, MA

Institute for Political Studies, Belgrade

The US Grand Strategy of restraint, transatlantic relations and future of the Western Balkans

Donald Trump's accession to the head of the US Administration has additionally aroused the debate on the need of redesigning the Grand Strategy of the United States and its potential distancing from the decades-long dominant approach of "precedence" or "deep involvement" in the direction of "restraint" or "step-down". In terms of theory, it means that, a decade and a half after the invasion of Iraq, a realistic approach to the study of international relations continue with their transformation from descriptive and explicit towards more and more standardised group of theories. In terms of practice and politics, potential adoption of the Grand Strategy of restraint would mean a fundamental change of the kind and scope of American involvement in different regions, including Europe. Transatlantic relations would suffer deep reconfiguration, although not necessarily a complete collapse. Such development could affect in two ways the position of Southeast Europe as a whole, and especially the Western Balkans as its politically most fragile part. On the one hand, adoption of the Grand Strategy that would significantly limit the activity in the regions which are not of top security priority (what the Western Balkans is certainly not) could imply that the United States abandon this zone to the security coverage of the European Union and its strongest members who would then, confronted with their own domestic problems, with more or less success, compete for influence with other regional and global players such as Russia, Turkey or China. On the other hand, this could imply that the United States are decreasing their influence and material presence in the Western Balkans, but primarily in the scope of multilateral institutions and involvement, and also their missions and operations, maintaining considerable degree of independent presence, involving in that way in the strategic competition with other regional and global players – some of them

could be the United States' yesterday's allies. Two years after Trump's victory at the elections, judging from the attitude of his administration as well as from the American personnel solutions in the sphere of diplomatic correspondence with the Western Balkan players, the aforementioned scenario seems like a certain option. Using the contemporary literature on the American Grand Strategy, particularly from the scope of realistic theories on international relations, as well as primary and secondary sources from the fields of contemporary political and security processes in the Western Balkans, the speaker is trying to predict the consequences that the potential US strategic reorientation could have on the region, with special retrospective to the position of the Serbs in the context of foreign players competition for the influence in this region. In conclusion, in the case of adequate and/or restrictive and not expansive approach of all players to the subject of determining their own security interests, reformulation of the US Grand Strategy need not necessarily represent a challenge and risk, but can be a potential encouragement for revision of previous foreign policy failures in the regional and wider context.

Key words: the Western Balkans, Europe, Serbia, the United States, the US Grand Strategy.

Mladen Lišanin, MA, is a Research Associate at the Institute for Political Studies, Belgrade. His research covers international relations (particularly IR theory), international security and Serbian foreign policy, with academic papers on these topics presented at domestic and international scientific conferences and published in journals and proceedings in Serbia and abroad. His professional training was conducted at the European department of Johns Hopkins University – School of Advanced International Studies in Bologna, Italy. He is also the Editorial Secretary of the academic journal *Serbian Political Thought*.

mladen.lisanin@ips.ac.rs

Dr. Siniša ATLAGIĆ

Faculty of Political Science, University of Belgrade

Great game in the “backyard” of the West: Russia’s foreign policy in the Balkans

In a broader sense, the Russian Federation seeks to consolidate the position of the country as one of the three most influential centers in the modern world – besides the United States and China. According to the *Foreign Policy Concept of the Russian Federation* approved in 2016, the strategic priority of the country is “strengthening the position of the Russian Federation as one of the influential centers of the modern world”, which will be primarily aimed at “strengthening positions in the system of economic relations, by preventing the discrimination of Russian goods, services, investments, using for these purposes, the possibilities of international and regional economic and financial organizations”. The basic proclaimed goal of the Russian Federation is to promote trade-economic interests and, in close connection with this, the protection of national security. The Russian Federation seeks to act in the field of economic cooperation and complements its influence in the diplomatic, public diplomatic and military-technical action in the Western Balkans, too. If economic cooperation is excluded from the public diplomacy framework (which theoretically falls under this activity), it is about the development of relations on the humanitarian plan, that is, in terms of cultural and religious affinity. The most favorable scenario for Russia would be to create a group of militarily neutral countries in the Balkans with Serbia in the first place. Assuming that the European Union is viewed only as part of the *Pax Americana* (a global trade empire supported by the strength of the NATO) with little ability to independently solve geopolitical problems, and bearing in mind the still uncertain future of the Western Balkans, in this way Russia would strengthen its position in Southeast Europe. This primarily relates to Serbia, which is seen in Russia as a unique former Yugoslav country with a state-building tradition and integration potential. With its cultural and historical

