

NEUTRALITY IN THE 21st CENTURY

LESSONS FOR SERBIA



NEUTRALITY IN THE 21st CENTURY –LESSONS FOR SERBIA

- ESSAY COMPENDIUM -

© ISAC Fond

Editor

Igor S. Novaković

Assistant Editors

Branka Milinčić

Jelena Kajganović

Publisher

ISAC Fond

International and Security Affairs Centre

Kapetan Mišina 5

11000 Beograd

www.isac-fond.org



This publication was made possible with the support of the Swedish Armed Forces

Executive Publisher

Nikola Petrović

Design

Nenad Baćanović

Print

Colorgrafx

ISBN

978-86-86383-16-7

2013

Views presented in this document reflect only the opinion of the participants at the conference and cannot be attributed to any of participating organizations.

CONTENT

Igor Novaković Introduction	7
Milan Pajević Keynote Speech	9
H.E. Christer Asp Introductory word	11
Tanja Miščević International Security Cooperation of the Republic of Serbia	13
H.E. Mette Kjuel Nielsen Western View of Serbia’s Neutrality	17
Traditional Concept of Neutrality	19
Ove Bring The Concept of Neutrality: Origins and Challenges From the Peace of Westphalia to the European Union	21
Thomas Fischer European Neutrals in the Cold War	29
Dragan Bogetic Yugoslavia and the Non-Aligned Movement	35
Neutrality in Europe at the beginning of the 21st Century	41
Thomas Fischer Switzerland: Invention of Permanent Neutrality	43
Jacob Westberg Sweden’s policy of neutrality	49
Charly Salonijs-Pasternak Finland - From a Buffer Zone to an EU member state	55
Friedhelm Frischenschlager Austria’s “Permanent Neutrality” after 1955 – a Model for Serbia?	59
Karen Devine The ethos and elements of Irish neutrality: 18th – 21st Centuries	67

Post Cold War Security Architecture and the Role of Neutral States	81
Jiri Kyrian	
NATO and European (permanently) neutral states	
Neutrality is not an issue for NATO	83
Srdjan Gligorijevic	
The Common EU Security and Defence Policy – a unique framework for	
cooperation in the field of security	87
Dr. Sandro Knezović	
Neutrality vs. Collective Security – Economic Dimension – A View from Croatia	91
Post Cold War World and “new neutral states”	95
Dragan Štavljanin	
Post Cold War “neutral” states - Moldova, Turkmenistan, Ukraine	97
Žarko Petrović	
Russia’s perception of Serbian neutrality	105
Biographies	109

ABBREVIATIONS

BDR - Federal Republic of Germany
BiH – Bosnia and Herzegovina
CASFOR – Caspian Force
CFSP – Common Foreign and Security Policy
CIS - The Commonwealth of Independent States
COCOM – Coordinating Committee for Multilateral Export Controls
CSCE - Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe
CSDP – Common Security and Defence Policy
DDR - German Democratic Republic
EC – European Community
EEC - European Economic Community
EFTA - European Free Trade Association
EU - European Union
FCMA - Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance
FDI - Foreign Direct Investments
FYROM - Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
GDP - Gross domestic product
IFOR – Implementation Force
ILA - International Law Association
IPAP - Individual Action Plan for the Partnership with NATO
IPP - Individual Partnership Programme
IRA – The Irish Republican Army
KFOR - Kosovo Force
MAP - Membership Action Plan
NATO – North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NORDEFECO - Nordic Defence Cooperation
OEEC - Organisation for European Economic Co-operation
OSCE - Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
PARP - The Presentation Document for the Planning and Revision Process
PfP – Partnership for Peace
PR – Public Relations
SFOR - Stabilization Force
SOFA - Status of Forces Agreement
UK – United Kingdom
UN – United Nations
USA – United States of America
USSR – Soviet Union
WEU - Western European Union

Igor Novaković

Introduction

The rapid development of communication technology, energy dependency and galloping globalization irreversibly influences the structure of international relations, priorities of national states, and stimulates the enlargement on a regional basis in the “new” supranational structures. The “weakness” of small nation states is most visible in two aspects: economics and security.

Due to rapid communication development, energy dependency and globalization, the global security challenges are changing and the so-called asymmetric security threats came into fore. The main characteristic of this new type of threats are their transnationality, i.e. reaching beyond national boundaries. Consequently, states themselves are less capable to respond to most of the security challenges. In the economic field, growing interdependence and consolidation of global economy force national states to become more open to the outside world in order to “stay in the game.” In addition, regional supranational economic integrations around the world have also limited options that states have in front of them. The key concept connected to statehood is sovereignty. However, it is obvious that the previously described processes reduce sovereignty of individual states. Under the circumstances, core decision-making power is transferred to the regional community, while coordinated global action is necessary in some aspects. In terms of sovereignty, it is interesting to see what it means for a country to be neutral at the beginning of the 21st century, and what is meant by neutrality. Neutrality is irretrievably connected to the sovereignty of individual state, i.e. to the right to decide on declaration of war and peace. If the sovereignty of states decreases, is it really possible to maintain the status of neutrality? Furthermore, what does it mean to be a neutral state today, and is this status as static as it is displayed, or is it a dynamic category that changes depending on the nature of the international system? Besides, what are the real security and political benefits of the neutral status for the country in the 21st century? These are the questions that we would like to answer in this publication.

The concept of neutrality was introduced into the political life of Serbia by the Resolution on the Protection of Sovereignty, Territorial Integrity and Constitutional Order of the Republic of Serbia, adopted by the National Assembly at the end of 2007. Article 6 prescribes for Serbia from that moment on is “in relation to existing military alliances (it is) a neutral country from the military aspect”. However, the discussion about the “military neutral” status, i.e. what it exactly implies and how it affects the foreign, security and defence policy of the Republic of Serbia remained sketchy. No other document issued by state institutions to date defined in more detail what the status means. The media treated this issue rather speculatively, comparing the current status of Serbia with the statuses of other neutral states in Europe, such as Sweden, Switzerland, Finland, Ireland and Austria. Still, the status of “military neutrality” seems to be almost unanimously accepted by the majority of the political elite and the broader public. On the other hand, the majority of critics of “military neutrality” are doing so by reducing their criticism to an unfounded and unconvincing manifest rather than to the essential, which are the issues of the meaning

of being neutral in the 21st century in Europe and the practical benefits for Serbia of the thus defined foreign policy status.

Without a defined and developed concept of neutrality and without upgrading cooperation in the system of collective security in Europe and harmonization with European Union member states and the region, this situation is not sustainable in the long run. Having this in mind, the Centre for International and Security Affairs – ISAC Fund, with support from the Armed Forces of the Kingdom of Sweden, organized a two-day conference *Neutrality in the 21st Century – Lessons for Serbia*, on December 1-2, 2011, in Belgrade. The intention was to provide a forum for experts, representatives of the civil sector, representatives of universities, the media and politicians from Serbia, the Western Balkans and the EU, who would speak on topics such as: dynamic changes of the concept of neutrality from the beginning of the 19th century until today; historical preconditions for the neutrality in former Yugoslav republics; development of concepts of neutrality and the current situation in the countries that are traditionally considered neutral in Europe; security priorities change in Europe and worldwide; methods of cooperation and communication of “neutral” European countries with the European Union and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO); the perspectives of neutral countries on the territory of former Soviet Union (USSR); approach of Russia and West towards “militarily neutral Serbia”.

These proceedings contain texts based on conference presentations of authors. We hope that we will, in this way, provide more information about different aspects of this very important political issue for the future foreign policy and security orientation of the Republic of Serbia and thereby contribute to the further public discussion.

Milan Pajević

Chairman of the International Advisory Board of ISAC Fund

Keynote Speech

Dear Colleagues and Friends,

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Opening today's conference *Neutrality in the 21st Century - Lessons for Serbia*, I wish to thank all of you who have recognized the importance of the topic that we will discuss today and tomorrow.

I would especially like to thank the Swedish Armed Forces and the Embassy of Sweden for the valuable assistance and support in organizing this event, as a continuation of our several years of cooperation.

Also, I want to express my gratitude and to wish a warm welcome to our guests from Sweden, Finland, Ireland, Austria and Switzerland, who have kindly responded to our invitation to use their vast expert knowledge to help us deal with the topic of neutrality.

Finally, I wish to thank the Foreign Ministry and the Embassy of the Czech Republic in Serbia for their support.

*

I would like to place the significance of the moment when we are speaking of neutrality in a context: when it comes to its foreign policy orientation, Serbia is still balancing, and its problematically articulated and undeveloped concept of neutrality is an indivisible part of that orientation.

Therefore, although the approach of our conference is academic, its goals are very practical. We would like to learn more about the concept of neutrality, in order to be able to implement this knowledge in Serbian circumstances, i.e. to re-evaluate our foreign policy which finally needs to become unequivocal, and in the same moment also more European and more in line with Serbian traditions. And the Serbian tradition is not neutrality.

Our parliament has proclaimed "military neutrality" towards all existing military alliances until the referendum about this issue (!?) A referendum implies a choice by citizens, but informed citizens - otherwise it becomes an excuse or an undemocratic exercise. Knowledge and information are of key significance for the choice of citizens, therefore today's conference is our modest contribution to the dissemination of knowledge about neutrality.

In this spirit, I would like also to say: neutrality does not mean isolation!

There are not so many countries that have proclaimed themselves neutral in the past, or today. This tells us that neutrality is a very specific status, that few states desire or can fulfil. Moreover, this status must be also recognized by others, and without formal or informal recognition there can be no mention of neutrality.

The idea of Serbia's isolation in international security affairs and cooperation is still not in place, nor has it become dramatic, and I think that this assumption will best be confirmed by the presentation of my dear and esteemed colleague Tanja Miscevic.

Finally, during these days of our Conference, I would like for us to get an answer to the question if there are really neutral states in Europe today? It seems to me, by all means, that there are none, exactly because of the value concept shared by European states. As for that "shred" of neutrality that may be left over – it is our desire to learn what exactly it relates to?

As I have already mentioned, neutrality does not mean isolation. It is not a constant – it is prone to changes imposed by political circumstances and technological development. Globalization and supranational associations have fully undermined what neutrality had been in the past. Borders are more porous than ever, and the real danger lies in asymmetrical threats such as terrorism, while classical military threats have considerably diminished. On the other hand, almost all European neutral states, with the exception of Switzerland, have become EU members, which brings with it also rights and obligations infringing the sphere of security and defence as well. Key determinants of foreign policies of these states are solidarity and cooperation with partner states.

Given that at this conference we have with us the representatives of all major neutral states in Europe¹, I hope that through a fruitful debate we will contribute to the discussion about neutrality in Serbia – the only Balkan state which has for the time being, at least nominally, opted for this.

1) Editor's Note: Under "major" European neutral states are usually considered the following five countries: Switzerland, Austria, Finland, Sweden and Ireland, while in the group of "small neutrals" are Liechtenstein and Vatican City. Former members of Non-alignment Movement, Malta and Cyprus, are also sometimes considered to be neutral.

H.E. Christer Asp

Ambassador of the Kingdom of Sweden in Serbia

Introductory word

It is certainly an honour and a pleasure to open this conference. The subject is very timely and very important for Serbia, and I am glad that so many prominent and competent speakers are participating.

Sweden is committed to support Serbia on its road to full membership to the EU. Our engagements span in many different areas, from administrative reforms to protection of the environment, protection of minorities and others. But our engagement is also reflected in support for the projects of the civil society, like this one. Swedish support to various development projects stems from our view of continued EU enlargement. Namely, enlargement has an important strategic component, and in this respect Serbia plays an important role in this part of Europe. Neutrality itself has many dimensions, which I am sure that will be reflected during the conference.

From the Swedish perspective, its path to the status of neutral state began after 1809 when Sweden was defeated in the war against Russia. As a consequence, we have lost Finland, and the price was high in many different aspects – human, financial as well as geographical. The German unification under Prussia that was led by Bismarck, and German wars against France and Denmark² were the first real tests for Sweden's neutrality policy. During the World War I, Sweden remained neutral, although there was a widespread support for Germany at the beginning of the war. Voices were even raised in the Parliament that Sweden should side with Germany against Russia, in order to try to regain Finland. During the World War II, Sweden continued the policy of neutrality, however we were more or less forced to accommodate to German request to transfer its soldiers on out railways. At the same time, there was a quite extensive cooperation with the Allied forces. The debate about the extent of Sweden's neutrality in that time is actually still going on. During the Cold War, Sweden continued with the neutral stance, although our relations with the United States of America (USA) and North Atlantic Treaty Organization were very close. Surely, if World War III had happened, Sweden would accept the help from the NATO countries. This was also in the interest of both parties under that assumption, given the important geographical location of Sweden.

2) Editor's note: The Second German-Danish war (The second Schleswig war) was fought in 1864. The war resulted in a Prussian victory and Denmark lost its German speaking territories, the Duchies of Schleswig and Holstein. Franco – German war (1870-1871) was a war between France and Prussia over supremacy in continental Europe. The conflict was ended by the Prussian siege of Paris and establishment of the Paris Commune. The result of the conflict was the proclamation of the unification of Germany in Versailles in 1871.

However, the Swedish policy of non-alliance in peace and neutrality in war was still valid up until the 1990s, after the fall of the Berlin Wall and the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact. The policy of neutrality gradually changed as a consequence of the political reality on the ground. In 1995 Sweden became a member of the EU. It also became an active partner in NATO's Partnership for Peace (PfP) programme. Today, the cooperation within the EU is the main pillar of our foreign and security policy. The relation between the security policy and the European policy is obvious – Swedish security is strengthened by the European integration. And indeed, war between the member states of the EU today is unthinkable. And that is not a small achievement if you consider we belong to a continent that has been ravaged by wars for centuries. Consequently, the declared policies are there to strengthen the common security of the member states and in the same time to make the EU strong security policy actor that can contribute robustly to peace and democratic developments around the world. From this derives that Sweden has, more or less, abandoned the traditional policy of neutrality in favour of the policy of non-participation in military alliances. Another consequence of the membership in the EU is that Sweden will not stay passive in the case of the attack on the EU member state. Each country defines its own security policy, and in the case of Sweden we have realized that our traditional policy of neutrality was no longer relevant due to the rapid changes in our part of the world. With this brief description of the rise and fall of the traditional Swedish neutrality policy or the adaptation of our security policy to changes of political reality in our neighbourhood, I wish you a very successful and interesting conference.

Thank you very much.

Tanja Mišević

Keynote Speech

International Security Cooperation of the Republic of Serbia

Today, I will not speak as a professor, but as the State Secretary responsible for defence policy in the Ministry of Defence of the Republic of Serbia, without the intention to give a final answer to the question of military neutrality, its content, range, and how it will look in the 21st century. I would like to say more about how a state that has proclaimed military neutrality in one of the parliamentary resolutions, observes, acts and functions in those conditions, aware of the fact that it does not exist in a vacuum, but also aware of the fact that it must find the answers to all of the new security challenges that lie ahead, and especially the asymmetrical ones.

I have to remind you that, legally speaking, the Ministry of Defence has been within the state system of the Republic of Serbia only since 2007.³ That is a relatively short period of time; however this offers a solid foundation for initiating reforms in a fitting manner. What reforms have been undertaken to date? Exactly those reforms that have already been or are being implemented in modern European states, with modern European armies, of which most are EU member states, all or almost all are either NATO members or members of the Partnership for Peace. Therefore, this was the guidance, which has also determined the strategic and organizational framework of all reform processes. We are now in the final phase of the reform process. For the level of success of implemented reforms, it suffices to review the latest European Commission Progress Report, especially in several significant segments, such as civil and democratic control of the armed forces, the manufacturing and sale of dual purpose weapons, etc. This means that the legislative framework exists and that its implementation has been very successful.

What has been done? Firstly, the fundamental missions of the Ministry of Defence and the Army of the Republic of Serbia have been defined. The first and essential mission is to defend the country against any external attack. The second, also immeasurably important, is partnership with other countries and international organizations to secure world peace and security. And finally, the third mission of the army is to assist civilians by all means, i.e. citizens, in humanitarian and various extraordinary situations. The defining of such mission's scope for both the Ministry of Defence and the Army of Serbia, also required the setting up of the strategic framework. I would like to remind you that for the first time, both in Serbia and in ex-Yugoslavia, the Strategy of National Security and the Strategy of National Defence are laws that are defining all of these issues in more detail. Both documents have been adopted after an open public debate, which, to tell you

3) Editor's note: Before 2007 a Ministry of Defence existed only at the federal level. Following Montenegro's declaration of independence and 2006 parliamentary elections, the Ministry of Defence has officially been transferred in the Serbia's state system.

the truth, was not completely perfect and implemented all the way through. However this was the first time that the public (and here I primarily mean the expert public) was included in the creation of such a framework for the adoption of the Law. As of 2010, the legislative framework, including the above mentioned strategy and laws, was adopted. In this moment we are in the phase of adopting additional bylaws, and we have commenced the process of careful harmonization with standards stemming from the good practices of European states.

One very important element of our activity is cooperation with NATO through the Partnership for Peace Program. Our accession to the PFP in 2006 defined the policy that we, as the Ministry of Defence, of course in close cooperation with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, had to implement, through the execution of all the obligations deriving from this programme. Since the previous year, after several years of low intensity cooperation with NATO, almost all instruments available at our level of relations within the Partnership for Peace programme were triggered. Firstly, we have reopened the work of the Group for Defence Reform, which is currently in the phase of transformation. This is a mixed group consisting of representatives of the Ministry of Defence, the Army of Serbia and NATO representatives. The Group for Defence Reform defined the pace of reforms implemented to date. Now this group is responsible for creating and defining projects that are necessary in particular sections of the reform process. Recently, the Assistant Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Zoran Vujić, presented the Individual Partnership Action Plan with NATO (IPAP), which represents a step forward in the operationalization of all those elements necessary for the realization of the goals defined by the scope of our Partnership for Peace programme. During the presentation of Serbia's Presentation Document for the Planning and Revision Process (PARP), we had disagreements with some member states on defining what the security challenges are for Serbia as a state and as a partner of NATO. This fact demonstrates that there is an exchange of opinions within the programme framework, which is very important. Currently, we are in a phase of negotiating the Status of Forces Agreement (SOFA) with Partnership for Peace forces, which is an additional important development. Some say that all these steps are in fact advancement towards NATO membership through a back door, despite the fact the membership is prohibited by the resolution of the Serbian Parliament. We define this as the fulfilment of obligations from the Partnership for Peace membership, and as a proof of partnership with European states. To date, we did not receive any objection pertaining to potential membership in NATO or any, to be quite frank, conditioning that would pertain to a further and deeper progress in this process that would lead to the full NATO membership.

This year, we organized a very important event – the Strategic Military Partner Conference on the topic of NATO transformation. We are very proud that the Conference was held in Serbia, because this is the highest level military event attended by chiefs of staff and deputy chiefs of staff, coming not only from NATO countries, but also from the countries participating in the NATO programmes such as PFP, Mediterranean Dialogue, and many other countries in partnership relations with NATO. We are proud that Belgrade was the venue where the future development of NATO and its transformation were discussed, after the adoption of the new Strategic Concept in Lisbon. The discussion about this issues was continued in Belgrade, and it is evident that it will continue to develop.

In addition, I would like to underline some of the priorities of the Ministry of Defence upon which I will insist in the following period. As of January 1, 2011 we have a professional army,

with the possibility of voluntary conscripts. Our professional army became operational, and the Ministry of Defence is aware that there are still many open questions, for which we do not have a concrete answer. However, through contacts with partner states with experience in the process of the army professionalization, we are attempting to find adequate solutions for these issues.

The second priority is the continuation of bilateral military cooperation. As a state, we can boast of having good bilateral relations in the field of defence with numerous states, with over fifty concluded agreements with almost all of the states in the region. We do not have an agreement only with Albania for now, but it is also in the final stages of conclusion. We don't need to emphasize the importance of cooperation in the area of defence, especially in a region such as ours, that only 10-15 years ago was the site of bloody conflicts. Today, the armies of these states cooperate very well and not only on paper. On the contrary, we are cooperating very concretely up to the level of joint military exercises. At the end of last year, representatives of the Serbian army have participated in an exercise in Albania for the first time. One has to admit that this is an important development. It is not unusual to cooperate at military exercises with our colleagues from Montenegro, Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH), Croatia, but also from Bulgaria, Romania, Hungary, and Macedonia. For soldiers and officers this cooperation is very important.

Much of our attention is devoted to education of our personnel at foreign military schools, not because we feel that our military schools are not good, quite the contrary. Our stance is that our officers should get introduced to the foreign education systems and have the possibility of schooling abroad. When they return to the country, they will be able to communicate these new experiences to their peers.

We place high value on multinational operations and on crisis management missions. In the United Nations (UN) at the end of November 2011, the Minister of Defence, Dragan Šutanovac, signed together with the Assistant General Secretary for Multinational Operations, the so-called Stand-By Arrangement, thus placing a certain number of soldiers, officers and capacities at the disposal of the UN. Next year, Serbia will have approximately 570 officers, non-commissioned officers and professional soldiers taking into account all the rotations in multinational operations. In comparison to today's 150 (in all rotations), this is a significant increase. One of the questions is what is Serbia's motivation to increase the scope of participation in these operations? Our belief is that partnership is not forged only through good economic relations and friendly political relations, but also by cooperating side by side with the armies of other countries. In other words, through cooperation in multinational cooperation we are acquiring another kind of publicity, which is strongly recognized by other armies and states.