closeness to Russia, support to Russia in public opinion, the unresolved issue of Kosovo and its uncertain European future Serbia would be a relatively strong standpoint from which the Russian Federation would defend its interests in Europe and make a "frozen" conflict in the region of Southeast Europe whose future solution could, to a considerable extent, depend on the relations between the United States and China. The conclusion is that the Balkans is still a Russian zone of geostrategic, political and economic – in a word, national interest. The focus of its foreign policy will be directed towards Serbia because of the resources that other powers do not have in Serbia – support in public opinion and territorial position of Serbia in the "backyard" of the European Union and NATO. It will strengthen its position in Serbia primarily by diplomatic means (support of Serbia in defense of territorial integrity) and by means of public diplomacy. In the case of a more serious change in global relations and possible collapse of the European Union, Russia could intensify its activities in the Balkans by fostering the unification of the Serbian national space.

Key words: foreign policy, national interest, Russia, Serbia.

Dr. Siniša Atlagić is an Associate Professor at the Faculty of Political Science (FPN) in Belgrade, where he teaches at undergraduate and postgraduate studies. He has graduated from the Faculty of Political Science in Belgrade (Department of Journalism and Communication), where he has obtained a master's degree (political sociology) and a doctorate (political communication – political propaganda). He is the head of the Center for Russian Studies at FPN. The areas of his scientific interest are political communication (political propaganda, political marketing, international communication), social psychology (psychology of political communication and electoral motivation) and Russian studies (contemporary political processes in the Russian Federation).

sinisa.atlagic@fpm.bg.ac.rs

Dr. Vladimir AJZENHAMER
Faculty of Security Studies, University of Belgrade

Manipulation with “Otherness” in the Balkans: Turkish influence in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Serbia

The use/production of *Otherness* is a frequently exploited foreign policy instrument of those states who want to increase their internal cohesion as well as their international influence playing with the card of identity. Promotion of the feeling of unity within a community i.e. its “conglomeration” (such as this process is figuratively described by Iver Neumann) can be easily achieved by underlining the duality idea *Us* and *Them* which, according to the constructivist interpretation, plays a crucial role in the formation of collective identities. The aim of this presentation is to show that the same formula can be used for the opposite goal – when some communities have to be “separated”. Therefore, the concept of *Otherness*, its production and use will be of great help when analysing the Turkish foreign trade practice, in the first place the instrumentalisation of ethnic-religious tensions in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Serbia. The actual Turkish foreign policy devotes great attention to the area of the Western Balkans. For Ankara, the increased influence in this region is the springboard for stronger root-planting of its presence in Europe. Without abandoning Davutoglu’s concept of historical depth (whose core is the idea of State Continuity with the former Ottoman Empire), Turkey is attempting to increase its political, economic and cultural influence in those Balkan states that used to be part of the Ottoman Empire. Ankara’s activities in the Balkans are oriented to the states with dominant Muslim population as well as to the states where a considerable minority who belong to this confession live (Bosnia and Herzegovina, Albania, Macedonia and Serbia). In so doing, Bosniaks and Albanians, as the successors of the Ottoman heritage, are stressed as the chief support for revitalisation of the Turkish power on these territories. On the basis of the theoretical concept of *Otherness* (taken in the

interpretations of Alexander Wendt, Frederick Bart and Iver Neumann) and its role in the conflicts based on identity antagonisms, this presentation will analyse the policy of the Republic of Turkey toward Bosnia and Herzegovina and Serbia (in the first place Sandžak and Kosovo and Metohija). According to this analysis, the author shows how external i.e. foreign manipulation with *Otherness* in the area of the Western Balkans can destabilise frail multiethnic and multireligious communities that have not yet recovered from the 1990s conflicts. The presentation emphasises the connection between Turkish regional ambitions and permanent solicitation for the development of ethnoreligious *Otherness* in the Bosniaks and Albanians.