Lately, we are emphasizing the importance of the participation in the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) of the European Union, after having concluded two important agreements and after having sent two officers from our River Flotilla for training. By the end of 2011, at the request of the European Union, we will send an additional team to Uganda. The EU has a Training Mission there, and our efforts will be regarded as a significant contribution. As for expenses, funds for the mission are covered by the EU. The importance of our contribution was best seen at a security conference held in Panama, at which I participated. At that venue, the State Secretary for Defence of the United Kingdom criticized the Common Foreign and Security Policy of the EU, questioning its existence

and purpose, by giving the example that in the whole of Europe it is impossible to find a single doctor who would go to Uganda to cover the needs of the EU Mission. This position in the EU Mission will in fact be covered by a Serbian contribution.

As we understand, participation in multinational operations, engagement and cooperation with countries in the region, and with all countries under conditions when security challenges have acquired a global dimension, is not in conflict with the provisions of the above mentioned Parliamentary Resolution. Our logic is that by joint engagement and cooperation with other countries we wish to demonstrate a partnership relation. Technically, practically, professionally, for all those participating in such cooperation, this means one more element of their training and learning. Politically, for the state of Serbia this means proof of partnership with other countries. Partnership is very important in all integration processes that Serbia desires to achieve. Activity needs to be real, tangible, proactive and not autistic.

H.E. Mette Kjuel Nielsen

Keynote speech

Western View of Serbia's Neutrality

Colleagues, Ladies and Gentlemen, dear friends from the ISAC Fund,

It is a joy to be here today and take part in this Conference. I must admit that when I heard the title, my first thought was: is this still seriously being discussed in the XXI century?

And then I had a flash from the past, thinking back to my early days as a diplomat - and to my university days following intensely the debates in Sweden about neutrality and exciting events in the early eighties. But I will not entertain you with that.

In the coming sessions you will listen to real experts going in-depth on the concept itself and on national experiences. I will therefore do what diplomats are good at: talk more loosely over the subject.

Recently here in Belgrade, I attended the 11th November Solemn Memorial for the World War I. That made me reflect, both on the horrors of war, and also on national experiences of my own country. Denmark was neutral in the "Great War"⁴. This was a decision taken after we were on the losing side in a previous war (1864).⁵ Being a neutral country meant for some more shady business people that they earned a lot of (dirty) money selling poor quality food to the warring sides. It also shaped our foreign policy in the following decades, the 1920s and 1930s.

Neutrality was a decision taken in fear of a great neighbour. It was a political choice in a specific situation. The *side-effects* were that it seriously curtailed our freedom of action in both foreign affairs, in defence and in national politics in the same period. And it laid us bare to intimidation and pressure. On top of that, it did not spare us the horrors of World War II.

As I see it, neutrality is a defensive act at the disposal of small / or weaker states in conflict situations. It developed, and was an option, in the security situations in the 19th and 20th century.

But one should seriously ask if it still makes sense in the 21st century, which is characterised by globalisation and the emergence of non-state threats and actors? The original "neutrality concept" was declared, notified and recognised. That was the whole point. But whom do you notify now a-days? Some scholars say that a declaration of neutrality only makes sense in conflict situations. What then for other situations?

In peace support operations, where there is a conflict, but most likely *not only* state actors, one may be neutral to the parties of a conflict but not to one's mandate. In this distinction lies the seed to success for the mission. Let me add that this is exactly what Kosovo Force

4) Editor's note: The World War I

5) Editor's note: the previously mentioned Second Danish-German war (The second Schleswig war)

(KFOR) is doing.

Reflecting further – and maybe not quite scientifically - with the help of dictionary and thesaurus, neutrality seems to mean:

Not to have an opinion; to be disengaged; to not care; to be on the side line; to be indifferent; to sit on the fence.

In other word: to be neutral sounds boring.

So let me get to the title of my address “Western view on Serbia’s neutrality”. I was originally told, I could suggest on another title, if I wanted. And I forgot to do so. For, actually, I do not think there is a Western view on Serbian neutrality. So I could be very brief: there is none – and the concept is outdated.

But let me dissect this a little bit: what exactly is implied by declaring of neutrality? And we see in the conference papers that there are variations in official translations and the original wordings.⁶ One can reasonably ask if it embraces any of the implications of the last century’s neutrality concept or maybe is primarily meant for internal political purposes.

If the latter is the case, maybe the question should be rephrased: “Should Serbia be a member of NATO?” My answer to this would be that is up to Serbia to decide if membership of NATO is of benefit for the Serbian people – and of course up to NATO to accept.

But why pose this question? My colleague Christer, the Swedish Ambassador, and I are both happy and content people. I am a member – he is not. Sweden has a policy of being neutral vis-à-vis military alliances but takes actively part in the EU Defence cooperation, which Denmark does not. Each country must make its own choice. I would argue that Serbia has a huge interest in cooperating under *the Partnership for Peace* programme. Serbia is doing this already, and it makes really good sense.

I saw a quote – I have forgotten from whom – saying that you become a better tennis player from training with players better than yourself.

This is a good picture to describe one of the many benefits of the PFP cooperation: i.e. further professionalization of the armed forces, and the ability to cooperate, *interoperate* and communicate with other military forces; enhancing the ability to be able to deploy together. This is what you also heard Tanja Mišćević talk about.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

I wish you a very good conference and I wish you plenty food for thoughts. I have tried in this introductory speech to go around the subject a little bit and to pose cheeky questions. I hope I have in a small way contributed to the discussion.

6) Editor’s note: This refers to the differences in the original text and the official translation (on the former website of Serbian the Ministry of Foreign Affairs) of the National Assembly *Resolution on the protection of sovereignty, territorial integrity and constitutional order of the Republic of Serbia*. This resolution, adopted in 2007, established a military neutrality of Serbia.

Traditional Concept of Neutrality



Ove Bring

The Concept of Neutrality: Origins and Challenges

From the Peace of Westphalia to the European Union

Neutrality could be defined as a nation's status of impartiality, and thus non-participation in hostilities, when other countries are at war. The position of neutrality is probably as old as war itself, but only in the sense that certain actors wanted to stay outside an armed conflict. The self-proclaimed neutrals had no rights in this context, no guarantees, no legal assurances. But during the Middle Ages and later, for example during the Thirty Years War in Europe, bilateral agreements were concluded that promised certain states respect for their position of neutrality during an ongoing armed conflict. The position of *permanent* neutrality, valid also in future wars, was more ambitious and was not, at this time, covered in international agreements. But to the extent that a concept of neutrality slowly was emerging, it was linked to the existence of an armed conflict. It was not a matter of neutrality or impartiality in a general political sense. Thus, the emerging *legal* position of neutrality did not exist in peace time, but only after the outbreak of war. That important point also corresponds to the position of modern international law.

Westphalia and beyond

The so-called father of international law, the Dutchman Hugo Grotius, had introduced a legal concept of neutrality in his famous book *De Jure Belli ac Pacis* (1625). But this concept was deduced from natural law, it was not based on state practice or international agreements. Grotius argued that "those who remain at peace should show themselves impartial to either side in permitting transit, in furnishing supplies to troops and in not assisting those under siege".⁷ But if it was possible to identify an aggressor, neutrals could take political action against that aggressor. This part of Grotius' thinking would not survive in later doctrine.

In 1648 the concept of neutrality was *challenged* by the Peace Treaty of Westphalia and its embryonic principle of collective security. According to the Westphalian texts, the peace of Europe should be defended by everyone, if necessary by military sanctions against a state breaking the peace. The implication was that a neutral position was prohibited for parties to the treaty system. Thus, there was an obligation to identify an aggressor and join forces to repel the aggression. This idea of collective security and common action would not prevail in actual practice during the following centuries, but after 1648 it was once and for all ideologically implanted in political theory.

7) Quotation from Örvik, Nils. *The Decline of Neutrality 1914-41*. Oslo: J. Tanum, 1953, p. 11

During the French Revolution a declaration on international law principles was discussed, including the proposition that an armed attack by one nation upon another would be an offence against all nations, and the principle that the interests of individual states should be subordinated to the “general interests of the human race”. The declaration was not adopted but the Westphalian principle of common security had resurfaced.

When Immanuel Kant published his famous essay *Zum ewigen Frieden* in 1795 he linked the issue of common security to international trade. He argued that “the spirit of trade cannot coexist with war, and sooner or later this spirit dominates every people. For among all those means that belong to a nation, financial power may be the most reliable in forcing nations to pursue the noble cause of peace”.

Conference diplomacy and legal codification

In the aftermath of the Napoleonic wars and the Vienna Congress of 1815 the then big powers recognized the permanent neutrality of Switzerland and declared that Swiss independence and territorial integrity was in the common interest of Europe.

The following decades were characterized by Great Power initiatives and conference diplomacy. Belgian independence was recognized in 1830 and Belgian neutrality in 1831. During the crisis of 1867 over Luxemburg, British diplomacy engineered the solution of an independent and *neutralized* principality of Luxemburg.⁸ Neutralization of certain territories in state practice is often combined with demilitarization of those same territories.

Neutrality as a regime of international customary law was recognized in the Alabama Claims Arbitration of 1872. Rights and duties of neutral states were presumed to exist, as were rights and duties of belligerent states.⁹ A multilateral codification of the norms in

8) Editor’s note: After the Austro-Prussian War in 1866, there was a confrontation between Prussia and France over the political status of Luxembourg, as the Prussian chancellor Bismarck failed to comply with earlier promise to the Emperor Napoleon III to allow the hegemony of France over Belgium and Luxembourg. The conflict between the two countries was avoided by convening of a conference in London in 1867 and the signing of the Treaty of London, where Luxembourg was finally declared a neutral state in personal union with the Kingdom of the Netherlands. Besides that, Prussian troops, on the territory of the duchy since 1815, were withdrawn, France gave up ambitions to annex the duchy and the fortifications around the city of Luxembourg were destroyed.

9) Editor’s note: The Alabama Claims was a diplomatic dispute between the United States and Great Britain. US argued that formally neutral Britain was assisting the Confederacy during the American Civil war by building warships. The Confederacy was using those warships (including the ship Alabama) for attacking ships of the Union. On the basis of the previously signed Washington Treaty in 1871, an arbitration commission was established in Geneva in order to evaluate the merit of U.S. financial claims on Britain. The commission found that the United Kingdom violated the rules of neutrality, and that it had to pay compensation to the U.S.

question was achieved at the Second Hague Peace Conference of 1907.¹⁰ Neutrality law in land warfare was addressed by Convention V and neutrality law in naval warfare by Convention XIII. The Hague rules became automatically applicable at the outbreak of war. They were applicable for the belligerents and for all states not involved in the conflict. At the time, all States not party to the conflict were obliged to follow the rules of neutrality.

Under the law of the Hague, a neutral state is under an obligation not to assist either belligerent by supplying arms or troops or the use of its territory. In return, the neutral state has the right to have its territory respected by the belligerents. The neutral state is not required to regulate its trade or economic ties with the belligerent states in a uniform manner, nor is it obliged to be impartial in ideological matters. The Hague rules have, in essence, retained their validity to this day.

Neutrality challenged: the League of Nations

After World War I the first world organization for collective security, the League of Nations, was established in 1920.

Under the Article 16 of the Covenant of the League each member was obliged automatically to take economic sanctions against an aggressor state. Military sanctions were also possible, but only upon recommendation of the League Council. To take part in sanctions in order to influence the outcome of an armed conflict would not be neutral behaviour under the Hague Conventions. Thus, there is a clear contradiction between the rules of neutrality and the rules of collective security. As a matter of law, the more advanced regime of collective security would triumph over the regime of neutrality. If collective security works, there would be no legitimate possibility for neutrality. On the other hand, if collective security fails, the option of neutrality would be reintroduced. And if the system of collective security is not watertight, there would be some room for neutrality. In sum: the more there is of collective security, the less there is of neutrality – and vice versa.¹¹

In 1920, questions were asked in the allied states, which had fought the war to a successful end, whether neutrals could really be accepted as members of the League of Nations, an organization for collective security which very purpose was to react on the basis of solidarity against aggression.

10) Editor's note: Hague Conferences of 1899 and 1907 were convened by the great powers in an attempt to adopt multilateral agreements which would ensure peace, initiate disarmament, enforce the laws of war and recognition and prosecution of war crimes. The conferences adopted 16 conventions relating to such matters as peaceful settlement of disputes, laws and customs of war and the rights and duties of neutral powers and persons in war on land and sea. These conventions are still an important part of the international humanitarian law.

11) This "communicating vessels" expression was coined by Judge Sir Hersch Lauterpacht, quoted by J. F. Lalive, "International organization and neutrality" in *British Yearbook of International Law*, Vol. 24 (1947), p. 72.

As it were, the Scandinavian countries were admitted, as was Switzerland. Sweden's adherence was unqualified, while Switzerland obtained formal exemption from the duty to participate in military sanctions.¹²

But the League system had great defects. One of them was that small neutral states in the immediate vicinity of a great power were expected to impose economic sanctions on that power, if it embarked upon a policy of aggression. The system of the League was put to the test when Mussolini's Italy attacked Ethiopia in 1935. The Council of the League could not agree on effective counter-measures and the mechanism of automatic economic sanctions collapsed. Switzerland declared that she would revert from qualified to full neutrality. Other states took similar steps. In 1936, seven of the small, traditionally neutral nations, Denmark, Finland, the Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden and Switzerland, signed a joint declaration signalling withdrawal from the obligation of sanctions under Article 16. That same year, twenty-one Latin-American countries agreed on a declaration of neutrality. And later, in 1938, the five Nordic countries issued similar rules of neutrality. The less there was of collective security, the more there was of neutrality.

Neutrality challenged again: the United Nations

The League of Nations collapsed and World War II followed. In 1945 a Charter for the new world organization, the United Nations, was drafted in San Francisco. Doubts were immediately raised regarding the compatibility of neutrality and the new system of collective security. The founding fathers of the United Nations had officially been united in war; neutrals like Sweden and Switzerland were not invited to San Francisco. The UN Conference even saw a proposal by France to preclude neutral states from joining the Organization. Although this proposal was not adopted, it may have reflected a general state of mind among those nations that had fought Nazi-Germany. An amended French proposal explicitly prohibited neutral behaviour during UN enforcement action. This proposal, although not adopted either, resulted in an understanding that permanent neutrality was incompatible with UN membership. According to Article 2(5) of the UN Charter, Member States are duty bound to give the Organization every assistance in any action it may take against belligerents to restore the peace.

Moreover, under Article 25 of the Charter, Members are obliged to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council. Consequently, in cases of armed conflict where the Council takes a stand against an aggressor, there is no room for impartiality and neutrality.

In comparison to the League, it could be summarized that the UN is based on the same objectives (international solidarity and collective security), but that the UN Charter has tried to avoid some of the characteristics that weakened the League and reduced its efficiency. Chapter VII of the Charter establishes a stronger and more authoritative system for the maintenance of peace and security. All decision-making is concentrated with the Security Council. The more centralized approach of the Charter plugged the main

12) According to the Swiss view Switzerland could participate in economic sanctions and still be neutral, so called "qualified neutrality". See Hans Blix, *Sovereignty, Aggression and Neutrality. Three lectures*, Uppsala 1970, p. 45.

loopholes of the League Covenant which had eroded the collective security system after 1935.

The issue of neutrality and UN membership was discussed anew at a meeting with the International Law Association (ILA) in Cambridge, UK, in August 1946. The British lawyer C. S. Dehn argued that Neutrality involving as it does, obligations to both belligerents, is not longer a permissible status.¹³

Most of the international lawyers at the ILA Conference seemed to have shared this view, although some also seemed to recognize that the Charter had not filled *all* gaps that the Covenant had left open and that some kind of neutrality was still imaginable. Paul Guggenheim of Switzerland went a step further when he tried to get recognition of the permanent neutrality of Switzerland and argued for the possibility of all kinds of neutrality in the future.¹⁴ As a consequence, Guggenheim found himself fairly isolated.

When the famous lawyer Hans Kelsen published his commentary on the UN Charter in 1951, he made it quite clear that Article 2(5), in his view, made “the status of neutrality incompatible with membership in the Organization”¹⁵

The practical implications of this conclusion did not deter neutral states from joining the UN, nor did it deter other states from embarking upon a policy of neutrality after their admission as UN members. Sweden joined in 1946, Austria, Finland and Ireland in 1955. Laos was admitted as a member in 1955 and issued a declaration of neutrality in 1962. Cambodia was admitted as a member in 1955 and enacted a law of neutrality in 1957. Malta became a UN member in 1964 and declared its neutrality in 1980. Costa Rica, a member since 1945, declared its permanent neutrality in 1983. Switzerland finally joined the UN, after a referendum, in 2002.

Thus, during the Cold War, neutral states joining the UN displayed an “eat the cake and have it” attitude towards the system. As early as 1946, everything indicated that the enforcement provisions of the Charter would develop into a dead letter, thus leaving scope for positions of neutrality after all. Security Council decision-making was soon to be hampered by the veto-right of permanent members. It was difficult to imagine that any great power would permit the Council to pass a resolution on sanctions against itself - or any of its allies.

But after the end of the Cold War, the Security Council developed into a more efficient body, collective security started to work, and the legal and political space for neutrality decreased.

13) *The International Law Association, Report of the Forty-First Conference*, Cambridge 1946, p. 43

14) *Ibid.*, p. 51

15) Kelsen, Hans. *The Law of the United Nations*. New York: 1951, p. 94

The changing law of neutrality

As a consequence of the repeated starts of collective security in 1920, 1945 and 1990, the automaticity of the neutrality regime of 1907 has ceased. The Hague Conventions will not apply if the Security Council has decided upon actions against an aggressor. Member States would be bound by a UN resolution to discriminate against one or several parties to the conflict. Even if there is no Security Council resolution, states could decide for themselves to embark upon economic sanctions against an aggressor. In both cases they would lawfully pursue a policy of non-neutral behaviour, thus deviating from the law of the Hague. It is true that some states could, in the absence of UN decisions, choose to follow a line of neutrality and apply the rules of 1907, but the Hague rules have clearly become non-obligatory when the UN is passive. Thus, in the modern world the concept of neutrality has become somewhat marginalized.¹⁶

At the same time, and especially after the end of the Cold War, regional organizations have supplemented the UN and added new dimensions of collective security. For members of both universal and regional systems the norm of solidarity is manifestly in the foreground. If solidarity and collective security is recognized as having priority over neutrality in the global context (cf. Article 103 of the UN Charter), this should be even more so in the regional context of even closer co-operation. After all, from a national security point of view, neutrality must be seen as "a second best option", and collective security as the most advanced form of international co-operation that should not be rejected when it becomes feasible.

The European Union adopted the Lisbon Treaty in 2007 and thereby took steps to strengthen its efficiency. Article 42(7) of the new version of the Treaty on European Union conveys a clear message of regional solidarity in case of an armed attack against a Member State. Collective self-defence in line with Article 51 of the UN Charter is the norm. Neutrality is basically excluded, although the special character of the security and defence policy of certain Member States shall be respected. So, that is where we are today in Europe. What awaits aspiring new members of the European Union is an expectation of mutual solidarity.

16) See my article "The Changing Law of Neutrality", in Ove Bring & Said Mahmoudi (Eds.), *Current International Law Issues, Nordic Perspectives, Essays in Honour of Jerzy Sztucki*, Stockholm 1994, pp. 25-50.

References

1. Blix, Hans. *Sovereignty, Aggression and Neutrality*. Three lectures, Upsala: 1970.
2. Bring, Ove. *The Changing Law of Neutrality* u Ove Bring i Said Mahmoudi (eds) Current International Law issues, Nordic Perspective, Essays in Honour of Jerzy Sztucki, Stockholm: 1994.
3. Kelsen, Hans. *The Law of the United Nations*. New York: 1951.
4. Lalive, J.F. *International organization and neutrality*. Yearbook of International Law, vol. 24 (1947)
5. Orvik, Nils. *Decline of Neutrality, 1914-41: with special reference to the United States and northern neutrals*. Oslo: J. Tanum, 1953.
6. The International Law Association, Report of the Forty-First Conference, Cambridge: 1946.

Thomas Fischer

European Neutrals in the Cold War

I have been asked to present at this opening panel some historical background information on the European neutrals in the Cold War. As we will talk more specifically about the experiences of individual neutral states tomorrow, I will mainly focus here tonight on the ideological and systemic conflict between the superpowers and on what this meant for the practice of neutrality during the period from 1945 to 1989.

Situation after the end of World War II

It is worth recalling that out of 20 states that had declared neutrality at the outset of World War II, only 8 survived the international turmoil more or less unharmed. The negative experience of the war led many of the former neutrals to abandon this policy and join either of the emerging military alliances instead after 1945. In Europe such was the case for Belgium, Luxembourg and the Netherlands, but it was also valid for Denmark, Norway or Portugal – these states no longer believed in neutrality as a guarantee for their security and independence, instead they were now looking for UN and NATO membership, as well as the prospect of European integration, as a means to strengthen their national sovereignty.

But 1945 has also been a crossroads for the remaining European neutral states, in particular for the long-standing neutrals Sweden and Switzerland. After the war their neutrality came under considerable international pressure, as the neutral states were accused of prolonging the fighting in Europe and profiteering economically from the war, while contributing little to the demise of the Nazi regime in Germany. Quite abruptly the neutrals no longer stood between two belligerents but in front of a closed block of victorious powers making claims and subjecting its governments to pressure.