Key words: foreign policy, otherness, manipulation, Turkey, Bosniaks, Serbs, Albanians, Ahmet Davutoglu, Alexander Wendt, Frederick Bart, Iver Neumann.

Dr. Vladimir Ajzenhamer is an Assisant Professor at the Faculty of Security Studies, University of Belgrade. He teaches International Relations. The fields of his academic interest are international relations, geopolitics, theory of international relations, foreign policy, regional studies (Turkey and Middle East), and securitisation theory.

ajzenhamer@fb.bg.ac.rs

Dr. Ivona LAĐEVAC

Institute of International Politics and Economics, Belgrade

China as a new “actor” in the Western Balkans

The Balkan has attracted attention of global powers through all periods of its turbulent history. Owing to strengthening of its political and economic position since the beginning of the 21st century, the People’s Republic of China has joined the “traditionally concerned” powers. China began to exert its interest in the Balkans and/or the Western Balkans at the time when political situations in the countries of the region started to stabilise. In the background of the growing Chinese interest lies the powerful economic growth of this country and the need for accomplishment of long-term plans for economic and political development. China has achieved cooperation with the Western Balkan countries mainly through the “16+1 Platform”, that is the forum for cooperation between China and Central and Eastern European countries, which represents a component within the wider scale of the “Belt and Road” Initiative. The cooperation with Central and Eastern European countries is predominantly economy-oriented, while the domain of politics is focused on confidence-building and cultural exchange strengthening. Special emphasis in the field of economy is given to the railway infrastructure and technological projects which are widely considered as part of the Chinese coherent strategy for construction of infrastructure that will enable movement of Chinese goods from several ports – Piraeus, Thessaloniki and Bar – via the Western Balkans all the way to Northern Europe. An exception in the scope of development of political relations is the relation that the People’s Republic of China has with the Republic of Serbia and the fact that two countries have signed Strategic Partnership Agreement. This kind of cooperation between China and Central and Eastern European countries, as well as the Western Balkans itself, does not meet a benevolent standpoint of the European Union. There is a widely spread fear that in this way, by strengthening of its economic and later political influence, China intends to undermine the relations

within the EU and weaken it from the inside. Because of the increasing inflow of the Chinese foreign direct investments in Europe, the European Commission insists that all tender procedures are performed transparently and under strict compliance with the European Union regulations. On the other hand, China insists that the political stability and legal certainty is in its interest and, hence, it supports full integration of the Western Balkan region into the European Union and, accordingly, the European Single market. From this point of view, the growing role of China should not present a threat for integration processes. However, some European leaders expressed their fear that the presence of China would compromise the efforts of the European Union for the region democratisation.

Key words: China, the Western Balkans, the European Union, "16+1" Initiative, "Belt and Road" Initiative.

Dr. Ivona Lađevac joined Institute of International Politics and Economics in 2001. Since September 2017 she is a Head of the Regional Center "One Belt, One Road". She graduated and earned her MSc Degree at the Faculty of Political Sciences Belgrade University (Department for International Relations), while her PhD got at the Faculty of Security Studies, University of Belgrade, with thesis on "Strategic Partnership of Russian Federation and People's Republic of China within global security context". The main areas of her research interest are contemporary international relations, focused to relations between China and Russia, the Belt and the Road Initiative as well to cooperation "16+1".

ivona@diplomacy.bg.ac.rs

PANEL 3:

**WESTERN BALKANS
AGAINST THE MIRROR:
WANDERING THE PATHS
TOWARDS TRANSITION
AND EUROPEANISATION**

Dr. Dragan ĐUKANOVIĆ

Faculty of Political Science, University of Belgrade

Western Balkans at the end of 2018: Confusion and stabilisation

European integration of the Western Balkan states are still “on hold”. Next year, in 2019, elections will be held in the European Union and its new institutions will be formed under real and considerable threat that the right-wing political options, otherwise rather eurosceptic within the European Union member states, will be represented in the Brussels institutions. Three dominant events in the Western Balkans feature the year 2018. In the first place, there have been oscillations in the normalisation process between Belgrade and Priština, but also to the attempt to conclude the twenty-seven years long dispute between Macedonia and Greece by signing the Prespan Agreement (July 2018). The dialogue at the route Belgrade-Priština experienced several challenges, but it is quite clear that the United States have currently intensified their efforts to have this process successfully concluded. The internal dialogue on Kosovo conducted in Serbia in 2017 and 2018 showed that the political options who would freeze the existing conflict and do not offer a clear perspective for normalisation of the relations between Belgrade and Priština are predominant. In addition, the idea on the correction of the borderline or exchange of territories between Kosovo and parts of the Central Serbia created various tensions in the public of both sides, which reflected to the dialogue intensity. Commitment of the United States, in the first place, but also of the European Union to conclude the dispute between Greece and Macedonia that has lasted since 1991 proved the necessity of a diplomatic action for such an achievement. The agreement signed at mid-2018 was compromised several times, both in Macedonia and Greece. Despite the failure of the consultative referendum on enforcement of this agreement held in Macedonia on 30 September 2018, the required two-thirds majority in the Sabor was ensured so that the process of amendments to the

Constitution of Macedonia could commence. On the other hand, there are many challenges on whether and how this agreement will be ratified in the Greek Parliament. Both admission of Macedonia in NATO and opening of the negotiations with the EU depend on all above mentioned. The third event that marked the current year are the elections in Bosnia and Herzegovina which *via facti* confirmed previous negative trends and tendencies within the country. Although a number of electoral irregularities were observed on 7 October 2018, it is clear that the opposition parties in Bosnia and Herzegovina and its entities are not strong enough to offer a clear alternative for development of the country. That is why the perspective of the membership of Bosnia and Herzegovina in the NATO and the EU will still be in the shadow of obvious strengthening of the influence of certain actors, such as the Russian Federation and Turkey.

Key words: the Western Balkans, the European Union, Macedonia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia, Kosovo.

Dr. Dragan Đukanović is an Associate Professor at the Faculty of Political Science, University of Belgrade. From 2001 to 2017, he was researcher at the Institute of International Politics and Economics, Belgrade, and Editor-in-chief of *Međunarodna politika* (2008–2017). He is the president of the Center for Foreign Policy (NGO based in Belgrade), and Vice-President of the International Relations Forum of the European Movement in Serbia. His field of academic interest is focused on Foreign Policy, studies of South-Eastern Europe and European studies.

dragandjuk@yahoo.com

Dr. Simonida KAČARSKA
European Policy Institute, Skopje

Freeing a captured state: What role for EU accession? – The case of the Republic of Macedonia

In 2017 the Republic of Macedonia experienced the most difficult turnover of power in its history with a government formed six months after the December 2016 elections. The change of government came after a wiretapping scandal in early 2015 had revealed large-scale, high-level corruption, and a lack of control over the state intelligence and security agencies. In response, the European Commission raised concerns about state capture in its annual “progress report” – “The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia 2016 Report” (9 November 2016) – claiming that the Assembly had failed to provide an effective oversight to the executive power, the justice system was not independent, and the authorities showed no willingness to resolve these issues. A later (much-praised) assessment conducted – published in “2017 Report of the Senior Experts’ Group on systemic Rule of Law issues in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia”, described the circumstances in the country as “capture of the judiciary and prosecution by the executive power”. The new government committed to bring the country back to the European accession by resolving thorny bilateral disputes, freeing captured institutions and regaining the trust of citizens. Thus, it is expected that the EU drive will help the reestablishment of checks and balances between the various branches of government. The question remains, however, whether this is too heavy a lift for what is now a relatively weak enlargement process. At the same time, experience from the previous enlargement clearly highlights that accession is an executive led process, which largely sidelines and even overshadows all other branches of power. In light of these expectations and the specificities, this presentation examines how and whether the EU accession process is fit for re-instating checks and balances between various branches of power. The presentation will be based on qualitative methodology, including desk

analysis as well as data from interviews and focus groups with stakeholders, including policy makers, civil society representatives, members of parliament and judges in the course of 2018.