The neutrals had been excluded from the UN founding conference in San Francisco in 1945, and when the Swiss a year later tried to negotiate membership under condition of acceptance of its special status of neutrality, UN Secretary General Trygve Lie answered with laconic words: "Neutrality is a word I cannot find in the Charter." The founding of the UN system was an enormous conceptual challenge to the foreign policies of the neutral states. The UN had declared war illegal and defined a system of collective security based on economic and military sanctions against perpetrators of peace that theoretically left no room for neutrality. Sweden in 1946 reacted to this by subordinating its neutrality to modern UN law, which meant that it chose not to apply its neutrality in cases where the Security Council managed to agree on sanctions. Austria too later joined the UN in 1955, but based on the assumption that the international community would respect its neutrality in case of a clash with sanctions obligations. The Swiss in 1945, on the other hand, as I said, tried to get recognition from the UN that they were a 'special case' exempt from implementing sanctions because of their neutrality. When they failed to get such recognition, they decided to stay outside the UN.

The fall of the Iron Curtain and the emergence of the military bloc constellation in Europe in the following years provided as much a challenge as an opportunity for the neutral states. The bipolar international system that emerged, while in theory much more conducive to a policy of neutrality, in reality posed serious new problems to the neutrals' traditional foreign policy. Their economies were to a large extent dependent on exports to Western Europe and the USA. In ideological terms, the European neutrals were clearly part of the free world. Whether this constellation would still leave room for neutrality at a time when the Soviet Union was perceived to be expanding towards Western Europe was far from clear.

The USA perspective on neutrality

The period 1945 to 1952 saw a lot of American pressure, in particular upon Sweden, to relinquish its interpretation of its neutrality policy and to consent to the USA hegemony. Already at the time there existed a dilemma for the neutral states of increasing the credibility of neutrality policy by strengthening their autonomous military defence and the factual dependence on Western military technology needed for this aim. Sweden tried to escape the growing pressure with a plan to expand its neutrality by establishing a neutral Scandinavian Defence Union in 1948–49, which would have included Denmark and Norway. But this plan of a neutral zone in the European North failed because of lack of the USA support. The Americans were simply telling all involved countries that such a separate Scandinavian Defence Union would not get to purchase any defence material in the USA. As we know, Norway and Denmark pondered their security options and chose NATO membership in consequence.

If the USA and its allies in the end came to accept the Swedish and Swiss refusal to join the Western military alliance, it was mainly for the following reasons: In the case of Switzerland Washington was well aware that pressure on Switzerland to enter into formal military arrangements would likely have the counterproductive effect of the country moving further away from the West. Second, Switzerland was not very relevant for transatlantic security from a military strategy point of view. The Alpine territory was an unlikely theatre of operations for any Soviet advance to the West. Moreover, the Swiss army at the time may not have been geared towards modern defence requirements, but it was likely to offer resistance to any attack from the East. Third, the Swiss government made important concessions to Washington at the interface of economic and security cooperation. In response to considerable USA pressure and the threat of Swiss companies ending on a black list, the Swiss government in 1951 adopted controls over the export of strategic goods to the Soviet bloc similar to those adopted by the Western Export Control regime, known as COCOM.¹⁷ Forfeiting their economic neutral rights, the Swiss thus secretly participated in NATO's economic warfare system. But this was no exception among the neutral states in the Cold War. On the contrary, Sweden as well as later Austria and Finland had to enter into similar secret agreements with the USA for compliance with the COCOM regime in the early 1950s.

17) Editor's note: COCOM (Coordinating Committee for Multilateral Export Controls) - the establishment of this committee introduced the control of arms exports to the countries of the Eastern bloc. The committee lasted until 1994 and all European neutral countries were "associate states" in the implementation of this regime.

The Swedish government even went a step further. In exchange for the much needed access to vital USA military technology for their defence, Sweden in 1949 began to secretly cooperate in military matters with its Scandinavian NATO neighbours, Norway and Denmark; a process that eventually led to Sweden's defence being hooked up to NATO's military infrastructure in the North.

In short, if neutrality in Europe was an accepted international posture again for the USA in the early 1950s, it was only under the condition that neutrality did not impede the overall USA ambitions in Europe in the Cold War. Only as long as neutrality did not contradict vital strategic interests of the Western alliance and as long as the neutrals clearly stayed in line with the ideology of the capitalist world, there was room for neutral states in Europe in the eyes of Washington.

Under these circumstances, the overall developments in the late 1940s and early 1950s allowed the European neutrals to economically and ideologically integrate into the Western camp without having to give up their political and military neutrality – at least not officially. But the idea of neutrality remained ambivalent for the USA throughout the remaining period of the Cold War, as the famous dictum of 1956 by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles of “neutrality as an immoral concept” in face of the ideological struggle, taking place around the globe, illustrates.

Soviet perspectives on neutrality

For the Soviet Union neutrality in the early European Cold War came in as a bargaining chip at best. Whether neutrality was rejected or promoted by the USSR and how it was defined entirely depended on its usefulness for Soviet policy. While for a socialist state, the status of permanent neutrality was no option in the context of the ideological struggle between the blocs in Europe, Soviet policy mainly came to accept peacetime neutrality for Switzerland and Sweden after World War II for the following reasons:

In the early Cold War, the Soviet doctrine of the “two camps” had still ruled out neutrality. Stalin voiced doubts that small states would be able to maintain neutrality. The idea of creating a neutral bloc in Scandinavia was harshly denounced by Soviet propaganda, and Sweden and Switzerland were repeatedly attacked for allegedly disobeying the rules of neutrality. However, between 1949 and 1954, in the context of the Soviet struggle against the emergence of NATO and the European Defence Community, neutrality started to be promoted by the Kremlin and the communist parties as a tool for preventing Western states from joining the blocs. This campaign reached its peak with Stalin's proposal of March 1952, which offered the reunification of Germany at the price of the country's neutralization. But it was plain to see that the Soviet use of neutrality remained primarily propagandistic at the time.

It was only once a new Kremlin leadership had taken power that the Soviet attitude towards permanent neutrality changed to any fundamental degree. This change was most likely a strategy to counter the expansion of NATO in 1955. With West Germany (BDR - Federal Republic of Germany) fully integrated into NATO's Western defence, the Soviets saw potential in using a neutralized Austria in preventing a closed Western military flank

from the Federal Republic of Germany down through Tyrol to Italy. Instead withdrawal of Soviet occupation forces from Eastern Austria under the condition of a parallel withdrawal of the Western occupation forces from the rest of the country in exchange for an Austrian declaration of military neutrality opened the strategic perspective for Moscow to drive a "neutral wedge" formed by Switzerland and Austria into NATO's territorial defence. A "neutrality modelled after the Swiss example" now became the solution for the re-establishment of an independent and democratic Austria.

Together with "peaceful coexistence", neutrality and nonalignment were now promoted among non-socialist countries by the Soviets, as this status was seen as more progressive than capitalism, but still less progressive than socialism, of course; but at least it was seen as a status that paved the way for this optimal condition. By means of an ever closer political, economic, and cultural cooperation with the Eastern bloc, neutrals were now expected to gravitate towards socialism.

The Soviet concept of "two camps" was now transformed into one of three, with the third one consisting of the neutral or nonaligned states. The Kremlin seemed optimistic to eventually merge the socialist and neutral camps into a "zone of peace," and thus to tilt the international balance in favour of the Soviet side. Thus, the USSR, unlike the theory of neutrality as held in the West, thought neutrality to be a means of changing the balance of power rather than preserving it during the Cold War.

At the same time the founding of the Warsaw Pact in May 1955 reduced the danger of an East European state deserting into the neutral camp. The Soviet refusal to accept Hungary's 1956 declaration of neutrality made very clear that neutrality was to be spread exclusively among Western countries to promote the dissolution of the Western military alliance, but was no option to be considered for members of their own bloc.

In the same year as Moscow signed the State Treaty for Austria in 1955, the Kremlin finally came to accept Finland's striving for neutrality with the withdrawal of its forces from the Porkkala military base near Helsinki, which it had kept after World War II. In a speech to the 20th party congress in 1956, Khrushchev, finally, endorsed the principle of neutrality in international relations, and the Soviet Union openly acknowledged Finnish neutrality.

The development of Cold War neutrality in Finland is a particularly good example to illustrate the Soviet long-term political ambition and idea of neutrality. Finland was bound in a "special relationship" to its Eastern neighbour in the "Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance" (FCMA) signed on 6 April 1948. Unlike the treaties signed by the Soviet Union with the six Eastern European satellites, the treaty did not force Finland into a military alliance with Moscow. Still, Finland's concept of neutrality throughout the Cold War remained very much defined by the country's policy and position towards the Soviet Union. Of all the European neutral states, Finland had by far the most economic and political exchanges with the Soviet Union, and was thus the country most vulnerable to Moscow's attempts to influence its policy. Its geostrategic location and historical situation always required a vigilant eye on the big neighbour to the East to ensure that its political room to manoeuvre was not compromised.

But the constant danger and direct interference in Finnish foreign and domestic politics from Moscow raised considerable doubts in the West as to whether Finnish neutrality

could live up to set standards of neutrality. These doubts were expressed in a widespread use of the term “Finlandization”, developed in the 1960s and 1970s in West Germany and other NATO states. Essentially, the expression signalled that Finland had been losing its independence through a process of self-censorship and incremental submission to the Soviet Union, and that the same could happen to Western Europe as a whole if the region’s countries did not adopt a more intransigent and critical posture towards the Soviets. In result, Helsinki not only had to walk on high tightrope in its relationship with Moscow, but it also had to constantly fight off the Western notion of “Finlandization”, which called Finnish neutrality into question during the Cold War.

The Soviets were successful in blocking Finnish and Austrian attempts for a closer economic association with the Western European integration projects by reference to the treaties they had with Moscow prohibiting a re-alignment with the former war enemy Germany, but both countries by the 1970s were clearly anchored in the Western democratic system and gained increasingly international acceptance of their status of neutrality. That also meant that hopes of the Soviet Union that the Cold War newcomers to neutrality would eventually adopt a “benevolent” neutrality towards the Soviet bloc and pave the way for Socialism into Western Europe did not materialize.

European Cold War neutrality reached its heyday in the 1970s with the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE). While the signing of the so-called Helsinki Final Act of 1975 is nowadays primarily remembered for containing stipulations on the principle of fundamental freedoms and individual human rights, it also bore a specific mention of the right to neutrality of individual states in Europe. Since the 1815 Vienna Congress no other international forum, where all the relevant great powers responsible for European security participated, had explicitly stated this particular right to the neutral states. But with the growing global interdependence, the progressing Western European integration process, and the dissolution of the Eastern bloc towards the end of the 1980s, the superpowers’ interest in the European neutrals for strategic reasons decreased considerably, and the neutrals after 1989 had to adapt to an entirely new political-strategic environment.

Conclusions

To sum up my presentation on the European neutrals in the Cold War I would like to make three general observations. First, it is important to retain from this brief historical overview that neutrality in the Cold War context had several key dimensions: a military-political one, an economic, as well as an ideological. And I haven’t spoken of the important domestic functions that pertained to neutrality throughout the Cold War in all the European neutral states.

Second, the history of European neutrality during the Cold War is a good reminder of the fact that a certain degree of tension and stability of the system in its geo-strategic environment is actually “beneficial” for the acceptance of the concept and idea of neutrality with the great powers. Under such circumstances the major rivals tend to consider neutrality a legitimate and sometimes even positive position for their own strategic interests. Neutral bridge-building between opposing camps for example be-

comes a much appreciated servicing function under these conditions. If the situation in the international environment is in flux and relations between the major opponents are too controversial, however, the strategic interests of the big powers can no longer be blended with the security interests of the neutrals; in result the risk for the neutral of having to succumb to one or the other side becomes critical, as each side tries to force the "undecided" into his camp.

This leads me to my third and final observation, namely that there is a certain neutrality-nostalgia existing today – at least among the population – in all of the former European neutral countries that takes the Cold War as a period, when the principles of neutrality were still widely respected by the governments at home and abroad. This idealized perspective on Cold War neutrality in the view of the historian never was and never has been true, rather under the ideological Cold War circumstances there has always been a clear price-tag attached to neutrality in Realpolitik. All the neutrals had to compromise to a greater or a lesser extent in the political, military and economic dimensions to find acceptance of their neutrality with the great powers and to safeguard the necessary room to manoeuvre between the blocks.

Dragan Bogetic

Yugoslavia and the Non-Aligned Movement

I will make an attempt to briefly present the key determinants and content guidelines of the Yugoslavian non-aligned policy, but also to indirectly indicate the contact points and differences between this policy and the concept of neutrality itself. After a period of uncritical glorification, followed also by euphoric satanization of the non-aligned concept, finally the time has come, based on relevant archive material, to provide real answers, at least to some elementary questions in this field. Some of them are: if this policy was in fact desired or forced; how difficult was it to prompt sometimes unwilling partners who were not belonging to neither of political-military blocks to cooperate, and finally, why Yugoslavia distanced itself from Europe and connected to far away and unknown civilizations.

From today's perspective, it seems that the country that lost the most with the end of the Cold War was in fact Yugoslavia – a country that was one of the biggest proponents of a world free from confrontation between blocks and Cold War tensions. Whether one can call it violence perpetrated by the flow of history or its inexorability, but the fall of the Berlin wall, in a sense, also destroyed the very foundations of socialist Yugoslavia. The entire diplomatic history of this country was marked by relentless foreign policy wonderings and maneuvering between the East and the West. Ideology did not let it join the West, and billions of dollars and Western economic concessions did not let it join the East. It found a way out of this intricate tangle in something, neither East nor West - in non-alignment.

A history of the shaping of such a doctrine and foreign policy orientation should be sought in the complex international position of Yugoslavia at the transition period between the 1950s and 1960s. It was a time when Yugoslavia, because of its non-aligned policy, almost simultaneously, was confronted both with the East and with the West. For the first time officials from Moscow and Washington agreed on something. Namely, both completely identified Tito's foreign policy strategy, both terminologically and conceptually, with a policy of neutrality, denoting it most often as "Yugoslav neutralism." Both treated this policy as "immoral," "opportunistic" and "short-sighted", and even as "a new type of social disease". Such negative labels were determined by reasoning that this was actually an attempt to "avoid responsibility", at a moment when the international community was at a critical crossroad - "to benefit from both sides", and thus realize petty and selfish national goals and interests, incompatible with current global priorities. Because of this orientation, Western powers labelled Yugoslavian foreign policy as "too red neutrality", while the Soviets, on the other hand, persistently called Yugoslavia the "Trojan horse of imperialism".

Yugoslavia's refusal to join the socialist block in mid-1958 led to the second Yugoslav-Soviet conflict, which in many of its aspects reminded of the previous one with Stalin in 1948. On the other hand, the evident compatibility between Yugoslav and Soviet positions in relation to virtually all more important international issues (irrespective of the

Yugoslav-Soviet conflict), resulted simultaneously in an abrupt deterioration of relations between Yugoslavia and the West and the halting of a large program of military and financial aid from that side.

Thus, at the end of the 1950s, Yugoslavia faced a real threat of being exposed to overall international isolation. Rejected by both the East and the West, by America and by Europe, for the umpteenth time in its post war history, it was once again searching for a new strategy of foreign policy and an exit from this complex and dangerous situation.

At this point, it was clear to Yugoslav officials that in Europe, divided into blocks “without any remainder”, it is not possible to lead an independent, neutral policy. Such a policy could be realistic only with the support of some powerful international factor, which quite apparently needed to be sought somewhere outside European space.

By the logic of a system of elimination, this ally could only be found among the newly liberated states of Africa and Asia. In fact, they individually could not play any more significant role in international relations, but gathered in a broad international association they could potentially, together with Yugoslavia, become an important international factor, able to successfully oppose the policy of two major blocks.

By the creation of the movement non-aligned countries Yugoslavia would finally break free of the unfavourable role of balancing on a tightrope between the East and the West, where only one wrong step could mean a total defeat and the loss of footing. By acting within a unified front of non-aligned countries, Yugoslavia could lean on much more solid ground and create conditions for its triumphal return to Europe, albeit via a detour through Asia and Africa.

However, the problem was that Tito initially did not manage to convince his potential future allies from Afro-Asia and Latin America of the usefulness of the idea to form a Non-Aligned Movement. In this respect, contrary to the predominant position in domestic and foreign literature, and even the opinion of the broader community, the Belgrade Conference (held in September 1961) was not the founding conference of the Non-Aligned Movement – this movement was not formed in Belgrade. On that occasion, the most influential statesmen of Africa and Asia, Nehru, Nasser and Sukarno, energetically opposed Tito's initiative. They feared that the newly formed movement could become a third block, which would bring its members into open confrontation both with the East and with the West and seriously complicate their relations with the great powers, from which, at that time, they were receiving large economic, financial and military aid.

The dilemma pertaining to the usefulness of creating a Non-Aligned Movement was resolved already during the next summit of non-aligned countries in Cairo, in October 1964. Namely, the rapid increase in the number of countries that opted for a non-aligned policy (simultaneously with the intensifying of the process of decolonization) and becoming a mighty voting machine in the UN, reignited the need for their organizing and continuous joint action, both in the World Organization itself, and in the broader sphere of international relations. However, during the Cairo Summit, another problem resurfaced which was the main reason why the Non-Aligned Movement was yet again not formed. Certain conference participants sharply disputed over the issue of which countries could be members of the new movement. The Cairo Summit had to resolve the dilemma: to

accept Tito's concept of universalism or Sukarno's concept of regionalism. In other words, to opt for bringing together all non-aligned countries, irrespective of their geographic position or to form a movement composed exclusively of countries belonging to the Afro-Asian region (a movement in which, of course, Yugoslavia as a European state could not find its place). The lack of consensus in Cairo – led to several years of postponement of the next non-aligned summit and of their organizing within an international movement. A period ensued which was labelled as the "continuity crisis" or, more precisely a "non-alignment crisis".

The Non-Aligned Movement acquired its final shape, only at the Conference of Heads of State and Government of Non-aligned Countries in Lusaka, in September 1970. Namely, with the event in Lusaka, the "continuity crisis" was overcome and there were suitable conditions the creation of the first permanent bodies, thus enabling organized and coordinated activity of nonaligned countries. Consequently, Tito's idea about the necessity to form a broad international association that would bring together all nonaligned countries was finally realized.

In fact, one can note that at this time the most influential Afro-Asian leaders, Nehru, Nasser, Solomon Bandaranaike and Sukarno left the global political scene (the first three had died, and Sukarno was removed from power after a coup). Now, obviously, the following question arises: to what extent was this moment crucial for Tito's later predominant influence in the Non-Aligned Movement, and also, how much did he influence (in a positive or a negative way) the very cohesion of the Movement.

In any case, after the Lusaka Conference came a period frequently labelled as the "golden age" of non-alignment. This title seems justified, since this was the time of the branching out of institutional mechanisms of cooperation between movement members and their ever more frequent and offensive joint action in international relations.

At that time, Yugoslavia attempted to channel the actions of non-aligned countries, among others, also in the direction of more intensive cooperation with the group of neutral countries in the Disarmament Committee and within the preparation and realization of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. These initiatives leading towards organized and joint action of the group of neutral and non-aligned countries were especially fruitful during the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe in Belgrade in 1977 and 1978, and in Madrid from 1980 to 1982. Namely, at that time, multilateral meetings and consultations of nine neutral and non-aligned countries: Switzerland, Austria, Sweden, Finland, Lichtenstein, San Marino, Malta, Cyprus and Yugoslavia, were held for the first time. At these conferences, neutral and non-aligned countries more and more imposed themselves as intermediaries between the East and the West, and initiators of compromise solutions. This role can be explained by a high level of compatibility of foreign policy goals and security priorities between the concept of neutrality and the policy of non-alignment during the Cold War era.

However, here we need to indicate also some important differences in foreign policy of these two groups of countries, originating from their varying level of impartiality and reserved attitude towards the sides in the conflict and towards opposing blocks. Namely, as opposed to the neutral policy of European countries – non-alignment here implies a very engaged approach and open support for that side in the conflict, which (naturally

as assessed by nonaligned countries), is opposing aggression and contributing to the preservation of world peace, and at the same time, also a sharp condemnation of the side in the conflict which by its policy is acting in the contrary direction and threatening international peace and security.

In addition to this difference of foreign policy between the two mentioned groups of countries, there is also a huge difference in the very perception of the existing system of international relations and in the concrete political strategy toward that system. In this context, neutral countries are exclusively advocating for the conservation of the status quo or for certain reforms that do not threaten the existing international order. Non-aligned countries, however, regard the existing system of international relations as unacceptable and untenable, and according to them, as the source of domination of major powers over small states and as the pillar of inequality, political pressures and numerous international crises. For this reason, one of the main priorities of the Non-Aligned Movement was the struggle for a radical transformation of the existing system of international relations. Within this framework, there was a special place for the struggle of the non-aligned for establishing a new international order, which would enable the bridging of the growing gap between the rich North and the poor South, and the elimination of the tendencies of the "rich becoming richer, and the poor poorer".

In addition, there was also a difference in concrete conditions for obtaining the status of neutrality or non-alignment. For the status of permanent neutrality to be achieved, other than a unilateral statement of the country in question, an international agreement expressed in the adequate international-legal form is also required. In this sense, permanent neutrality has a basis in international law. And of course a much needed particle is the acceptance of major powers. Non-alignment itself, as the individual foreign policy orientation of certain countries, is not regulated by legal norms, nor does it imply the acceptance of major powers, or any other political and legal conditions. Only when it comes to membership in the Non-Aligned Movement, there is a condition – to respect a relatively flexible codex of behavior (criteria for membership), which boils down to the existence of the principle of peaceful coexistence, nonparticipation in military alliances of major powers and refusal of any possibility of installing foreign military bases on own territory.