Key words: state capture, EU accession, rule of law, the European Union, Macedonia.

Dr. Simonida Kačarska is the director of the European Policy Institute in Skopje, Republic of Macedonia. She holds a PhD in Politics and International Studies from the University of Leeds in the UK. Her research examines the relationship between political conditionality and democratisation focusing on the European Union accession processes, including visa liberalisation. She has held research positions at the Central European University, University of Oxford, the College of Europe and the University of Edinburgh.

skacarska@gmail.com

Dr. Lejla RAMIĆ-MESIHOVIĆ
Foreign Policy Initiative BH, Sarajevo

**Where does the process of EU integration come into conflict
with inconsistencies of international crisis management:
The case of Bosnia and Herzegovina**

Twenty-two years after the war, Bosnia and Herzegovina is becoming more of an object than a subject of international relations, mostly due to inconsistencies in international crisis management. Since the first and the last serious attempt at constitutional reform that failed in April 2006, Bosnia and Herzegovina has been permanently faced with interior petty-political blockades which are justified as being allegedly anchored in General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina signed in Paris on 14 December 1995. As a country that has been aspiring to become a member of the European Union since 1997, Bosnia and Herzegovina has been suffering the consequences of growing inconsistencies in international crisis management for more than a decade, which seriously undermines both its integration processes and its prospects. Two mechanisms for crisis management operate in Bosnia and Herzegovina – the Office of the High Representative and the Office of the European Union Special Representative. Immediately upon signing of a document known as Dayton Peace Agreement, the Peace Implementation Council was established consisting of over 55 parties. The Peace Implementation Council which gives political directions to the High Representative comprises of countries and organisations which are changing their own interests and mutual relations with ever more increased dynamics. In the Council, the parties have the obligation to contribute to the peace process in implementation of the Dayton Peace Agreement, without a clear idea of how the context in which such implementation can be deemed finalised, should look like. The very process of the implementation of the Dayton Peace Agreement as well as the social and political relations generated by it, have made manifest that it does not practically originate in a functional democracy, but, quite the contrary, that it is a

generator of systemic anomalies increasingly producing the symptoms typical of a frozen conflict. One of the parties of the Peace Implementation Council is also the European Union, represented by the European Commission and the person that is at the same time employed by the Commission and that is under the mandate of the Council of Europe. The European Union Special Representative is obligated to guide and encourage the country on its path to membership, but also to support the implementation of the Dayton Peace Agreement. Considering that those two processes are increasingly becoming opposed essentially and implementation-wise, mandate structured in such a way seems to be an embodiment of contradiction in international crisis management. Essentially opposed nature of these two roles of the representative of the European Union, further dulls the edge of integration process, undermining its credibility and scope of its action, which leaves room both for further development of non-constructive processes in the country and for ever more arrogant and patronising attitudes of the neighbouring countries and other unwanted foreign influences.

Key words: Bosnia and Herzegovina, European Union, international crisis management, Dayton Peace Agreement, European integrations, foreign influences.

Dr. Lejla Ramić-Mesihović is the Director of Foreign Policy Initiative BH, Sarajevo, and she has been dealing with European integration issues for the last two decades. After several years in journalism, Dr. Ramić-Mesihović worked for 15 years in the EU institutions in Bosnia and Herzegovina as an adviser and civil servant, with professional focus on analysis and policy advocacy regarding the EU–Bosnian relations as well as reforming Bosnia and Herzegovina towards EU accession. Main fields of her academic interest include geopolitics of southern part of the Balkans as being the follow-up of her previous academic research – MA in Macedonian foreign policy and doctoral dissertation about the impact of Albanian ethnic identity on stability of southern part of the Balkans.

lejla@vpi.ba

Dr. Jovana MAROVIĆ
Politikon Network, Podgorica

Montenegro between autocracy and democracy: Weaknesses of the EU Conditionality Policy