On the other hand, there are numerous differences in the determinant characteristics of protagonists of neutral and non-aligned policy: historical differences (while permanent neutrality appears at the beginning of the 19th century, non-alignment is a modern phenomenon with its first forms appearing in the mid 20th century); geographical differences (Europe – Third World); civilization and economic differences (rich North – poor South); differences in volume and interconnectedness (few neutral countries with a lack of any higher level of synchronized action – numerous nonaligned countries and their mutual connections within the Non-Aligned Movement).

In any case, as for Yugoslavia itself, it factually lost its membership in the Movement in 1992, based on a special decision of the Ministerial Conference of Non-aligned Countries

in Jakarta (“the empty chair rule”).¹⁸ To compound the absurd, at the moment when the decision to suspend its membership was made, Yugoslavia was functioning as the President of the Movement (given that it had been the host of the last Summit of Non-aligned Countries, in September 1990).

Whatever the case may be, after all that happened, the issue of the rationale for the Yugoslav policy of non-alignment frequently arises, i.e. the issue why Yugoslavia distanced itself from Europe, and bonded with distant and unfamiliar civilizations. This policy is frequently condemned by the domestic public as a characteristic “escape from Europe”. Still, if we wish to objectively assess the real result of the Yugoslav policy of non-alignment and answer this question, we must have in mind the fact that exactly because of such a foreign policy orientation, Yugoslavia played a far more significant role both in Europe and in the world, than was realistic, if we consider its territory and its real economic and military power.

In addition, when we speak of the “Yugoslavian escape from Europe”, we must also face some economic parameters and facts that cannot be disregarded. Namely, during this entire period, the annual share of Europe and the USA in the total Yugoslav economic and financial foreign cooperation was on the average 78%, while the share of developing countries was only some 20%. In this context a characteristic discrepancy arises that set the tone for the overall subsequent foreign policy orientation of Yugoslavia. Politically, Yugoslavia moved closer and closer to the newly liberated countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America; but economically and financially, and even from the civilizational aspect, Yugoslavia still remained part of Europe.

However, in order to be objective to the end in this context, we must keep in mind also one major negative aspect of the Yugoslav non-alignment policy. Namely, by opting for such a foreign policy orientation, Yugoslavia directly linked its fate to the fate of the system of a bipolar world. For this reason, with the fall of the Berlin wall and the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact, the context of international relations within which socialist Yugoslavia could survive and develop, also collapsed.

18) Editor’s note: At the beginning of the Yugoslav crisis, members of the Non-Aligned Movement stood for peaceful conflict resolution and territorial integrity of former Yugoslavia in UN. They paid more attention to the conflict in 1992, when the possibility for a peaceful resolution of the crisis and the role of Yugoslavia in the Movement was discussed. Several members of the Movement (member countries of the Organization of the Islamic Conference) advocated non-participation of Yugoslavia at the next conference, but African and Latin American states opposed to that. A consensus was not reached, so Yugoslavia took part in the Jakarta conference in September 1992. Immediately after the conference, on the Coordinating Bureau meeting, it was decided that the membership of Yugoslavia would be suspended. Even though it was not formally excluded, Yugoslavia did not participate in further work of Non-Aligned Movement. Serbia had applied to join the Movement in 2001 and now has an observer status

Neutrality in Europe at the beginning of the 21st Century



Thomas Fischer

Switzerland: Invention of Permanent Neutrality

Until today Switzerland is considered the prototype neutral state, and although new security challenges such as organized crime, international terrorism or pandemics cannot be met by means of a neutral foreign and security policy, 9 out of 10 Swiss citizens would not want to give up neutrality. This is what we regularly find in opinion polls since the end of the Cold War. Politicians from all directions regularly invoke the tradition of Switzerland's permanent neutrality in international conflicts, dating back to at least the 16th century. The national legend sometimes even places the origins of Swiss neutrality in the late 13th century, when three cantons of what is today central Switzerland signed treaties of alliance protecting them from "the aggression of the wicked."

During my presentation today I would like to present the following:

- to first take a brief look at how Switzerland historically arrived to adopt a position of permanent neutrality in international affairs in the 19th century;
- then I will go on to discuss some of the experiences with neutrality Switzerland made in the 20th century; in particular I will explain Switzerland's specific Cold War neutrality concept, which left a deep mark on the debates on neutrality in the country until today;
- I will conclude with an outline of the conceptual changes in Swiss neutrality policy since the end of the Cold War and delineate with what questions Switzerland's permanent neutrality is faced with today.

Historical Roots and International Recognition

Let me begin with the historical roots and international establishment of Switzerland's status as a permanently neutral country. It was after the turmoil of the Napoleonic Wars in Europe between 1803 and 1815, that the big powers came to the conclusion that a neutral Switzerland in fact served their long-term interests to manage and maintain a delicate balance of power system. The idea was simple: Recognition of Swiss neutrality would ensure the political independence and territorial integrity of the country on a permanent basis, in return for Swiss assurance that the country would not take up arms against any other state, except to defend itself, and would not assume any international treaty obligations, which may compromise its neutral status. This should help the continent to return to a military, diplomatic, and political equilibrium – in short, by agreeing to a neutralized Switzerland, the powers felt they were strengthening the fragile new system for the European continent for the future.

Formally the five Great Powers (Austria, France, Great Britain, Prussia, and Russia), following an official request by Switzerland to the Congress of Vienna in spring 1815, signed a Declaration on Swiss Neutrality in Paris on 20 November 1815 stating that

“The Powers signatories to the Vienna Declaration of 20th March hereby formally and authentically recognize the perpetual neutrality of Switzerland and guarantee the integrity and inviolability of her territory within her new boundaries”.

The external interest in a neutralized Swiss territory, met with a number of ideas in Swiss foreign policy that favoured the adoption of a permanently neutral status at the time. What we can see in this instance is a convergence of interests on behalf of the guaranteeing powers presented with substantial problems in terms of maintenance of the new European order, and the Swiss seeking international recognition of their sovereign and independent status under the condition of neutrality.

Historical factors leading to neutrality

While it is wrong to speak of Switzerland as a neutral state in the modern sense before the 18th century, it is true, that some elements later contained in neutrality were well known in Swiss political traditions already at earlier times. For example the idea of neutrality was not quite new to the members of the Swiss Confederation, as some of the cantons already in the late 15th century had entered into agreements to “sit still” in conflicts in order not to draw their alliance members into external events.

But until the 16th century the Swiss cantons had continued expansionist and belligerent policies. Divided along religious, linguistic, and cultural lines, this, however, threatened to entangle the Swiss in the religious, diplomatic, and military clashes among European powers of the 16th and 17th century. Taking sides in the European religious wars would have been disastrous for the unity and survival of the country – remind you that the Swiss confederation by then encompassed four languages and a sharp division between Catholic and Protestant cantons. In the course of the Thirty Years War the stronger cantons in 1647 agreed to put a halt to expansionist ambitions and impose a policy of neutrality on all members of the confederation to resist the centrifugal force of religion, and pledged to create a federal army to protect the existing frontiers. Hence, Switzerland in the 17th century began to practice occasional neutrality, even if it was not considering itself a “neutral state” yet. Swiss mercenaries still participated in armed conflicts, and up until the 19th century the Swiss territory would be occasionally crossed by foreign troops.

The history of Swiss neutrality is in fact closely interwoven with the history of the European states and Switzerland’s geographic location in the heart of the continent, on the conflict ridden demarcation lines between France, the Habsburg Empire and Germany. For a long time, under these circumstances, neutrality was at best a pragmatic option, but far from a substantiated policy or an internationally respected status of a legal kind.

Only with the international recognition at the Vienna Congress in 1815, Switzerland’s neutrality gained both a legal foundation and a permanent status. It is only as of now that we can speak of Switzerland as a truly neutral state. What made Switzerland the prototype for all European neutral states of later times, is the fact that it was ready to transcend occasional neutrality and to declare its abstention from war already in times of peace. From now on for the Swiss, neutrality had a political dimension preceding the outbreak of war, and a legal dimension taking effect with the occurrence of war. It was the

political dimension to which the government paid special attention, and which became characteristic of Swiss neutrality, as it included a number of voluntary measures intended to preserve the Swiss credibility in case of war.

20th Century Experiences and Cold War Conception of Neutrality

During most of the 19th century and in the First World War neutrality enabled Switzerland to stay out of the major conflicts without much difficulty. When the League of Nations was founded after the war, however, Switzerland was faced with a new dilemma: Namely, could a neutral state join the League without having to participate in its collective security system? Switzerland was able to negotiate membership in the League of Nations under special conditions, recognizing that as a neutral state it could not participate in any military sanctions, and would only be required to take part in economic and financial sanctions as decided by the League. This concept is known in Swiss history as *differential* (or qualified) neutrality. However, after the war between Italy and Ethiopia in 1935, the Swiss government concluded that in reality this was an impracticable form of neutrality and decided to re-establish absolute (or integral) neutrality. Just before the outbreak of World War II Switzerland returned to integral neutrality, including extensive freedom of private trade with all belligerents.

I will not go into detail about Swiss neutrality during World War II; only as much as this: Switzerland barely succeeded in maintaining its integrity and neutrality during the war, as it was suffering overflights by military aircrafts from both sides, and was subjected to considerable pressure from the surrounding axis powers. While the USA respected the Swiss decision in 1944/45 not to join the war despite the likely victory of the allied powers, it strongly criticised Switzerland for continuing trade with Nazi Germany. On the other hand, many Swiss citizens were convinced that a strict policy of neutrality, along with the general mobilization of its army in September 1939 that stayed in power until the end of the war, had been the main reason that the country was able to avert an invasion by Hitler. Today it is clear that the Swiss had to make a number of exceptions to their policy of neutrality to all sides to manage to stay clear of war.

Neutral Switzerland was heavily criticized by the winning powers at the end of World War II as having unduly profited from the war as a neutral state. No wonder that at the founding conference of the United Nations in San Francisco 1945, the wartime allies decided that neutrality was incompatible with the UN membership and that no state could invoke its neutrality in order to avoid the obligations resulting from the collective sanctions system. Yet, despite the threatening international isolation Switzerland after 1945 held on to its status of neutrality. The Swiss had developed a deep emotional affinity to armed neutrality in the war, and more than ever trusted their traditional course of political and military autonomy. As the Swiss government was not ready to qualify neutrality anew, as it had done in the League of Nations, and instead after World War II expanded the scope of Swiss neutrality to embrace all international "political" activity, the door to the newly established United Nations remained closed. Neutral Switzerland, instead, engaged in a compensation strategy with regard to international collaboration.

In a speech to Parliament in September 1947 Foreign Minister Max Petitpierre proclaimed the new formula of “neutrality and solidarity” as a future guideline for foreign policy. This new doctrine should allow Switzerland to retain its integral neutrality conception in military and political questions, while at the same time make possible a wide international collaboration in economic, cultural, humanitarian and technical aspects.

On a conceptual level, this development reached its peak with the Swiss neutrality doctrine of 1954. In reaction to the emerging superpower confrontation and the beginnings of West European integration, the foreign ministry’s influential legal advisor Rudolf Bindschedler had drafted a set of major guidelines on Swiss neutrality in the Cold War. The resulting document, which came to be known as the “Bindschedler-Doctrine”, influenced several generations of politicians, diplomats and domestic opinion leaders.

The four-page document stated clearly that Switzerland was

- To refrain from joining collective security organizations in order to avoid endangering its status of neutrality in the event of international conflict or war (that clearly ruled out participation in the UN and/or NATO);
- As it argued that neutrality was incompatible with backing politically motivated economic sanctions of a group of states against other states;
- To refrain from participation in predominantly political international conferences and organizations – at the same time involvement in “technical” cooperation was allowed under the Bindschedler doctrine. This dualism not only enabled the Swiss government to justify domestically joining most special organisations and agencies of the UN, but also allowed Switzerland to become a member of the European Free Trade Association (EFTA) later on, which was qualified as a “non-political” cooperation. The same was true with regard to Switzerland’s participation in the Organisation for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC).
- Most important, in addition the paper declared that “Economic neutrality exists only in so far as the permanently neutral country may not conclude any tariff or economic union with any other country because it would thereby to greater or smaller degree relinquish its independence in a political respect as well”; with this declaration also the participation in a customs union was defined as incompatible with Swiss neutrality, and membership in the European Coal and Steel Community as well as the successive institutions of the European Community (EC) was ruled out for the rest of the Cold War years.

What is remarkable in the Bindschedler Doctrine is that all these additions were characterised as part of the “neutral duties”, despite the fact that this went expressly beyond the rights and duties of a neutral state as outlined in the Hague Conventions. But Bindschedler argued that in contrast to ordinary neutrals, a permanent neutral like Switzerland had to obey some neutral duties even in times of peace (what he calls secondary neutral duties, or *Vorwirkungen*). However, it needs to be said, while the Swiss government only abandoned this highly questionable interpretation of neutrality law after 1989, it served as a guideline not only to the Swiss in the Cold War, but at the time, many other states indeed accepted the Swiss interpretation of neutrality.

In fact, what the Bindschedler Doctrine did was to enhance the scope of neutrality policy rather than the framework of neutrality law. However, the Swiss for a long time insisted that these policy guidelines were actually based on legal interpretations (this was obviously done to strengthen their position and to legitimize their decision to abstain from a number of international activities).

The dualistic foreign policy concept prohibiting participation in important “political” international bodies, but allowing compensation for this abstention by involvement in “technical” cooperation (including participation in “non-political” international organisations, humanitarian assistance and good offices out of a neutral “reserve position” outside the UN), enabled the Swiss in the early 1950s to come to terms with the Cold War setting as a politically independent liberal democracy, economically and ideologically well connected to the Western camp, while officially maintaining a strict reading of neutrality throughout the remaining time of the Cold War.

Post-Cold War Neutrality in Switzerland

Only the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 paved the way for a critical re-evaluation of neutrality in Switzerland. In its foreign policy report of 1993, the Swiss government self-critically admitted an over-fixation with neutrality during the Cold War and distanced itself from the Bindschedler doctrine. The report in fact limited neutrality to its legal core of non-participation in war and made the case for Swiss accession to the EU and the UN, as well as significant Swiss contributions to international peacekeeping and European security cooperation. However, with identities changing more slowly than foreign policy designs, the Swiss electorate backed the new approach to a limited extent only, with Bindschedler-type interpretations of neutrality still playing a major role in Swiss foreign policy debates until today. In a political system marked by direct democracy, such a profound reorientation of foreign policy as envisaged with the 1993 Foreign Policy report proved impossible to implement. Although the name of Bindschedler is largely forgotten today, the traditional Swiss neutrality conception is still remarkably popular. While Switzerland has implemented UN sanctions since the early 1990s and joined the UN in 2002, there is no majority in favour of EU membership. Nor is there broad support for sending Swiss troops abroad. In contrast to the other neutrals that by 1995 had joined the EU, the Swiss are still pursuing a strategy of bilateral agreements with Brussels.

Efforts to deemphasize neutrality in public discourse after 1989 proved to be counter-productive for the government and only boosted those in favour of sticking with Switzerland’s traditional foreign policy conception. This is why today even proponents of a more active foreign policy base their arguments on the notion of neutrality again in order to win public support. The omnipresence of neutrality in the political debates conceals, however, the deep domestic divisions concerning Switzerland’s role in the world today, as there is no common understanding of what the concept of neutrality means today. Of the five major functions neutrality historically has fulfilled in Switzerland, only its identity-building character has retained importance. All the other functions, such as guaranteeing security and independence, free-trade, building a basis for mediation services, or keeping the country from being disrupted internally over religious differences have lost their significance. The continuing popular attachment to the notion of neutrality

in Switzerland, indeed, hides the fact that the country has found it exceedingly difficult in the past two decades to reposition itself in a neighbourhood marked for the first time in centuries not by conflict but cooperation and integration.

Sweden’s policy of neutrality

I have been invited to speak about Sweden’s experience of neutrality and the present relevance of this policy. During the Cold War the Swedish policy of neutrality was officially described as a policy of great consistency, resting on a long and successful historical track-record. Most Swedes believed that this tradition of military non-alignment and neutrality begun already in the early 19th century and that Sweden was to be considered as a permanent neutral state. The fact that Sweden had managed to stay outside the wars in Europe in the 19th and 20th century was also accredited to this policy.

The continuity of the Swedish policy of neutrality is a myth based on a selective reading of history. Sweden’s neutrality has not been laid down in the constitution or otherwise proclaimed as a permanent state doctrine. But during the Cold War the government was so successful in promoting this picture of the peaceful and neutral Sweden that many, both inside and outside Sweden, still believe that Sweden is neutral. In this presentation, I would like to draw your attention to the deviations from this apparent continuity and present a more nuanced picture of Sweden’s security policy during the 19th and 20th century. To detect the discontinuances in the Swedish policy I have used two dichotomies that highlight these differences: (i) Non-alignment/neutrality vs. Alignment/collective security and (ii) Isolation/passivity vs. solidarity/active internationalism. The argument is summarized in table 1 below.

	Isolation/passivity	Solidarity/active internationalism
Non-alignment/ neutrality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The declaration on peace time neutrality 1834 • The official security policy orientation 1864-1920 • The security policy after the withdraw from the collective security system of the League of Nations 1936-1946 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The active foreign policy of non-alignment and peace-time neutrality during the 1960’s, 1970’s and early 1980’s.
Military alliances/ collective security	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The failed effort to create a Scandinavian (neutral) defence union in 1948-1949 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The policy of 1812 (military alliance with Russia and United Kingdom (UK) against France) • The first Danish-German war 1848 • The November treaty 1855-1905 • Commitments before the outbreak of the second Danish-German war 1863 • Sweden’s present policy of solidarity

The history of Sweden’s neutrality ironically begins with a military alliance with both Russia and the United Kingdom. In 1812 the Swedish crown prince Charles John made a secret agreement with the Russian Tsar Alexander which promised Swedish military contributions the war against Napoleon. Charles John also agreed to make no future claims regarding Finland, the former eastern part of the Swedish kingdom that was

concluded by Russia a few years earlier. In return Sweden was promised long term friendly relations with Russia and support in a war effort against Denmark. Sweden entered the war in 1813 after receiving support from the UK and contributed to the allied war efforts in Germany. After the defeat of the French army Charles John attacked Denmark. The peace agreement between Sweden and Denmark in 1814 replaced the former union between Denmark and Norway with a union between Sweden and Norway.

The agreement with Russia 1812 and the Swedish-Norwegian union created the foundation for the new policy of neutrality. The age old hostility against Russia was (temporarily) put to an end and geographically the united kingdom of Sweden and Norway was detached from the Eurasian continent by the sea in east, south and west with just a short land border to Russia in the north east – a sort of semi-island position. In 1834 the growing hostility between Britain and Russia gave Charles John an opportunity to present his 'new system of neutrality' to both the Swedish parliament and the great powers. In this first Swedish declaration peace time of neutrality the king expressed a desire to keep Sweden and Norway out of any future hostilities between Britain and Russia. The basis for this policy was, according to the king's speech in parliament, a firm political will and a consistent policy of impartiality, a fortunate geographical position that would make our neutrality acceptable to the great powers and our ability to defend ourselves.

This policy lasted during the reign of Charles John, but it was replaced by an opposite policy of military alignment by his two successors, his son Oscar I and his son and successor Charles XV. In 1848 German speaking citizens in the southern parts of Denmark¹⁹ had demanded the right to join the German confederation as autonomous states. Efforts to find a political solution to the conflict failed and Denmark was attacked by an alliance of German states. After having received a request for military assistance from the Danish king, Oscar I responded by sending 4000 Swedish and Norwegian soldiers to Denmark and another 11 000 soldiers were prepared to join the war effort. Diplomatic pressure from Russia and Austria forced the German states to withdraw from Danish territory and the authority of the Danish king was restored.

In 1855 Oscar I took a second step away from the previous policy of neutrality. The Crimean War between Russia and the allied western powers of Britain and France had spread to the Baltic Sea and the Swedish king used this as an opportunity to negotiate with the western powers. These negotiations ended with the so called "November Treaty" which was a defensive alliance between Sweden-Norway and Britain and France. The treaty demanded that the Swedish authorities should resist any territorial claims from Russia and if Russia responded by using military force Sweden-Norway would receive military assistance from the allied powers. This agreement was formally still in force until the Swedish and Norwegian union was dissolved in 1905. Russia was informed of this treaty and the credibility of Swedish neutrality suffered. Oscar I himself noted that the doors to his father's policy of reconciliation with Russia was closed.

In 1863 new hostilities broke out between Denmark and the German confederation. The new Swedish king, Charles XV, promised the Danish Government military support, but this time the Swedish and Norwegian government refused to support the king's policy.

19) Editor's note: The former Danish province of Schleswig and Holstein

This time the Danes also lacked support from Russia and other great powers. Denmark was left alone and suffered a severe military defeat and the Danish king was forced to accept the loss of the German speaking parts of Denmark.

For Sweden the second Danish-German war resulted in a return to the neutrality system of Charles John. The Swedish Minister of Foreign Affairs noted in his own comments to this debacle that the foreign policy of Sweden should from now on be characterized by an 'absolute passivity', i.e. Sweden and Norway should hide in their own corner of North-West Europe and keep a low profile to avoid the attention of great powers. This policy continued until the end of the First World War. Two minor exceptions to this were some secret contacts with Germany concerning military cooperation if Sweden was attacked by Russia and an active Scandinavian cooperation concerning the development of international law.

The establishment of the League of Nations provided the Swedish government with a new alternative to neutrality: collective security and international peace building. The Swedish decision to join the League of Nations was preceded by a harsh political debate. The right wing party and the communists argued against membership, claiming that it would force Sweden to give up her 100 year long tradition of neutrality. These critics also claimed the league was dominated by the great power interests of Britain and France. The liberals and the social democrats, which supported an application for membership, argued that a membership would make it possible for Sweden to contribute to a positive international development by the strengthening of international law and institutions for peaceful conflict resolution which together with agreements on disarmament, would form the basis for a new more peaceful international order. Sweden joined the league as an 'ex-neutral state' and actively supported its work in these areas. The Swedish policy of neutrality was replaced by a new active policy of internationalism.

The charter of the League of Nations demanded that its members should not use military force until different instruments for peaceful conflict resolution had been used and the members should respond to the unlawful use of military force by economic and ultimately military sanctions against the aggressor. Sweden and other neutral states had expressed concerns about sanctions because they feared that military sanctions against great powers in their own region may draw them in to military conflicts without proper guarantees of support for their own security. Nevertheless, the Swedish government seemed to have believed that the great powers would live up to the principles of collective security. When Hitler and Mussolini challenged this system in the 1930's no effective sanctions were put in place. Britain and France did not support strong sanctions in spite of the obvious violations of the charter and in 1936 the Swedish government and other neutral governments decelerated that they would also consider the question of sanctions on a case by case basis. Sweden returned to its old policy of neutrality and hiding. During the Second World War Sweden was forced to compromise its neutrality, but managed to stay outside the war unlike most other European neutral states.

In 1948 the Swedish foreign minister Östen Undén initiated negotiations concerning a Scandinavian military defence union between Denmark, Norway and Sweden. Undén was worried that Denmark and Norway would join a western military alliance directed against the Soviet Union. Undén's idea was that the Scandinavian states should form a

military union that could present itself as a defensive alliance of neutral states with no formal ties to either the Soviet Union or the western powers. Denmark and Norway had both been occupied during the war and demanded that this Scandinavian cooperation should have external support from the western powers. These differences could not be bridged. Negotiations ended and Denmark and Norway instead became two of the founding members of NATO. Sweden officially responded to this by returning to her traditional policy of non-military alignment. Unofficially the failure of the military defence union was followed by a secret military cooperation with the western powers that lasted until the end of the Cold War.

In the 1960s, 1970s and early 1980's the Swedish security policy shifted again towards a more active internationalist policy focusing on issues related with arms control, economic development and a general support for the UN. In the context of the global bipolar struggle between East and West Sweden could act as a mediator and international bridge builder between east and west and north and south. Together with other non-allied and neutral countries Sweden actively supported the different international peace initiatives in this 'golden years of neutrality'. The primary goal of Sweden's peace time policy of neutrality was still the protection of Sweden's own security and territorial integrity. In this context the policy of neutrality was seen as a way of promoting regional stability (Northern Europe as a zone of détente during the Cold War).

The policy of neutrality did not, however, only provide Sweden with opportunities. The ambition to uphold a peacetime policy of non-alignment aiming at neutrality in case of war, created pressures on the government to demonstrate a political will to remain neutral and an ability to defend the national borders against aggression. The Swedish decision to not apply for membership in the European Economic Community (EEC) in the 1960's and in the 1970's was primarily motivated by concerns about the credibility of the policy of neutrality. During the 1950's and 1960's Sweden also made a serious effort to create a credible national defence that was based on the doctrine of marginal deterrence. The basic assumption of this doctrine was that Swedish armed forces would only have to face the limited military resources that an opponent could set aside, considering the forces needed to bloc its main opponent (another great power) and that the size of the Swedish armed forces should be strong enough to prove to the outside world that an attack against Sweden was not worth the risk and the military costs.

The fall of the Berlin wall and the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact created a new freedom of action for Sweden. Sweden used this freedom to apply for membership in the EU in 1991. When Sweden joined the EU in 1995 we became a part of a political alliance with growing ambitions to act as an external security provider in terms of international crisis management. Sweden has actively supported this development and to an increasing extent integrated its foreign policy with the EU. The fall of the Berlin wall also meant the end of bipolarity between East and West and membership in EU made it impossible for Sweden to portray itself as an independent third force in a wider foreign policy context. An increased concern regarding individual and societal security and new trans-national and non-state security threats, relating to international organized crime and terrorism,

failed states,²⁰ and non antagonistic treaties relating to economy and the environment has made neutrality even less relevant.

During the last decade Swedish government have officially declared that Sweden wants to be a committed and constructive force in European cooperation and one of the core states of the Union. In 2009 the government presented a defence bill that openly declared that Sweden will not remain passive if another EU member state or Nordic country suffers a disaster or an attack. The bill also expressed hopes that these countries would act in the same way if Sweden was attacked. As a consequence of this the Swedish armed forces has been given the task to develop a capacity to give and receive military support. This is not very neutral. Sweden's former independent peace time policy of neutrality has been transformed into a new policy of solidarity where Sweden's security is built in cooperation with other states and organizations.

Lessons for Serbia

What – if anything – can Serbia learn from the Swedish experiences? Serbian security situation is very different from Sweden's but I think that it is possible to present two general conclusions that are of relevance for both countries:

First, small and medium sized powers like Sweden and Serbia have in common that they cannot control their own security environment. This means that they must be prepared to adapt their security doctrines to a changing environment. We do not know much for certain about the security environment 20 years from now, but we have good reason to believe that it will be a different environment. A good strategy is therefore a strategy that creates the greatest possible room of manoeuvre, a freedom of action to choose between different alternative policies. The Swedish foreign and security policy in the 19th and 20th century was characterized not by consistency, which is commonly assumed, but by pragmatism and flexibility. Sweden has always tried to adjust her policy to changing external circumstances. To opt for neutrality in the 21st century would create less room for manoeuvre. The world is no longer bipolar and neutrality therefore creates no new action possibilities for neutral states and there is little international demand for neutral bridge-builders or mediators. Instead neutrality would limit Serbia's possibilities to create security together with others and Serbia would also have to sacrifice huge economic resources on building an independent credible national defence. That would decrease action possibilities in other policy areas.

20) Editor's note: Failed states are states perceived as having failed at some of the basic conditions and responsibilities of a sovereign government, such as: inability to make binding collective decisions, loss of control of its territory or of the monopoly on the legitimate use of physical force, inability to provide social and public services, widespread corruption and crime, economic decline and uncertainty, etc. However, the term is sometimes used for a wide range of quite different countries. The phenomenon of failed states is very important in security sector because the territory of some failed states is used as a center of international terrorist activities and international organized crime. The United States think-tank Fund for Peace and the magazine Foreign Policy publish annually a Failed States Index. The list consists of all UN member states and the position of a country on the list is determined by failure ranking based on different political, social and economic indicators.

Secondly, Europe and the world have changed and we would want to keep the door to the 20th century closed. This door will remain closed if states continue to choose cooperative security strategies instead of competing military strategies. This, however, demands that other doors instead should remain open. In the Statement of Governmental Policy in February 2012 the Swedish foreign minister Carl Bildt notes that 'the door to cooperation must remain open to all European Democracies that want to and can fulfil the obligations that come with membership. Then he continued by saying that he welcomed the fact that Croatia will become the 28th member of the Union. Concerning the other parts of the region the foreign minister said:

"Serbia deserves the status of a candidate country, and it should be possible to begin accession negotiations with Montenegro in the relatively near future. We hope that Bosnia's new government can take the measures required for applying for membership in the European Union, and following the judgment of the International Court of Justice it should be possible to begin negotiations with Macedonia. Albania and Kosovo need our support in their work to embark on the same path."

Considering the history of the First World War and the wars of the 1990's I can see no better way of closing the door to the 20th century than following the road described by Bildt. If we want a development along these lines neutrality is of little use and could even create obstacles.

Summing up, I would say that it is difficult to see why neutrality should be a relevant policy option for Serbia in the 21st century, for Sweden it certainly is not.

Charly Salonius-Pasternak

Finland - From a Buffer Zone to an EU member state

My presentation will be divided into three sections. In the beginning I will say a few words about the context for the development of the Finnish concept of neutrality. Secondly, I will share some thoughts about the Finnish experiences during the Cold War as they are relevant to today's situation and the goal of this conference. And finally, I will speak about the Finnish experience in the last 20 years.

Depending on one's reading of the Finnish history, Finland has been either buffer zone or a member state for centuries. For approximately 700 years it was either Swedish colony or than the eastern part of the (Swedish) empire. And later, for about a century, it was a part of the Russian Empire and the part of the protection of St. Petersburg or an autonomous grand duchy within the Russian Empire, with its own currency, postal service, judicial system, and parliament etc. This history has had a lot to do with Finnish discussions about identity, where do we belong (East or West), and (I will get to this by the end of the presentation) it is one of the main points in discussion on Finland's NATO membership also.

For Finland and its behaviour during the Cold War this has two implications. First, there is a comfort with making pragmatic decisions, accepting that political realities will impact on Finland. Second, as we have heard that it also happens in other countries, there is a trend of changing the content of the policy, but not the actual word. This allows people to create a history of consistent policies, while changing the actual content. It is good for creating (political) myths and constructing legends that surround them.

During the Cold War there was a need for Finland to be a trusted buffer zone from Soviet perspective. This made continued neutrality an attractive and pragmatic approach. It led to the official neutrality and desire to stay outside of superpower politics. I would like to stress here that the exact point of neutrality was this desire and not an aim to be neutral on all issues. Therefore, Finnish neutrality from its inception was more about the politics and specifically about the military cooperation.

In the introductory paper that we have got for this conference, it was stated that Yugoslavia was maybe a "double outsider" – both from the East and the West, at some point during the Cold War. In similar manner, Finland could be described as a "double insider". There was a general presumption that Finland had close relations with Moscow through the Treaty on Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance, which could be used by Moscow and West, for different ends. And, in the same time, it had close practical cooperation with the West, including (and that was know by even fewer people than in the case of Sweden) with the USA. Personally, I do not find any democratic problem with this, since had this come out, the response of Moscow would be quite strong and clear. But, this "two track" policy was anything but neutral, because for politicians neutrality was a tool, not an end to itself. You could even say that the goal of the official and recognized policy of neutrality was enlarging Finland's manoeuvre space in the international affairs.

That could be an argument for Serbia as well.

Yesterday, we have heard Dr. Tanja Mišćević mention that the Serbian Ministry of Defence does not see participation in international operations as “impeding neutrality in any way”. This is interesting to hear, because during the Cold War, Finland emphasized UN peacekeeping participation as a proof of its neutrality. Ironically, today participation in operations (not all, but most of them) tends to be the proof of the exact opposite.

Neutrality therefore required some myths to be strengthened. One of them is that neutrality works and is useful in international relations, which is, as we have heard, not necessarily the case. Another was the notion that you cannot trust collective security. Finnish elite at the time²¹ had to create the idea that there is an equivalent of “evilness” of NATO and Warsaw Treaty, because they had to explain why it was not in the Finnish interest to work with either one of them. There is also an argument that it is better if Finland does not take any positions which larger (super) powers could find objectionable. Ultimately, the state had to reinforce the idea that if Finland does not interfere in others’ business, it will be left alone.

At the end of the 1980s, Finland came out of the Cold War with a widespread sense that through the good and stable foreign policy (and some luck) it was able to maintain its independence, while having to compromise on some security policy issues. There was the feeling that the future was Finland’s to decide, and soon the discussion on potential EC/ EU membership began.

The most important security policy change in the post Cold War period was without any doubt the EU membership in 1995. Pre-referendum debate was mostly based on economic benefits of joining, but frequently political and security perspectives were strongly used to motivate a YES vote.

Before this vote, in 1993-1994, the Finnish political establishment have seriously discussed if Finland could consider itself neutral if it becomes the member to the EU. The result was consensus that “as a member of the EU Finland cannot call itself neutral - *since neutrality was simply a political decision, a political tool not a goal in itself, not enshrined in the Constitution, unlike the EU membership. Therefore, Finland began to speak about itself as a militarily non-aligned state.* This was officially modelled in 1997 Security and Defence Policy White Paper, where it was said that *as a member of the EU Finland cannot be neutral in case of the EU’s or the EU member state’s conflict with the third party* – this line underlines that Finland cannot be neutral.

In 2004, during discussion about EU’s “security guarantees” (I will call it so, to be understandable for the wider public) a new debate emerged in Finland about being

21) Editor’s note: Finland joined the European Union as a militarily non-allied country that participates actively and constructively in the Common Foreign and Security Policy creation and its implementation. As a Member, Finland cannot be objective of the European Union and third-party conflict. On the other hand, the European Union membership has contributed to strengthening of Finland’s security policy position. Even if the membership does not include military security guarantees, it represents a shared responsibility, and the protection. Finland does not face threats that need prevention, thus the security guarantees by one military alliance would not be necessary. Finland’s military non-alignment contributes to the stability of Northern Europe.

militarily non-aligned. Again the near consensus sense was that Finland could no longer call itself militarily non-aligned, if you are taking on these responsibilities to assist and cooperate also on the military level. So, the current formulation began to emerge that Finland does not belong to a military alliance – implying that the EU is primarily something else. It has military cooperation components, but it is not the military alliance.

Today, Finland is supporting the development of a more coherent CFSP, and it is a member of the PFP, and a member of the Nordic Defence Cooperation (NORDEFECO)²² which is a new addition. Politically it represents a new initiative (defence cooperation was a no-go area for Nordic countries during the Cold War), but it does not seem to increase security and defence policy commitments for now.

I would also like to say a few words on Finland's relations with NATO. Finland is the PFP member state since 1994 in Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council since its founding in 1997, partially to increase its interoperability for participation in the peacekeeping operations mainly in the Balkans – Implementation Force (IFOR), Stabilization Force (SFOR) and others. In this moment cooperation is very deep. I would argue that almost no citizens and almost no politicians recognize how deep it is. Of course, this is not hidden – everything is in the official, accessible documents. Maybe, that is due to the lack of interest, and that is ironic – but I will get to that later. Yesterday, we have heard at the conference that there are constant accusations in Serbia *that someone is driving Serbia into NATO*. We also hear about it continuously, that somehow increased cooperation would suddenly cause Finland to wake up and become a member.

So, why is Finland not a member, if it does all this cooperation with NATO? Does it have anything to do with concepts of neutrality? My answer is not really, but it has a lot to do with the myths of neutrality. There is very little support for it among population, approximately 25%, and therefore politicians recognize that it is not in their interest to favour NATO membership. One of the explanations for this is that people do not see reason for that membership is not seen as necessary for Finnish security interests and for some it is seen as even counterproductive for both Finnish and the security of the Baltic area.

I would return to yesterday's comment of professor Bring, that "from a national security point of view neutrality is a second best option to collective security" (which is an argument used by many who favour Finnish NATO membership), yet there is a strong sense among the Finnish population that the situation is quite the opposite – that the neutrality is the best option. What is the reason for that? Again, the answer has a lot to do with the myths on neutrality and that the return to neutrality would be the best. It requires that one has to believe in at least **four** myths that were very useful during the Cold War and have been strengthened and modified in the past two decades. The first is that the neutrality works as the foreign policy orientation. The second one is that Finland would be left alone if it does not trouble others – this notion is starting to decrease with the European financial crisis. Most of the population nowadays realizes that Finland will be impacted whatever

22) Editor's note: NORDEFECO is a political and military collaboration among the Nordic countries: Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, and Sweden. It was established in 2009 by merging three initiatives (NORDCAPS, NORDAC and NORDSUP) into one, in order to strengthen the participating nations' national defence, explore common synergies and facilitate efficient common solutions.

it does. Third myth is that Finland's military is strong enough. In this moment, I would say it is – on paper there is a reserve of around 350 000 soldiers, which is probably in practice around 250 000 – which makes Finnish military really large at the European level. We have heard that any kind of interstate war is highly unlikely in Sweden, and I would say it is like that in Finland too. However, the main focus of Finnish defence system is national, territorial defence. Only 5 to 10 percent of the defence budget is used for other issues, and 90% goes to territorial defence. Also, the system is based on conscripts, which makes the cost of the soldier marginal. And finally, the fourth myth is that no one would come and help, regardless of the promises – here people often reference the Winter War²³ (despite the fact that there was no actual promise, and Sweden helping actually quite a lot despite being neutral). And of course, Finland's main ally during the World War II was Germany and Finns often tend to forget that the German support in arms and food was central in stopping the Soviet invasion in 1944. But, this was a convenient thing to remind people of during the Cold War. Therefore, it became a strong myth that no one ever helps us, despite the fact that history tells us exactly the opposite.

These myths which were useful for “strengthening” Finnish neutrality during the Cold War have come to negatively shape public discussion and views even today, because the public has the false idea of what actually happened.

So, Finnish foreign, security and defence policy is anchored in its EU membership, but it does not mean NATO membership isn't discussed, in fact, for more than 15 years, it has been the most talked about security policy issue.

What we are seeing lately is the emergence of a sort of “confident independence”, and not necessarily neutrality or permanent neutrality. This means that Finland supports the development of the EU's CFSP within it the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP), yet it becomes more comfortable in making its national decisions, made up of many interconnected strands. For the first 10 years of Finnish membership it was about to show that you can really work and agree with everyone, but now there is more willingness to push Finland in its own direction. In addition there is a slowly dawning recognition among population of the impossibility of “neutrality” or “isolation” – though there is a strong wish this was not the case (here myth building rears its head). However, there is recognition that Russia still exists out there. One of the Finnish Cold War architects said that *wisdom comes from recognizing facts* – therefore, Finland cannot to anything with its geography vis-à-vis Russia. This can partially explain Finland's flirting with neutrality while cooperating with NATO, however there is no clear answer what is the best approach regarding these facts.

23) Editor's note: War between the USSR and Finland (from the end of November 1939 to the mid-March 1940) started by the Soviets who wanted to secure the hinterland of Leningrad because of the possibility of invasion of the Third Reich to the Soviet Union.

Friedhelm Frischenschlager

Austria´s “Permanent Neutrality” after 1955 – a Model for Serbia?

Austria´s permanent neutrality is a very specific case of neutrality, quite different from the other examples of neutrality introduced at this conference. Its origin, substance and political weight are linked mainly to the international developments after 1945 at European and global level and the Austrian reaction to them. Accordingly it has undergone some changes since its adoption in 1955. Formally Austria never abandoned permanent neutrality, today more for domestic reasons, as Austrian citizens grew extremely emotionally attached to it.

Could Austria's permanent neutrality serve as a model for Serbia? From the “original” Austrian permanent neutrality – as a product of the Cold War – more or less nothing is of relevance for a European state of today. Austria itself faces some difficulties with its permanent neutrality and tries to pass by “new interpretations”. But, how Austria dealt with its neutral status when approaching EU, the role it played for the EU in the accession process and today for Austria as an EU member state in a Union with a Common Security and Defence Policy, these experiences provide some interesting aspects, may well be relevant for Serbia's EU accession process.

Historical background and development of Austria´s permanent neutrality:

Permanent neutrality in the Cold War Period 1955 – 1989²⁴

In order to get rid of the military occupation by the four World war II Allies USA, USSR, UK and France, to regain its full sovereignty by the State treaty 1955, Austria promised in negotiations with the USSR, to follow in the future a permanent neutrality “like Switzerland”, based on International Law.²⁵ This met the interests of both sides of the Cold War: of the West, as it allowed for the withdrawal of the USSR from a part of central Europe; of the USSR, because it led to creation of a “neutral barrier” between NATO North and South (Switzerland plus Austria). This mutual interest of East and West was not only the political precondition for the State Treaty 1955, but also the political basis for Austria's permanent neutrality to be respected in the Cold War period.

24) To the history and political development of Austria's permanent neutrality with an English summary and a comprehensive list of literature see: Krottmayer, Markus. *Die Neutralitätsfalle - Österreichs Sicherheitspolitik in der Sackgasse?* Wien: LIT-Verlag, 2009

25) Convention (V) respecting the Rights and Duties of Neutral powers and Persons in Case of War on Land, The Hague: 1907 <http://www.icrc.org/ihl.nsf/FULL/200?OpenDocument>.

Austria fulfilled its promise to permanent neutrality firstly by adopting a constitutional law on permanent neutrality²⁶ with a very restricted content: *Austria shall not be part of a military alliance, admit foreign forces or military bases on its territory and be ready to defend its permanent neutrality by all available means ("Armed Neutrality")*. Secondly, this Constitutional provision was notified by Austria to all states it had diplomatic relations with in 1955, thus entering into a *unilateral* international obligation as regards its permanent neutrality. The Austrian permanent neutrality is not based on a multilateral state treaty. Austria has stressed again and again that its permanent neutrality was its sovereign decision in order to exclude an interpretation of its status as a kind of "neutralization" (by the four signatories of the Austria's State Treaty), which could have been used by the former Allies as a legal basis to justify an intervention following possible allegations, that Austria violates its obligations to permanent neutrality.

The content of Austria's permanent neutrality

The term "permanent" neutrality is often misinterpreted: it lies in mere opposition to the term "ad hoc" neutrality which is declared by a state in case of a specific war between third states, as it is an obligation to keep out of any future war. It is no obligation to maintain this status forever, it can be abolished at any time by a simple notification to the international community.