Even though in different phases of European integration process, all countries of the Western Balkans have formally and technically achieved certain progress in meeting the criteria defined by the European Union (EU), all countries are still burdened with different problems – from the lack of media freedom, politicised institutions, corrupt officials, weak preconditions for holding of free and democratic elections to frequent abuses of public resources. In spite of the context that is supposed to be stimulating for democratisation, democracy is in effect stagnating and/or declining. European Union is not sufficiently dedicated to reforms, ignoring even the most blatant violations of law and human rights “supporting” in that way “autocratic” elites in power. When it comes to Montenegro, the country that is often described as the leader in the process of integration in the Western Balkans, with its deep polarisation of the society, all the mentioned problems are quite prominent. In comparison to other countries of the region, Montenegro is specific in the sense that it has never changed the power structures on democratic elections; therefore, undemocratic practices have taken stronger roots. The same people are at the same time agents of reforms and the main responsible for state capture. This uninterrupted reign is the main cause of the intertwining of the state and the party and the lack of accountability on all levels. The lack of democracy is manifested on at least three planes: the improved norms have no effect on progress in practice, since they are not implemented consistently; expression of free will on elections is questionable, because all elections so far have been accompanied by irregularities and abuses; and, even though the institutions have been reformed, they are still highly politicised and do not function in accordance with the standards of modern democracy. The only success that Montenegro can boast of is that, after more than six years of

negotiations for full membership, it has opened negotiating chapters and met technical preconditions for integration, which do not necessarily imply the building of institutions and strengthening of the rule of law. Therefore, the reforms have limited effect on democracy. Some of the problems identified in the EU approach imply the lack of transparency, the shift of the focus from the substantial to technical aspects of the process, the imprecise and too broad reporting and evaluation of reforms. The presentation starts from the following premises: further withdrawal of EU from the Western Balkans or maintenance of the process of integration at the present level, implies further decline of democracy. Political elites in the region cannot eradicate undemocratic practices with this tempo of the reforms. The lack of will for serious changes lies in the fact that undemocratic practices are the basis of power of the ruling parties. Bearing in mind the problems that the EU has in its own backyard, its democratic transformation, democratisation of its member states, as well as of those on the Balkans, are the processes that are inseparable and should go hand in hand. The integration framework requires significant improvements which imply changes in the evaluation of reforms that have been carried out, more precise link between the requirements and guidelines as well as the prioritisation of reforms so as to avoid purely technical approach.

Key words: democratisation, integration, clientelism, corruption, monitoring, reporting, reforms.

Dr. Jovana Marović is Executive Director of the Politikon Network, a Podgorica-based think tank, member of the Balkans in Europe Policy Advisory Group (BiEPAG), and a member of the Working group for Chapter 23, Judiciary and Fundamental Rights, within the EU accession negotiations of Montenegro. Jovana holds a PhD from the Faculty of Political Science, University of Belgrade. Her fields of academic and professional interest include rule of law, democracy, federalism, Western Balkans, EU political system and enlargement policy.

jovana@politikon.me

Dr. Jelena TODOROVIĆ LAZIĆ
Institute for Political Studies, Belgrade

Challenges of Enlargement Policy in the light of European Union transformation: Is the rise of Euroscepticism in Serbia inevitable?

During six decades of its existence, European Union (i.e. European Communities as it used to be called) has found itself at the crossroad, but never before has it been at the same time the target of so many different crises (financial crisis, euro crisis, migrant crisis, Brexit crisis, identity crisis) which are almost synergically shaking its grounds. While different scenarios of the future look of the Union are being considered, what is important for Serbia, one of the countries of the Western Balkans, is where the question of enlargement will be located in the transformed Union. The enlargement politics, as a relatively “young” European politics, has achieved a great success in the last decades. The dominant factor that has made this politics so successful is the mutual readiness (absorption/integration capacity) both of the Union to take in the candidate countries and the (administrative) capacity of the candidate countries to meet the set conditions and become members of the European family. We should not forget the influence of the political will that has always been integral element of the enlargement politics, therefore some countries of the Western Balkans are often pointing to “unequal treatment”, which has become particularly prominent after the entry of Bulgaria and Romania in the EU. Even though we get assurances from the Brussels that they will not give up on enlargement, it is obvious that this issue is not on the list of priorities of the EU at the moment. Not only is its decisiveness to encompass with enlargement the Western Balkans on shaky grounds due to numerous challenges that the EU is facing at the moment, but such decline in interest leads to decline in interest in the countries of the mentioned region that are currently in the accession process. This further leads to the rise in Euroscepticism for which the Western Balkans is a breeding ground. The reasons for Euroscepticism existed even