Austria's obligations deriving from International Law and the Austrian Constitution are clear: it shall not wage war and keep out of any war between others, notwithstanding the participants, the reasons or the geographical location of such a war. They leave no room for political or moral interpretation.

Austria is obliged to

- equal treatment of both sides of a war and not to grant advantages to one side e.g. by supplying or transferring (flights over its territory) troops or material
- to be able to defend its territory by military means ("armed neutrality"), in order to prohibit any party to a war to take advantage of its neutral territory by occupation, establish transport lines, misuse its air space etc., in a way, that the international community can fully trust that Austria can actually maintain its permanent neutrality status in case of war.

This entails also obligations in peace times: to pursue a "neutrality policy", an impartial, non-biased foreign and security policy, that the International Community, in particular potential partners to a conflict like NATO or the Warsaw Pact, can trust, that the permanent neutral state will defend its neutrality in case of a conflict. This "pre impact" of permanent neutrality was of great practical importance during the Cold War.

26) Constitutional Law on Permanent Neutrality 1955:

http://www.ena.lu/state_treaty_re_establishment_independent_democratic_austria_vienna_15_1955-2-803

(1) For the purpose of the permanent maintenance of her external independence and for the purpose of the inviolability of her territory, Austria, of her own free will, declares herewith her permanent neutrality which she is resolved to maintain and defend with all the means at her disposal.

(2) In order to secure these purposes, Austria will never in the future accede to any military alliances nor permit the establishment of military bases of foreign States on her territory.

Austria's neutral status between two opposing blocks was seen as a way to be kept out of military conflicts in Europe and allowed Austria to play a specific role in certain areas of international affairs. This explains why Austrian citizens grew emotionally attached to it and started to regard permanent neutrality as part of the Austrian national identity.

At the same time permanent neutrality also created some political problems:

When Austria applied for UN membership permanent neutrality stood principally in contradiction to the UN system of collective security, which obligates all UN member states to take side and to participate in UN military measures against an aggressor. Theoretically there is no room left for neutrality. Austria overcame this obstacle by a first reinterpretation of the "Swiss model" of neutrality by simply declaring, in the framework of UN, there is no neutrality. The UN accepted Austria, in particular the permanent members of the Security Council, understandably, all of them except China were politically involved in the creation Austria's permanent neutrality.

Austria faced after 1955 two serious challenges of its "armed neutrality": 1956, when the Soviet Union suppressed the Hungarian revolution, and 1968, when the Soviet Union occupied the Czechoslovakia, destroying the "Prague Spring". But even in these situations Austria's permanent neutrality was respected, except some violations of its airspace.

Sandwiched between East and West, Austria in general had to handle a sensitive foreign policy situation. On the one side Austria emphasized permanently its contingency "to the West", as there is no "ideological neutrality". On the other side Austria pursued at the beginning after 1955 a very cautious, more "passive" foreign policy between the two blocks. Not prior than in the 1970s, when Bruno Kreisky became Federal Chancellor, Austria changed to the so called "active neutrality", an attempt to combine the neutral status with a more flexible and ambitious foreign and security policy under the conditions of the Cold War, providing "good services", increasing the commitment to UN peace keeping missions, "pioneering" in delicate recognitions (German Democratic Republic (GDR), China, Palestine/Arafat). Of greatest importance in this context became the successful Austrian effort in making Vienna to one of the three main sites of the UN. Another highlight in this period of "active neutrality" came up with the very exposed cooperation of the three Social democratic leaders Olof Palme, Willy Brandt and Bruno Kreisky. Austria's permanent neutrality in this period showed even a sort of ideological, moral touch by underlining its particular peaceful approach, compared to the more military oriented NATO - or Warsaw Pact countries. However, all these experiences and activities are today more or less history. With the end of the Cold War in 1989, the focus concerning permanent neutrality moved to its role in the context of Austria's access to the EU.

Austria's permanent neutrality after 1989 and the EU accession

Until the late 1980s the opinion that Austrian (full) membership of the European Union was incompatible with permanent neutrality prevailed, in particular in the main political parties (Social Democrats and People's Party). Consequently, Austria joined EFTA in 1960, together with Sweden, Switzerland, the UK and others and refrained from applying for

the EU membership until June 1989, a few months before the unexpected end of the Cold War in November 1989.

Applying in 1989 was easier from a permanent neutrality point of view, as the EU only set up its CFSP with the Maastricht Treaty in 1992 and agreed on the “Copenhagen-criteria”²⁷, which, i.e., oblige candidate countries not to block the development of CFSP in 1993. These fundamental changes in the political substance of the EU were adopted at a time, where the two leading political parties had fully endorsed the Austrian EU perspective and were thus ready to, accept the conditions set by the EU in the accession negotiations on CFSP, while of course stating, that the permanent neutrality is compatible with EU membership and CFSP. The Austrian citizens endorse the accession treaty in a referendum in June 1994 with a two thirds majority. The participation of Austria to the EU and the CFSP necessitated a series of constitutional amendments, e.g. to enable Austria to participate in CFSP sanctions, which are contradictory to classical permanent neutrality.

The Amsterdam Treaty of 1997 incorporated the “Petersberg-Tasks”²⁸ including autonomous EU peace making operations, which contradict the core obligation of permanent neutrality, not to participate in wars. Taking into account the deep rooted support in the Austrian public opinion for permanent neutrality the Austrian government chose not to initiate a public debate on this issue, but instead to further amend the Constitution to cover the “Petersberg Tasks”, simply arguing, that this development of the CSDP does not touch upon the Austrian status of permanent neutrality.

The other neutral countries joining EU in 1995 did not face a political problem with their neutrality: Sweden was never bound by international obligations to its neutrality and was therefore free to accept the CFSP based on a non-aligned status. Finland seized immediately after 1989 the opportunity to get rid of its post World War II neutrality as a part of a legal obligation vis-a-vis the USSR and declared itself as a non-aligned country. Only Austria maintains and stresses its permanent neutrality until today.

Following restrictive interpretation Austria’s traditional permanent neutrality is not in contradiction to CSDP: The EU recognizes by the so called “Irish Clause”²⁹ the special status

27) Editor’s note: Copenhagen-criteria are accession criteria for any country seeking membership of EU. They are established by the Copenhagen European Council in 1993 and consists of three aspects: economic (existence of a functioning market economy and the capacity to cope with competitive pressure and market forces within the Union), political (stability of institutions guaranteeing democracy, the rule of law, human rights and respect for and protection of minorities) and legislative alignment (acceptance of the Community acquis and administrative and judicial capacity to take on the obligations of membership).

28) Editor’s note: The “Petersberg tasks” were set out in the Petersberg Declaration adopted at the Ministerial Council of WEU in June 1992. On that occasion, the WEU member states declared their readiness to make available to the WEU, but also to NATO and the European Union, military units for the purposes of: 1. humanitarian and rescue tasks; 2. conflict prevention and peace-keeping tasks; 3. tasks of combat forces in crisis management, including peacemaking; 4. joint disarmament operations; 5. military advice and assistance tasks and 6. post-conflict stabilization tasks. The “Petersberg tasks” are an integral part of the ESDP and the Treaty of Lisbon.

29) The “Irish Clause”, Art. 42 par 2 Lisbon Treaty: *If a Member State is the victim of armed aggression on its territory, the other Member States shall have towards it an obligation of aid and assistance by all the means in their power, in accordance with Article 51 of the United Nations Charter. This shall not prejudice the specific character of the security and defence policy of certain Member States.*

of neutral member states in the context of CSDP, which have the right to opt out from military missions. However, an EU member state can't pursue in peace time a foreign and security policy, which in case of war will comply with the obligations of neutrality. This is politically no longer possible: The international community and in particular all other member states will expect from their EU partner, that he exercises, if not military, at least political solidarity as demanded from Lisbon Treaty.

Austria's pragmatic way out of this problem was again a reinterpretation of permanent neutrality, adapting it to the new situation of the EU - requirements: permanent neutrality was reduced to the "core elements" of the law on neutrality - no alliance, no bases. As long as the EU does not become a military alliance and no military bases on Austria's territory are requested, neither the law on permanent neutrality nor the international obligations to permanent neutrality are formally violated. However, as Austria amended the constitutional law to enable its participation in EU peace *making* operations on a voluntary basis ("Irish Clause"), the status of permanent neutrality was de facto changed into a non-aligned status. This actually already has been written down in Austria's National Security and Defence Doctrine in 2001, which even mentioned NATO accession as a future "option". This option however, is now being questioned again in the framework of ongoing discussions on a new Security and defence Doctrine. In any case: Austria has so far adapted to all developments of CFSP from the Maastricht to the Lisbon Treaty and participated in all EU military operations, based on the assumption, that permanent neutrality does not apply within the EU, but only to the rest of the globe.

This situation is, however from a legal and political point of view, neither clear nor satisfactory. The discrepancy between the - formally never abolished - status of permanent neutrality based on international law and the status of an EU member state with an obligation to solidarity³⁰ persist. The perspectives for an even stronger CSDP will entail new problems: Of course, in case of a military aggression against an EU member state Austria could in theory opt out of a military participation. But politically it is unthinkable to treat a third state and an EU partner equally, or to deny member states, which want to render assistance access to Austrian territory or airspace.

In case of an EU peace making operation without UN mandate, the "constructive abstention" (not to vote in favor, but not to impede such an operation) introduced by the Lisbon Treaty is a wise compromise between requirements of Nonalignment or Neutrality and CSDP.

For Austria however this legal and political ambiguity on peacemaking operations might pose some serious domestic problems in case of dramatic security situation the EU is confronted with. As long as Austria formally sticks to permanent neutrality, while at the same time the constitution allows Austria to participate in peace *making* operations, a decision to actually take part an autonomous EU peace making operation, could trigger a serious domestic conflict, over the primacy of EU solidarity over permanent neutrality.

30) Solidarity clause Art 42/7Lisbon Treaty: *The policy of the Union in accordance with this Section shall not prejudice the specific character of the security and defence policy of certain Member States and shall respect the obligations of certain Member States, which see their common defence realised in the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO), under the North Atlantic Treaty and be compatible with the common security and defence policy established within that framework.*

This situation affects Austria's reliability in CFSP and CSDP and weakens in general its position within the EU.

Therefore, from a general European perspective it is worthwhile to consider, whether permanent neutrality and non-alignment make at all sense for current and future EU member states. The real issue is a very practical one: How are security interests of (non NATO) - EU Member states best served: By sticking to a *national* security policy, based on neutrality or non-alignment or by a CSDP?

In my opinion, there is no reasonable alternative to CSDP: The political perspectives of CSDP as designed by the Treaties are indispensable for the peace and security interests of Europe and its member states. An effective value based CSDP has the potential to be an important contributor to global peace and security. An integrated CSDP provides more security for all EU Member states, compared with 27 separated national policies, strategies and military forces. By pooling and sharing of military resources national defence budgets could gradually decrease.

The EU today is still far away from this vision, as the interventions on the Balkans, in Iraq, Libya, Middle East etc. show, it is not a full-fledged collective defence system. But politically CSDP is based on and is directed towards an integrated EU security policy, providing more security for all EU member states, including non-aligned and neutral countries. An effective CSDP represents an enormous added value for all Europeans. Therefore all EU member states have an obligation to contribute to it. Permanent neutrality, nonalignment doesn't contradict the idea of a strong EU-CSDP, but weakens it politically and diminishes its effectiveness.

Security and defence are among of the strongest prerogatives of national sovereignty. For countries with a strong tradition to permanent neutrality or non-alignment, CSDP is not easy to accept as it demands more or less a total shift from a national to a collective approach to security. However, there is no reasonable alternative to CSDP, even from a national interest point of view, and Austria is a good example for this: Today, with the exception of Switzerland and Liechtenstein, there is no foreseeable threat to Austria that does not affect other EU – or NATO-Member states - first. Austria no longer needs to defend its borders. Without any doubt: Austria enjoys security, as long as the EU as such is secure. That's why, at least for Austria, there is no reasonable alternative to CFSP, and Austria should fully contribute to it instead of trying to keep out preserving the historical permanent neutrality.

Therefore Austria should clarify formally, where it stands as regards CSDP and permanent neutrality. "No Neutrality within EU – but outside EU" is not a position that can be maintained for ever. Permanent neutrality outside the EU and its neighbourhood is irrelevant. Austria emptied the content of its permanent neutrality to an extent, that it is today more or less politically obsolete. The country's position today is rather that of a non-aligned country. Austria should thus formally revoke the status of a permanent neutral country. This can be communicated to the international community without difficulties. The domestic situation is however quite different, as any such decision would require a deep national debate, viewing that Austrians are still strongly emotionally attached to permanent neutrality.

Serbia and other candidate countries: Lessons from Austria´s Neutrality?

From the “original” Austrian permanent neutrality – as a product of the Cold War – more or less nothing is of relevance for a European state of today. Austria´s experience with its permanent neutrality in the context of EU accession, in particular its participation in CSDP, could prove interesting for Serbia and other EU candidate countries on their way into the EU.

Serbia is – understandably – not eager to join NATO. EU integration however is of vital importance for its future. In this context the question arises how to assess the status of neutrality or non-alignment of Serbia within the EU.

The EU accession of neutral/non-allied countries poses no legal or political problems, in particular since the “Irish clause” in the EU treaties. The security policy of traditional neutral, non-aligned countries is accepted within EU as the examples of Austria, Cyprus, Finland, Ireland, Malta and Sweden have proven. On the other side, since the Maastricht-Treaty 1992, neutral and non-aligned candidate countries and EU member states are obliged not to hinder the further development of CFSP. The Lisbon Treaty introduced new elements in CFSP, in particular the obligation to military solidarity in case an EU member state is attacked. Another new aspect to be taken into consideration by neutral/non-aligned states is the new opportunity to an enhanced cooperation of some EU member states in the area of defence policy³¹, which could lead to a “Two class”-situation within the EU CSDP and beyond.

Permanent neutrality and non-alignment are elements from the Cold War with limited relevance today. However, principally Serbia could easily insist on a non-aligned position, also based on its history, like Sweden or Finland. To remain outside of NATO is no hindrance at all, against the trend of many other new EU member states, which joined NATO.

A permanent neutrality status like Austria would however make no sense at all for Serbia. On the contrary, it would create the political and legal problems Austria is facing now, without any tangible advantage. Non-alignment is at least the much more flexible status, avoiding all the legal and political distortions needed to adapt permanent neutrality to CSDP.

However, also Serbia has to answer the principal question any other new EU candidate country has to: how far is it willing to participate, integrate in the developing CSDP, politically and militarily, whether it prefers a more individual, national security and defence policy, based on non-alignment, with some reluctance to EU CSDP, or sees its future security grounded within the CSDP. The latter offers, from my point of view, a more positive perspective for all EU member states as it strengthens Europe´s security as a whole and its contribution to the global security.

One last remark: Serbia is crucial for the security in South East Europe, but is today still involved in potentially violent conflicts. This is first of all a Serbian problem in relation with

31) Enhanced cooperation Art 42/ 6 Lisbon Treaty: *Those Member States whose military capabilities fulfil higher criteria and which have made more binding commitments to one another in this area with a view to the most demanding missions shall establish permanent structured cooperation within the Union framework. Such cooperation shall be governed by Article 46. It shall not affect the provisions of Article 43.*

its EU ambition. Undisputed borders and stable political relations with its neighbours are important preconditions for EU accession. The unresolved issue of the status of Kosovo, which also affects the EU internally, as only 22 of the 27 EU member states recognize Kosovo and five do not, is a clear obstacle to Serbia's EU accession.

The resolution of all conflict on the Balkans, besides the Kosovo issue, also the dispute between FYROM and Greece differences, the internal problems in Bosnia and Herzegovina and not to forget the frozen conflict in Transnistria, are a precondition for the EU accession of the countries involved in them.

To conclude: non-alignment and neutrality are no doubt compatible with EU-membership and CFSP. The question remains however, whether they also make sense. Today, the focus of any European country should lie on an effective, integrated CFSP of all current and future EU member states, including Serbia.

References

1. Krottmayer, Markus. Die Neutralitätsfalle - Österreichs Sicherheitspolitik in der Sackgasse?. Wien: LIT-Verlag, 2009
2. Convention (V) respecting the Rights and Duties of Neutral powers and Persons in Case of War on Land, The Hague, 1907
<http://www.icrc.org/ihl.nsf/FULL/200?OpenDocument>.
3. Constitutional Law on Permanent Neutrality 1955:
http://www.ena.lu/state_treaty_re_establishment_independent_democratic_austria_vienna_15_1955-2-803
4. Lisbon Treaty

Karen Devine

The ethos and elements of Irish neutrality: 18th – 21st Centuries

The ethos and elements of Irish neutrality can be traced across four centuries of discourse and practice. To understand Irish history is to understand the current of neutrality running through centuries of Irish foreign policy. This paper will outline the motivations and foundations of Irish neutrality in the context of Ireland's historical narratives and security identities, using Irish leaders' and successive governments' speeches and policies. The research shows Irish neutrality was driven by ideas and norms that are constitutive of survival and material interests

Theobald Wolfe Tone was born in 1763 in Dublin, educated at Trinity College Dublin and undertook two years of legal training in London prior to being called to the Irish bar in 1789. Theobald Wolfe Tone was a key figure in Irish history because he supported a more radical position of complete Irish independence compared with the more moderate Whig proposals an arrangement for Irish autonomy complementary with British imperial unity. Tone spent his early life in Ireland writing manifestoes and pamphlets, lobbying parliamentarians at home and networking abroad, influencing politics to secure Irish independence. He was a key figure in the 1798 Rebellion³² that took place at the dawn of the age of European nationalism, in the context of the American and French Revolutions and in the setting of the new ideas of Pain and Rousseau; this Rebellion marks the birth of modern Irish nationalism. In a pamphlet written in the context of the deterioration of relations between Spain and Great Britain in May 1790 due to a dispute over possession of the coast along Nookta Sound off the north-west coast of America, Wolfe Tone clearly advocated Ireland's objective in foreign relations: "**peace with all the world**, but peace with Spain particularly, is our object and our interest".³³ In considering "the question of the obligation on Ireland to follow Great Britain to war" he sought "arrangements to obtain and secure **a safe and honourable neutrality**".³⁴ Neutrality was the vehicle used to exercise a policy of peace with states in Europe and for the wider world in eighteenth century Irish policy and continued to be until the dawn of twenty first century.

Tone insisted, it is "For her own interest and honour she [Great Britain] embarks in war and **drags in this unoffending and unoffended country** as a necessary sequel";³⁵ "for

32) Editor's note: Irish Rebellion of 1798, an unsuccessful uprising against British rule in Ireland, lasted from May to September 1798. The main force of the rebellion was the Society of United Irishmen, an organization inspired by French and American revolution, established in 1791, whose main objectives were parliamentary reform and the elimination of British rule in Ireland. The result of the rebellion was Prime Minister William Pitt's Act of Union, which abolished the Irish Parliament.

33) Moody, T. W. et al. (eds). *A New History of Ireland*. Oxford: Clarendon Press 1976, p. 54

34) Ibid, p. 52

35) Ibid, p. 59

England, not for our country we fight and we die”³⁶ Tone sought to overturn the subjugation of Irish interests to British imperial ambitions and inspire **self-determination** through an appeal to pride in **Irish national identity**; “It is a mortifying truth, but not less true for its severity, that the honour of the British is the **degradation of the Irish flag**. We are contented to be the subaltern instrument in the hands of our ambitious and politic sister, without one ray of generous **national pride** beaming forth to light us on to **our honour and our interest**”³⁷ He argued, “to say that it is a *necessary consequence* of our connection with England, that we should be involved in every war her Ministers shall wage for her *pride*, or her *power*, or her *profit*, I hope and believe is a most foul *calumny* upon that *connection*”³⁸ The theme of **seeking to avoid being dragged into the wars of Britain and other Great Powers**, and taking a stance in favour of Ireland’s national interest based on a sense of patriotism is consistent in future leaders’ discourses on neutrality up until the dawn of the 21st century. Tone sought Ireland to become an independent state in the world community from the basis of **self-reliance rather than alliance with Great Powers**, “We should then look to our internal resources, and scorn to sue for protection to any foreign state; we should spurn the idea of moving, an **humble satellite round any power**, however great, and claim at once and enforce our **rank among the primary nations of the earth**”³⁹; a theme that would be echoed in the invocation of neutrality on the eve of World War II by the then Taoiseach (leader) of Ireland (and throughout the Cold War), Éamon de Valera.

In a follow-up pamphlet “On the Threatened War with Spain” published in July 1790, Wolfe Tone argued for neutrality as the best of Ireland’s options, explaining “I **already begin to think our standing neutral** would not only be possible and wise for us at the present crisis...”⁴⁰ and emphasised that it is within the power of the King “**to make terms for neutrality for Ireland**, at any time that England happened to be engaged in a foreign war”⁴¹ Part of the issue was the miseries suffered by the good people of Ireland, stating, “I, for one, in the last war with difficulty preserved myself and my family from the jaws of **famine**”⁴² Thus an independent and neutral Ireland was not only the backbone but the essential condition of Irish peace policy for centuries: it was seen as both the means and the end for peace, internally and externally.

The early 20th Century period of rebellion, wars and independence in Ireland was to sediment the infusion of anti-imperialist and anti-colonial sentiment in nascent Irish foreign policy. The previous centuries’ discourses embodying the slavery vs. freedom, imperialism vs. self-determination and colonialism vs. independence nexus fed into a more dynamic framework of individual and state rights that justified more intense campaigns for neutrality at the state level, to avoid being dragged into British wars, and

36) Ibid, p. 61

37) Ibid, p. 58

38) Ibid, p. 61

39) Ibid, p. 61

40) Ibid, p. 64

41) Ibid, p. 64

42) Ibid, p. 65

anti-conscription at the individual, to avoid the masses dying for the expansion of Empire, and by corollary, the continued subjugation of Ireland. The same signifiers of **starvation** and **suffering** wrought through injustice to Irish people at home, and attempts to exploit Irish people to serve British interests abroad through conscription for war, led to an attempt to secure Ireland's independence and neutrality by a number of key individuals in Irish history through the 1916 Rising.

The 1916 revolutionaries invoked the framework of **universal rights** and **equality** to justify the attempts to win independence, and formed the basis for Ireland's neutrality-embedded peace policy exercised some forty years later through her membership of the UN: "We went out to break the connection between this country and the British Empire, and to establish an Irish Republic..... We succeeded in proving that Irishmen are ready to die endeavouring to win for Ireland those **national rights** which the British Government has been asking them to die to win for Belgium. As long as that remains the case, the cause of Irish freedom is safe".⁴³ The desire not to be dragged into what was considered by most Irish people as an imperialist war between Great Powers underpinning policy then, is still a central component of current popular support for Irish neutrality now, and was foremost in the Irish foreign policy debates on the 2003 Iraq War.

Between 1919 and 1921 a War of Independence was fought between the regular British forces being assisted by the British "Black and Tans" against the Irish Volunteers who were being marshalled into a foundational army of the republic, known as the Irish Republican Army or the IRA.⁴⁴ The Irish population stoically endured the reprisals at the hands of the British; according to Lyons, the "impulse to fight, to hold on, to contend with almost insuperable difficulties and almost impossible odds", which "had its roots in a tradition of insurrection and a spirit of resistance which, however irrational, were too strong and too deeply implicit in the history of the country to be ignored. The embers of **Irish identity** had been subdued, they had not been extinguished; and out of them...rose once more the deathless phoenix of independent nationality".⁴⁵ Ireland's neutrality in World War II was conditioned by her status as a fragile, newly independent state that was deeply traumatised by the violence of her colonial experience. Sean Lester, the last Secretary General of the League of Nations wrote in his diaries in the context of an intense and sustained propaganda war against Irish neutrality waged by the United States of America and Britain:

"It makes me rather tired however if any outsiders talks about a moral issue for a Government in Ireland not having taken that action. What was the position? We all know that the collective security system might have worked but it had broken down primarily because of the refusal of the Great Powers to take their responsibilities and fulfil their obligations in the years immediately preceding the war...the case of Ireland was still different to those others. Her independence had been won by much sacrifice and suffering after a struggle lasting longer than that of Poland. I was always gratified by how quickly good will and

43) J. Connolly, Statement at court material, 9 May 1916, ponovo objavljeno u O. Dudley Edwards and B. Ransom (eds), *James Connolly: Selected Political Writings*, New York, Grove Press, 1974, p. 378

44) Lyon, F.S.L. *Ireland Since The Famine*, London: Wiedenfeld & Nicolson, 1971, p. 408
Ibid, p. 21

45) Ibid, p. 21

common sense prevailed in Ireland to such a great extent. Some are inclined to forget that it is only 20 years ago, i.e. within the lifetime of most people in Ireland, that the Black and Tans were loosened to ravage the country. There is scarcely a criminal act of which the Germans have been guilty which did not take place in Ireland at that time, although not on the same scale.... To have sided with Germany would have meant war; to have sided with England would have meant civil war, for Ireland was full not of historic memories, but of recollections of things done by English officers to Irish prisoners which were like what the Germans have been doing in this war. No-one can enjoy reading of these things, but it is right that they should be read and remembered. In spite of what happened, the Irish government adopted a most friendly and even helpful attitude in 1939."⁴⁶

A truce was declared on 11 July 1921 and negotiations lead to the signing of the Anglo-Irish Treaty on 6 December 1921. The Treaty was to lead to a new constitution and the establishment of the Irish Free State with 'dominion status' separate from Britain by the end of 1922. The Treaty maintained the King in a position of executive authority and the British controlled a number of Irish ports which prevented the Irish parliamentarians from being able to take independent foreign policy decisions on treaties, alliances and involvement in war.⁴⁷ A civil war took hold across Ireland by 29 June 1922 between the pro-Treaty Provisional Government under Michael Collins and its anti-Treaty opponents including de Valera. The violence between the two sides continued, leading to seventy-seven prisoners shot in reprisal for murders of members of government. The anti-Treaty side called off the war of attrition and negotiated a ceasefire on 24 May 1923.

Éamon de Valera is the most important figure in Irish history in order to understand the discourses and practice of Ireland's neutrality during World War II, that are linked to the promotion of Ireland's independence, her '**critical support**' League policy in the 1920s and 1930s, the Irish Constitution of 1937, and his stances with Frank Aiken taken at the United Nations. Ireland had struggled to shake of domination of Britain not just for her independence, but also to play her role in world politics.⁴⁸ Speaking to the Assembly of the League of Nations in Geneva on 2nd July 1936, Éamon de Valera, as the leader of a small nation, said:

Peace is dependent upon the will of great states. All the small states can do, if the statesmen of the greater states fail in their duty, is resolutely to determine that they will not become the tools of any great power, and that they will **resist with whatever strength they may possess every attempt to force them into a war** against their will.⁴⁹

Éamon de Valera's experience of League of Nations fed into a philosophy for neutrality in times of war.⁵⁰ The desire to remain outside of Great Power struggles was manifested in the policy of neutrality articulated on 25 August 1939: "Ireland desires to remain on

46) Gageby, Douglas. *The last secretary general: Sean Lester and the League of Nations*. Dublin: Town House, 1999, p. 185

47) Lyons, 1971, p. 444

48) Gageby 1999, p. 23

49) Dwyer, Ryle. *De Valera : the man & the myths*, Dublin, Ireland : Poolbeg, 1991, p. 209

50) Kennedy, 1997, p. 249

peaceful and friendly relations with all countries in the world. She wishes to remain outside the quarrels of the great powers ruling the world and to rebuild her own civilisation undisturbed by world rivalries".⁵¹ As Dwyer surmises,

De Valera's main reason for advocating neutrality was not **inspired by selfishness**. He believed in Ireland playing her full part in an ordered international society, and he was prepared to support actions designed to uphold the legitimate aims of the League, but once the major powers refused to honour their obligations under the Covenant, he thought it madness to become involved in a conflict, which had basically resulted from the various powers pursuing their own self-interests.⁵²

De Valera secured the transfer of property, rights and harbour defences at Berehaven, Cobh (Queenstown) and Lough Swilly from Britain to Ireland in an agreement signed on 25 April 1938.⁵³ The associated 1921 Treaty Articles of Agreement were repealed. Like every one of the states that opted for neutrality at the outbreak of World War II, security was primary concern underpinning de Valera's neutrality and deterrence was the basis for its achievement; as the Taoiseach said in Dáil Éireann on 27th September 1939,

"We are, in fact, in the centre of a theatre of war. There is war all around our coasts. We are in the centre of a theatre of war, and if we want to maintain our neutrality and to prevent our territory from being used by the belligerents in their own interests...we must have some force, and the bigger we are able to afford the better. We must have some force to see that any attempts upon us will not be made with impunity, and it will be clear to everybody that we will have a force which will be able, under ordinary circumstances, to protect our neutrality."⁵⁴

Frank Aiken, as Minister for Defence, outlined the expenditure and measures taken to achieve 762 what was termed "a position of armed neutrality"⁵⁵, explaining "It is in order to ensure, if we can, that our people will continue to govern themselves in their own interest that we are asking the people to spend a fair amount of our national wealth in building up our defences."⁵⁶

De Valera was realistic in saying "**nations are selfish whether small or great**"⁵⁷ and align with each other out of interests. A small state aware of that reality can take steps to safeguard its people from the wars of these states and he certainly had no illusions of either idealism or pacifism as he made clear Ireland's non-belligerent position:

51) Walshe (1939) u Crowe, Catriona [et al.]. *Documents on Irish foreign policy. Vol.5, 1937-1939*. Dublin: Royal Irish Academy, 2006, 495-496

52) Dwyer, T. Ryle. *De Valera's finest hour: In search of national independence, 1932-1959*. Dublin: Mercier Press, 1982, p. 182

53) Crowe, 2006, p. 278

54) Dáil Éireann Debate, Vol. 77 No. 2 Col. 269, 27th September 1939

55) Dáil Éireann Debate, Vol. 74 No. 6 Col. 691, 16th February 1939

56) Dáil Éireann Debate, Vol. 74 No. 6 Col. 763, 16th February 1939

57) Dáil Éireann Debate, Vol. 74 No. 6 Col. 712, 16th February 1939

"We have no hostile intent, but, as I have said, unfortunately, we cannot rely on that as a protection. We know that there is a possibility of being attacked. ... Even though any measures of defence which we would be inclined to take would be inadequate to protect us completely against the attack of any of the great Powers, we believe that by going the distance we propose, which we believe will be within our means, that that will be in fact a considerable defence."⁵⁸

Ireland did not have an arms industry and possessed few defence resources due to the strategic calculations of British rule that endured until 1921 and successive Irish governments' unwillingness to resource a sizeable army given the likelihood of renewed internal conflict in the aftermath of the Civil War in 1922. Thus, although de Valera had secured the use of the ports before the war, Ireland was relatively defenceless when a decision was made for neutrality in World War II. De Valera attempted to procure weapons from the Allies (having declined the offer of arms from the Germans⁵⁹), but both the British and Americans refused de Valera's requests to purchase arms⁶⁰: "Britain was obstructive; the US was uncooperative"⁶¹ Denuded of weapons, Ireland's refusal to participate in the war was no longer just an assertion of sovereignty; the policy had to prove successful in keeping Ireland out of the war.⁶²

During the war, in a speech on 18th April 1941, Frank Aiken made plain Ireland's **resistance to being dragged into the war**, by military aggression, economic pressure or by starvation: "if we fight in this war it will only be when we are attacked"⁶³ And despite partition, another key element of neutrality was a **refusal to allow herself to be used as a base to attack Britain**.⁶⁴ This was also an important condition to retain Ireland's independence.⁶⁵ De Valera had always maintained, truthfully, "We have no hatred—no section of the Irish people has any hatred—of the British people as such. We want to end the quarrel. We want to be friends"⁶⁶ The 'British Representative' in Ireland, Sir John Maffey, had understood that de Valera's 'goal had been to maintain neutrality and to help us within the limits of that neutrality to the full extent possible', and he further understood that de Valera regarded his policy as consistent. Irish neutrality had been conducted in accordance with the Hague Conventions to the extent possible and although the EU-

58) Dáil Éireann Debate, Vol. 74 No. 6 Col. 714, 16th February 1939

59) Salmon, T. *Unneutral Ireland: An Ambivalent and Unique Security Policy*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989, p. 139

60) Dwyer, T. Ryle. *Irish neutrality and the USA, 1939-47*. Dublin and Totowa, N.J.: Gill and Macmillan, 1977, p. 177

61) Duggan, John P. *Neutral Ireland and the Third Reich*. Totowa, N.J.: Barnes & Noble, 1985, p. 182

62) Fisk, Robert. *In time of war: Ireland, Ulster, and the price of neutrality, 1939-45*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1983, p. 160

63) Dáil Éireann Debate, Vol. 138 No. 7 Col. 853, 29th April 1953

64) Dáil Éireann Debate, Vol. 138 No. 7 Col. 860, 29th April 1953

65) Walsh memorandum to de Valera, 25 August 1939 in Crowe, 2006, p. 495

66) Dáil Éireann Debate, Vol. 74 No 6 Col 714, 16th February 1939

and Irish Government-supported revisionist discourses to paint Ireland as 'unneutral',⁶⁷ those revisionist claims have not stood up to scrutiny⁶⁸. Despite intense and at times outrageous acts of pressure to damage de Valera's credibility and to persuade de Valera to give up Ireland's neutrality by the British and the United States of America, it was made clear to the US State Department on 15 May 1941 at the height of the Anglo-US diplomatic, strategic and propaganda war waged against Ireland's neutrality, that "Ireland's survival as a nation and the safety of the remnant of her long persecuted people depends on the maintenance of her neutrality".⁶⁹

Irish neutrality was officially declared in September 1939 by Taoiseach Éamon de Valera, in view of the impending Second World War. The Italians were friendly and the French and the Germans respectfully and positively referred to Irish neutrality.⁷⁰ It is evident that Ireland's history, culture, values informed the decision to adopt neutrality. Undoubtedly, having recently gained independence from Britain for twenty-six counties of Ireland, neutrality was also an expression of Irish sovereignty.⁷¹ Neutrality was supported by the Irish public and political elite alike.⁷² **Public opinion** was consistently cited in government justification of neutrality during and after the war:

I have indicated that this Government, any more than 99 per cent of the Irish people, have no intention of considering getting into war... If attacked, of course, we will resist; but, unless we are attacked, this nation will not go into war and will not consider going into war".⁷³

De Valera continued to impress upon the belligerents of the normative democratic framework for neutrality, particularly in 1941 whilst fending off immense pressure from the Anglo-American party: 'the aim of the overwhelming majority of the Irish people' was to secure independence, 'with its neutrality guaranteed like the neutrality of Switzerland. A small country of ours that had for centuries resisted imperial absorption, was bound to choose the course of neutrality'.⁷⁴ A debate on 16 February 1939 indicates several other reasons why Ireland chose neutrality including (1) an **identity of non-aggression** in an international declaration of neutrality and a determination not to be involved in war, and

67) Salmon, 1989

68) See Devine, Karen M. "The Myth of 'the Myth of Irish neutrality': Deconstructing Concepts of Irish Neutrality using International Relations Theories." *Journal Irish Studies in International Affairs*, Vol. 17 (2006)

69) Bowman, John . *De Valera and the Ulster question 1917-1973*. Oxford; New York: Clarendon Press, 1982, p. 254

70) Kennedy, Michael. *Ireland and the League of Nations, 1919-46*. Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 1996, p. 244

71) Fisk, 1983, str. 39. i Fanning, Ronan. *Neutrality, Identity, and Security: The Example of Ireland. In Small States and the Security Challenge in the New Europe*. Werner Bauwens, Armand Clesse, and Olav F. Knudsen, eds. London: Brassey's, 137-149, p. 139

72) Longford, Thomas P. O'Neill. *Eamon de Valera*, London: Hutchinson, 1970, pp. 348-49, 353-54, 377

73) Aiken, Dáil Éireann, Vol. 138, Col. 859

74) Fanning, Ronan. *Irish Neutrality: An Historical Review*. *Irish Studies in International Affairs* Vol. 1, No. 3, str. 27-38, Royal Irish Academy, 1982, p. 32

having **no designs on other nations** (2) an identity as having a tradition of **resistance to threats, bullying and actions** that are against Ireland's interests and for mankind⁷⁵; and (3) **to avoid a likely civil war**: "If any Taoiseach had proclaimed that we would take one side or the other... that in itself would have caused civil war".⁷⁶

The framework of Big Powers and small states was also linked to violations of international law and the World Wars in de Valera's response to Churchill's victory speech attacking Irish neutrality after the war. De Valera replied,

Mr. Churchill makes it clear that, in certain circumstances, he would have violated our neutrality and that he would justify his action by Britain's necessity. It seems strange to me that Mr. Churchill does not see that this, if it be accepted, would mean that Britain's necessity would become **a moral code** and that, when this necessity became sufficiently great, other people's rights were not to count. It is quite true that **other great powers** believe in this same code – in their own regard – and have behaved in accordance with it. That is precisely why we have the disastrous succession of wars – World War No.1 and World War No. 2 – and shall it be World War No.3?⁷⁷

This same scepticism regarding the intentions of Big Powers and the ability of small states to influence such decisions is seen in de Valera's discourse on alliances in the context of the development of the European Economic Community (EEC) and proposals for Ireland's membership. Ireland did not join NATO in 1949 for a number of reasons, primarily because public opinion would never agree due to a preference for neutrality, which had successfully kept Ireland out of World War II and because the elite interpreted Treaty as obligating Ireland to protect the border with Northern Ireland. More than a decade later, in the context of Ireland's application to join the EEC, the government vigorously denied that they had interpreted Article IV of the North Atlantic Treaty as "implying an undertaking to preserve the Partition situation", and they denied that the interpretation formed the basis of their decision not to join NATO.⁷⁸

Aside from the neutrality-based reasons for avoiding alliances and the significant obstacle of public resistance to any change in that policy, the other more pragmatic reasons for not joining NATO were economic: Ireland was simply not in a position to spend the monies required by NATO membership; 1947 was a year that saw a fuel crisis, bread rationing, a paralysis of industry, lagging wages, higher prices and a new trade gap that led to a supplementary budget.⁷⁹ NATO membership would require double the then current level defence expenditure to meet the average expenditure of NATO members based on a proportion of gross domestic product (GNP).⁸⁰ The **loss of independence** in foreign policy was another consideration, as it was anticipated that the members would seek

75) Dáil Éireann Debate, Vol. 74 No. 6 Col. 709 - 710, 16th February 1939

76) Dáil Éireann Debate, Vol. 138 No. 7 Col. 842-43, 29th April 1953

77) Dwyer, 1982, pp. 142-143

78) Dáil Éireann Debate, Vol. 193 No. 1 Col. 11, 14th February 1962

79) Lyons, 1969, p. 68

80) Wylie, P. *Ireland and the Cold War: Diplomacy and Recognition, 1949-63*. Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 2006, p. 45

to co-ordinate foreign policy positions and that the views of others would require the subordination of Ireland's position.⁸¹ De Valera articulated the very real fear that joining a military alliance would mean automatic involvement in wars, without having a say or control over such decisions.⁸²

Because of this, de Valera was also wary of plans for a federal Europe, of any 'attempt to provide a full-blooded political constitution' and argued 'we would not be wise as a nation in entering into a full-blooded political federation' that would involve a military alliance.⁸³ This determination to avoid the obligations of a collective defence and signing up to a mutual defence clause lasted until the 1990s: Ireland's only White Paper on Foreign Policy specifies that the decision not to join NATO or the Western European Union (WEU) reflected successive governments' view that "the security of the State could be best preserved by the adoption of an attitude of neutrality."⁸⁴ This policy was reversed through the ratification of the Lisbon Treaty in 2009 (discussed later).

Ireland joined in the United Nations in 1955. **Neutrality, impartiality**, a reputation for independence and experience of **colonisation** and lack of imperialist aggression towards others all contributed to Ireland's role as a contributor to UN peacekeeping operations from 1958. Participation in **United Nations peacekeeping** operations was complemented by the state's role as a broker in **conflict resolution**, for example, 1967 activities in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and in **disarmament**, for example, driving and sponsoring the Non-Proliferation Treaty of 1968, all of which were couched within a framework of neutrality. Ireland's military personnel have contributed over 56000 individual missions to over 54 different UN peacekeeping operations abroad and carved a role for the Irish defence forces that enhanced the state's international reputation.

The stance on neutrality **changed** in the 1960s through Sean Lemass who had taken over leadership from Éamon de Valera in 1959 and had set his sights on **membership of the EEC**.⁸⁵ **Neutrality** started to be pared down by the government and its various elements chipped off and discarded in the 1990s, due to the EU's defence policy ambitions of incorporating the WEU military alliance into the EU and having the neutrals accede to the merged alliance.⁸⁶ The 1980s was the last time the Irish government admitted that neutrality permitted the elements of **active neutrality** or what the government termed, the "positive merits' of Irish foreign policy: UN peacekeeping, the nuclear non proliferation treaty, decolonization initiatives, opposing South African apartheid, accepting refugees, opposing US funding of South American paramilitaries, increasing aid to the Third World, and supporting Palestinian self-determination."⁸⁷ The concept was re-termed '**military**

81) Ibid, p. 45

82) Dáil Éireann Debate, Vol. 152 No. 5 Col. 549-51, 12 July 1955

83) Ibid

84) Government of Ireland, 1996 - White Paper on Foreign Policy: 'External challenges and opportunities', 26 March 1996, pp. 119 – 120

85) Dáil Éireann Debate, Vol. 193 No. 1 Col. 11, 14th February 1962

86) Reuter, 10 March 1995

87) Devine, Karen M. "Irish Political Parties' Attitudes towards Neutrality and the Evolution of the EU's Foreign, Security and Defence Policies." *Irish Political Studies*, Vol 24, Issue 4, (2009), p. 478

neutrality' meaning **non-membership of a military alliance** at the behest of the EU in order to make the concept more compatible with EC foreign policy and future EU security and defence policy.⁸⁸ This position of non-membership of the WEU was reversed by the Irish Government in the 2000s, with the adoption of a modified version of the WEU's mutual defence clause⁸⁹ inserted into the Constitution for Europe and subsequently the Treaty of Lisbon in article 42.7 that finalised the merger of the WEU with the EU⁹⁰ and made Ireland a member of that merged WEU-EU military alliance.