before the enlargement has been brushed aside from the Union agenda (those were mostly reasons related to pre-accession strategy for candidate countries/potential candidates and were present even in the case of countries of Eastern and Central Europe, even though there were also reasons specific for each of these countries), but they, it seems, have become stronger with the new developments in the Union. Incentive of membership affects the rise of negative attitudes towards the Union in the public opinion of these countries which becomes manifest if we look at numerous public opinion polls. The focus of this research will be the interpretation of the results of the research that the Institute for Political Studies has been conducting on an annual basis from 2015 to 2018 inclusive (by means of analysing the responses to the following questions – are you supporting Serbia's joining the EU, what is the opinion of citizens about the EU, do you believe that Serbia should meet all set conditions during the negotiations for EU membership?). The goal is to see how the opinion of Serbian citizens in relation to European integrations is changing taking into account the challenges that the Union is facing in the observed period.

Key words: enlargement politics, Euroscepticism, European Union, Western Balkans, Serbia.

Dr. Jelena Todorovic Lazic is a Research Associate at the Institute for Political Studies, Belgrade. Jelena earned PhD in Political Science by defending her thesis "The EU accession process influence on creation of environmental policy in Serbia". The areas of her academic interest are the relationship between Serbia and the European Union, enlargement policy, Euroscepticism, European environmental policy.

todorovic.j82@gmail.com

Programme Committee

Dr. Srđan T. Korać, Institute of International Politics and Economics, Belgrade, *Chair*

Prof. Dragan R. Simić, Faculty of Political Science, University of Belgrade

Prof. Slobodan Samardžić, Faculty of Political Science, University of Belgrade

Prof. Ivo Visković, Faculty of Political Science, University of Belgrade

Prof. Siniša Tatalović, Faculty of Political Science, University of Zagreb

Dr. Sandro Knezović, Institute for Development and International Relations, Zagreb

Dr. Duško Lopandić, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Government of the Republic of Serbia

Dr. Miša Đurković, Institute of European Studies, Belgrade

Dr. Milomir Stepić, Institute for Political Studies, Belgrade

Dr. Ana Jović Lazić, Institute of International Politics and Economics, Belgrade

Organisational Committee

Dr. Vladimir Trapara, Institute of International Politics and Economics, Belgrade, *Chair*

Nenad Stekić, MA, Institute of International Politics and Economics, Belgrade

Jelena Đurović, Office of Hanns Seidel Stiftung for Serbia and for Montenegro

CIP - Каталогизација у публикацији
- Народна библиотека Србије, Београд

341.217.02(4-672EU:497-15)(048)
327(497-15)(048)

НАУЧНА конференција Западни Балкан као "остатак"
уједињене Европе: свачија и ничија земља? (2018 ; Београд)

Zbornik apstrakata [Електронски извор] / Naučna konferencija
Zapadni Balkan kao "ostatak" ujedinjene Evrope: svачija i ničija
zemlja?, Beograd, 6. decembar 2018. godine ; [urednik Srđan T.
Korać]. - Beograd : Institut za međunarodnu politiku i privredu,
2018 (Beograd : Institut za međunarodnu politiku i privredu). - 1
elektronski optički disk (CD-ROM) : tekst ; 12 cm

Sistemski zahtevi: Nisu navedeni. - Tekst na srp. i engl. jeziku. -
Tiraž 100. - Str. 7-9: Уводна реч : Zapadni Balkan kao "ostatak"
Ujedinjene Evrope: svачija i ničija zemlja? / Srđan Korać. - Str. 12-
13: Uvodno izlaganje : Velika kriza Evropske unije promenila je
funkciju i sadržaj politike proširenja / Slobodan Samardžić.

ISBN 978-86-7067-258-1

a) Европска унија - Придруживање - Западни Балкан - Апстракти
b) Међународни односи - Западни Балкан - Апстракти
COBISS.SR-ID 270953740