Irish public opinion is a consistent and unwavering supporter of Irish neutrality over several decades. Research conducted in the 2000s shows that the most strongly supported public concepts closely resemble the wider, "active" concept of neutrality that embodies characteristics such as peace promotion, nonaggression, the primacy of the UN, and the confinement of state military activity to UN peacekeeping, not being involved in wars, and maintaining Ireland's independence, identity, and independent foreign policy decision-making (in the context of "big power" pressure).⁹¹ Research also shows that the first Nice Treaty referendum proposal to ratify the EU treaty was defeated, in part because the voters who turned out perceived threats to Irish neutrality arising from the Treaty.⁹² Support for neutrality was also the most important substantive policy reason driving the public's rejection of the Lisbon Treaty in the first Lisbon Treaty referendum held on June 12, 2008.⁹³ A €10,206,000 government and EU-funded re-run of the referendum bought a threats based campaign in the newspapers, radio, television and on-line social networking media discourse using the slogans "my job depends on Europe", "It's simple, I'm safer in Europe", "yes to jobs, yes to Europe", "yes to recovery, yes to Europe", "ruin or recovery, vote 'yes'". On the basis of this [mis]information, the second referendum was passed as research showed a dramatic increase in the number of people who believed voting 'yes' would "help the Irish economy", from 9% in 2008 to 38% in 2009⁹⁴ – yet in the wake of the second referendum Ireland was 'bounced' into an €85bn loan by the EU, unemployment

88) Devine, Karen M. "Neutrality and the development of the European Union's common security and defence policy: Compatible or competing?" *Journal Cooperation and Conflict*, Vol. 46 no. 3 (2011) p 328

89) Article I of the Brussels Treaty contains a provision that could be found in a slightly modified form, in the Lisbon Treaty (previously mentioned to article 42/7): If any of the High Contracting Parties should be the object of an armed attack in Europe, the other High Contracting Parties will, in accordance with the provisions of Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, afford the Party so attacked all the military and other aid and assistance in their power. Both of the articles contain a mutual defence clause and refer to the Charter of the UN. However, there is a possibility for the participation of neutral states in the ESDP in the Lisbon Treaty

90) Ibid

91) Devine, Karen M. "Stretching the IR Theoretical Spectrum on Irish Neutrality: A Critical Social Constructivist Framework." *International Political Science Review*, Vol. 29 no. 4, (2008), p. 471

92) Sinnott, Richard. *Attitudes and behaviour of the Irish electorate in the referendum on the Treaty of Nice: Results of a survey of public opinion carried out for the European Commission Representation in Ireland*. Dublin, 2001, http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/flash/fl108_summary_en.pdf

93) Sinnott, Richard at al. *Attitudes and Behaviour in the Referendum on the Treaty of Lisbon*. Dublin, 2009, <http://gnothai-eactracha.net/uploads/documents/ucd%20geary%20institute%20report.pdf>, p. 33

94) Flash Eurobarometer 284. *Lisbon Treaty PostReferendum Survey. Ireland 2009* http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/flash/fl_284_en.pdf

continued to rise, emigration rose to a rate of 1000 people a week and the suicide rate hit the highest level in the history of the state at 10 people a week. In adopting the Lisbon Treaty provisions on a common security and defence policy including joining the EU collective defence in order to improve the Union's capacity to shape globalization,⁹⁵ the last vestige of Irish neutrality was eradicated. Because of this, Irish political elites have placed the issue of neutrality in a zone of meaningful silence in Irish political discourse, particularly during referendums on EU Treaties, indicated by an interparty agreement to downplay the government's reversal of the definition of neutrality and the destruction of the prior concept so as not to alert the Irish public to its demise.⁹⁶ In tandem, neutrality has been effectively substituted for **EU solidarity**: the 2000s saw the adoption of 'solidarity' as a cornerstone of all of the European former neutral states' foreign, security and defence policies, including Ireland;⁹⁷ for example, on 9 Oct 2001 Austrian chancellor Wolfgang Schuessel declared that "classical all-round neutrality must give way to common solidarity within the European family".

In the Twenty-First Century, Irish governments seek to promote the view that "Ireland should **look increasingly to its interests** rather than to **ideals which may have been appropriate to another bygone era**".⁹⁸ In parallel with Irish neutrality being effectively defined out of existence in discourse, and legally and politically erased in practice, the government also started new discourses **favouring Ireland's membership of NATO** that reconstituted NATO as a democratic peace support organisation and supporter of human rights, for example, claiming that it is "the only force capable of, and willing to, take on the tyrants [in the former Yugoslavia] and bring an end to the appalling abuse of human rights".⁹⁹ NATO is also portrayed as providing "**a peace dividend** from which Ireland has derived a great deal of benefit".¹⁰⁰ This implies a need for gratitude that mirrors the European NATO members' "strong sense of indebtedness to the United States, arising from its role both in the Second World War and during the Cold War".¹⁰¹ It contrasts with the reality of Ireland's experience of US belligerence, withholding of arms, policy of starving Irish people into submission and involvement in the war, and a vicious propaganda war waged against Ireland during World War II; in fact, the US was no friend of Irish foreign policy and neutrality then or during the Cold War. Ireland has also changed its overseas mission focus from UN peacekeeping to EU "crisis management" and NATO "peace support" missions.

95) Barroso, 2007

96) Huff, Ariella. The Discursive Construction of the CSDP in the British, Irish and Polish Parliaments 1998-2008: Comparisons, Contrasts and Challenges. http://www.euce.org/eusa/2011/papers/3k_huff.pdf, pp. 9, 11 Devine 2011, p. 350

97) Devine 2011, p. 350

98) Dorr, Noel. "Ireland at the United Nations." in Ireland in International Affairs: interests, institutions and identities, B. Tonra and E. Ward (eds.). Dublin: Institute of Public Administrations, 2002, p. 119

99) Fine Gael Policy Action Unit. *Beyond neutrality: security, social justice and responsibility*. Dublin, 2003 <http://issuu.com/tcmeditorial/docs/beyond-neutrality>, p. 11

100) Ibid, p. 9

101) Sjursen, Helen. "On NATO's identity." *International Affairs* 40 (4) (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1944-), (2004), p. 703

Conclusion

Irish neutrality has a long tradition stretching back several centuries and remains intimately tied to Ireland's independence, peace policy and Irish people's identity today.¹⁰² Neutrality facilitated Ireland's contributions to peace including decolonisation, UN peacekeeping, conflict resolution, mediation and disarmament initiatives in the twentieth century and most importantly, kept Ireland out of the imperialist wars of Great Powers. In the twenty first century, Irish neutrality has been eradicated in favour of mutual defence commitments and military alliance membership at the EU level in the name of 'solidarity'. The failure of successive governments to bring public opinion along with their decision to eradicate neutrality in the 2000s will undoubtedly raise further political problems in future and places the Governments' and EU's professed adherence to the values of the rule of law, democracy, human rights and fundamental freedoms into serious question.

References

1. Bowman, John. *De Valera and the Ulster question 1917-1973*. Oxford ; New York : Clarendon Press, 1982.
2. Crowe, Catriona et al.(eds.).*Documents on Irish foreign policy. Vol.5, 1937-1939*. Dublin: Royal Irish Academy, 2006
3. Dáil Éireann Debate, Vol. 138 No. 7 Col. 853, 29th April 1953
4. Dáil Éireann Debate, Vol. 138 No. 7 Col. 858, 29th April 1953
5. Dáil Éireann Debate, Vol. 138 No. 7 Col. 860, 29th April 1953
6. Dáil Éireann Debate, Vol. 138 No. 7. Col.. 842-43, 29th April 1953
7. Dáil Éireann Debate, Vol. 152 No. 5 Col. 549-51, 12 July 1955
8. Dáil Éireann Debate, Vol. 152 No. 5 Col. 549-51, 12 July 1955
9. Dáil Éireann Debate, Vol. 193 No. 1 Col. 11, 14th February 1962
10. Dáil Éireann Debate, Vol. 193. No 1 Col. 11, 14th February 1962
11. Dáil Éireann Debate, Vol. 74 No. 6 Col. 691, 16th February 1939
12. Dáil Éireann Debate, Vol. 74 No. 6 Col. 709 - 710, 16th February 1939
13. Dáil Éireann Debate, Vol. 74 No. 6 Col. 712, 16th February 1939,
14. Dáil Éireann Debate, Vol. 74 No. 6 Col. 714, 16th February 1939
15. Dáil Éireann Debate, Vol. 74 No. 6 Col. 714, 16th February 1939
16. Dáil Éireann Debate, Vol. 74 No. 6 Col. 763, 16th February 1939,

102) Devine, 2008, pp. 479- 480

17. Dáil Éireann Debate, Vol. 77 No. 2 Col. 269, 27th September 1939
18. Devine, Karen M. "A Comparative Critique of the Practice of Irish Neutrality in the 'Unneutral' Discourse." *Journal Irish Studies in International Affairs*, Vol. 19 (2008)
19. Devine, Karen M. "Neutrality and the development of the European Union's common security and defence policy: Compatible or competing?" *Journal Cooperation and Conflict*, Vol. 46 no. 3 (2011)
20. Devine, Karen M. "The Myth of 'the Myth of Irish neutrality': Deconstructing Concepts of Irish Neutrality using International Relations Theories." *Journal Irish Studies in International Affairs*, Vol. 17 (2006)
21. Devine, Karen M. "Irish Political Parties' Attitudes towards Neutrality and the Evolution of the EU's Foreign, Security and Defence Policies." *Irish Political Studies*, Vol 24, Issue 4, (2009)
22. Devine, Karen M. "Stretching the IR Theoretical Spectrum on Irish Neutrality: A Critical Social Constructivist Framework." *International Political Science Review*, Vol. 29 no. 4, (2008)
23. Dorr, Noel. "Ireland at the United Nations." u *Ireland in International Affairs: interests, institutions and identities*, B. Tonra and E. Ward (eds.). Dublin: Institute of Public Administrations, 2002
24. Dudley, Edwards O. and B. Ransom (eds), *James Connolly: Selected Political Writings*. New York, Grove Press, 1974.
25. Duggan, John P. *Neutral Ireland and the Third Reich*. Totowa, N.J: Barnes & Noble, 1985.
26. Dwyer, T. Ryle, *De Valera's finest hour: In search of national independence, 1932-1959*, Dublin, Mercier Press, 1982.
27. Dwyer, T. Ryle. *Irish neutrality and the USA, 1939-47*, Dublin and Totowa, N.J: Gill and Macmillan , 1977.
28. Dwyer, T. Ryle. *De Valera : the man & the myths*. Dublin, Ireland : Poolbeg, 1991.
29. Fanning, Ronan. "Neutrality, Identity, and Security: The Example of Ireland." U *Small States and the Security Challenge in the New Europe*. Werner Bauwens, Armans Clesse, and Olav F. Knudsen (eds.). London: Brassey's, (1996)
30. Fanning, Ronan. *Irish Neutrality: An Historical Review*. *Irish Studies in International Affairs* Vol. 1, No. 3, str. 27-38, Royal Irish Academy, 1982.
31. Fine Gael Policy Action Unit. *Beyond neutrality: security, social justice and responsibility*. Dublin, 2003: <http://issuu.com/tcmeditorial/docs/beyond-neutrality>
32. Fisk, Robert. *In time of war: Ireland, Ulster, and the price of neutrality, 1939-45*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1983.
33. Flash Eurobarometer 284. *Lisbon Treaty PostReferendum Survey*. Ireland 2009.; http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/flash/fl_284_en.pdf
34. Gageby, Douglas. *The last secretary general: Sean Lester and the League of Nations*. Dublin: Town House, 1999.
35. Government of Ireland, 1996 - White Paper on Foreign Policy: 'External challenges and opportunities', 26 March 1996.
36. Huff, Ariella. *The Discursive Construction of the CSDP in the British, Irish and Polish Parliaments 1998-2008: Comparisons, Contrasts and Challenges*. http://www.euce.org/eusa/2011/papers/3k_huff.pdf
37. Kennedy, Michael. *Ireland and the League of Nations, 1919-46*. Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 1996.

38. Longford, Thomas P. O'Neill. *Eamon de Valer*, London: Hutchinson, 1970
39. Lyons, F.S.L. *Ireland Since The Famine*. London: Wiedenfeld & Nicolson, 1971.
40. Moody, T. W. et al. (eds), *A New History of Ireland*, Oxfor.; Clarendon Press 1976.
41. Salmon, T. *Unneutral Ireland: An Ambivalent and Unique Security Policy*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.
42. Sinnott, Richard at al. *Attitudes and Behaviour in the Referendum on the Treaty of Lisbon*. Dublin, 2009, <http://gnothai-eactracha.net/uploads/documents/ucd%20geary%20institute%20report.pdf>
43. Sinnott, Richard. *Attitudes and behaviour of the irish electorate in the referendum on the Treaty of Nice: Results of a survey of public opinion carried out for the European Commission Representation in Ireland*. Dublin, 2001,; http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/flash/fl108_summary_en.pdf
44. Sjursen, Helen. "On NATO's identity." *International Affairs* 40 (4) (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1944-), (2004)
45. Wylie, P. *Ireland and the Cold War: Diplomacy and Recognition, 1949-63*. Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 2006.

Post Cold War Security Architecture and the Role of Neutral States



Jiri Kyrian

NATO and European (permanently) neutral states

Neutrality is not an issue for NATO

NATO was founded as a political-military alliance with the core task of collective defence. As such, logically it could not be neutral. However, it has always respected the neutrality of partner countries.

When we speak about NATO, I would like to underscore its first adjective – it is a political-military organisation. In the alliance's history the relative weight of these two dimensions was not always the same. During the Cold War, the military dimension kept more visibility and importance. However, after the fall of the Berlin Wall and the radical changes that have occurred in the Eastern camp, the political dimensions perhaps did not take the primary role, but it got new content and meaning.

Neutrality and cooperation do not exclude each other. That has been the principle approach of NATO towards other countries since early 1990s, regardless of their foreign and security policy lines. Therefore, the Alliance has decided to extend the "hand of partnership" to the countries of former Eastern bloc. The sole thing that mattered was their willingness to cooperate.

The fall of Berlin Wall and the dissolution of the Soviet Union meant unprecedented changes in the security environment, both in and around Europe. Suddenly, the probability of a large-scale conventional conflict between then competing blocks dramatically sank. The Warsaw Pact was dissolved and the competition of two major political ideologies finally vanished. Black and white vision of "enemies vs. allies" was gone. With it the notion and the content of the concept of neutrality has changed as well. Nevertheless, NATO was also in the process of change – more openness, transparency, as it was presented in the strategic concepts that became public documents as of 1991.

The uncertainty about the development of the former communist countries preoccupied NATO. This notion was especially after the beginning of the conflict in former Yugoslavia.

This uncertainty was an unwelcome side effect of the end of the Cold War. For NATO members the new security architecture in Europe was to be built on three institutions: CSCE (Helsinki final act) which was transformed to Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), North Atlantic Alliance, and the European community.

NATO member states began to look for how to deepen the political ties with countries outside NATO. At the summit in January 1994 in Brussels, NATO has launched the Partnership for Peace programme, as a framework for cooperation with non-NATO countries in Europe. The leading principle was defined as *joint conviction that stability and security in Euro-Atlantic area can be achieved only through cooperation and common action*¹⁰³.

103) Partnership for Peace: Framework Document – Brussels Summit, 10 January 1994

Protection of fundamental freedoms and human rights was central issue of this initiative. Members of PfP reaffirmed commitment to the Helsinki Final Act, the UN charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The key for cooperation was individual approach to each country. In the PfP Framework Document, NATO has offered possibility for cooperation level of the partners' choice without setting the obligation to become a member or to give up the course of partner's course of foreign policy. In June 1997, Declaration at Ceremony of mutual acceptance of the Swiss Individual Partnership Programme (IPP) by Switzerland and NATO, Switzerland expressed in her declaration that:

"(...) for the first time we establish a formal relation with NATO. The participation in the Partnership for Peace does not signal a new orientation of our security policy. But PfP gives a new impulse to our policy of good offices. We appreciate the a-la-carte principle of PfP (...).

*(...) Switzerland is, and intends to stay, neutral. But this is a living neutrality. We understand neutrality as a commitment in favour of stability and security in Europe. Neutrality is not incompatible with solidarity. This is the reason why Switzerland wants to cooperate actively with NATO and the partner states. (...)*¹⁰⁴

With the development of broad partnership agenda in the 1990s, NATO did not intend to abandon its primary mission - collective defence. But what it strived for was to become a centre of cooperation. And you can see that the partnership project of NATO was so successful. It has survived two decades and its potential as well as the number of partners is further growing. It has been broadly accepted by nations, as it is not a one-way street only. The key PfP characteristics are flexibility, bilateral and multilateral dialogue structure, and the non-discriminatory nature. The means that the partner countries are offered the same basis for cooperation activities and discussions with NATO, but have the freedom to choose the content and intensity of their engagement with NATO, in full respect to the character of their foreign policy – be it neutrality, military non-alignment, non-block status etc. Neutrality has really never been an issue for NATO.

Initially, NATO was surprised, and it was a very pleasant surprise, by the active approach of European neutral states. They did not consider their neutrality (as you can see in the Swiss approach) an obstacle to cooperation. Sometimes I have even the impression as if they already became allies – they very often think and act like NATO members. The latest example of this behaviour is active participation of some of them in the NATO Operation *Unified Protector* in Libya.

At the NATO summit in Lisbon we enhanced this agenda even more, recognising cooperative security as one of three NATO core tasks. That shows how important is the cooperation to NATO. That also shows that partners are considered a key to alliance's success. They are so important that for the first time in the alliance's history all partner nations were involved in the debates on the new strategic concept of NATO.

Being a guest in Serbia, I feel obliged to make a few remarks on the relations of NATO with Serbia that declared it status a few years ago.

104) Ogi, Adolf, Minister of Defence of Switzerland. Declaration at Ceremony of mutual acceptance of the Swiss IPP by Switzerland and NATO, June 18th 1997, http://www.nato.int/cps/en/SID-27230B0B-31F00672/natolive/opinions_25625.htm

The relations have not always been easy. We cannot and do not want to delete or ignore some parts of history. That would be indeed a fatal mistake to make. But what I would like to see is that this relationship is not being seen and assessed solely through historical events.

Serbia, just like other partner nations, can choose the intensity, form and content of cooperation. Partnership is not a zero-sum-game, it is not “take it or leave it”. It is a vivid project that should reflect the mutual relationship.

Only a few days ago, Serbia presented its Presentation Document to the allies which is a first step to the Individual Partnership Action Plan. It is a welcome step and I wish Serbia all the best in its future work to develop the partnership with NATO.

In May 1990, Manfred Wörner, NATO Secretary General, made a speech in Bremen, Germany, on the Atlantic Alliance and European security in the 1990s. The main message was: *eternal peace is still nothing more than a sweet dream*¹⁰⁵. He argued in favour of collective solutions that are the means to achieve a more peaceful order.

In this vein, I would like to make a few concluding points:

- neutrality cannot be used as an excuse for non-cooperation (even with NATO).
- neutrality does not represent an obstacle on the part of NATO.
- the nature of relations and cooperation with NATO is voluntary.
- NATO does not review or judge the reasons for neutrality. What matters is the willingness to cooperate.
- NATO is interested in common solutions for European security.

References

1. Address by Secretary General, Manfred Wörner to the Bremer Tabaks Collegium, Brussels, 17 May 1990 http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/1990/s900517a_e.htm
2. Oli, Adolf, Minister of defence of Switzerland. *Declaration at Ceremony of mutual acceptance of the Swiss IPP by Switzerland and NATO*, 18 Jun. 1997, http://www.nato.int/cps/en/SID-27230B0B-31F00672/natolive/opinions_25625.htm
3. Partnership for Peace: Framework Document – Brussels Summit, 10 January 1994.

¹⁰⁵) Address by Secretary General, Manfred Wörner to the Bremer Tabaks Collegium, Brussels, 17 May 1990 http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/1990/s900517a_e.htm

Srdjan Gligorijevic

The Common EU Security and Defence Policy – a unique framework for cooperation in the field of security

Without a doubt the Common Security and Defence Policy of the European Union represents a unique framework for security and defence cooperation, since it is based on a unique strategic culture, an amalgam that consists of European members of NATO, then of former Warsaw Pact members, and finally former non-aligned countries and current neutral countries. The Republic of Ireland, was the first neutral states to join the then EEC in 1973. Twenty one years later, the EU was joined by 3 other European neutral states Austria, Sweden and Finland. Two states that had belonged to the Non-Aligned Movement, Malta and Cyprus, joined the EU during the so-called “big bang” of the EU enlargement in 2004, while many authors consider that Slovenia, as a of the former part of Yugoslavia, can be also regarded as a non-aligned country.

Strategic culture can be defined as a set of beliefs, viewpoints and norms pertaining to the use of military force, primarily formed in accordance with historic experience. One often loses sight of the fact that the EU is above all a security community. A security community is a community within which there is a firm guarantee that its members will not clash physically, i.e. by force of arms, but will resolve mutual problems in some other way. When establishing the definition of the security community in 1957, Karl Deutsch described it as a group of individuals who have become integrated. In the same manner, the “architect” of the European integration Jean Monnet, chose unification and joint control over the production of coal and steel, the key raw materials for the defence industry. As the starting point of the strategic cooperation primarily between France and Germany, and therefore also of the broader European family, the process of European integration rejected almost all historically inherited hatred, bringing down borders and completely rejecting war as a mean of resolving mutual problems. By this very fact, relations between European states, and even the lives of ordinary citizens were changed.

The core of European integration, and thus also of the European Security Community, is composed of a series of common values, norms, rules and principles, adopted by all members of the Community. Tangible European integration in the field of security and defence only came at the end of the entire process, regardless of the initial enthusiasm in early 1950s, based on the (failed) project of the European Defence Community. Cooperation at the European level in the field of security had stalled until the beginning of 1990s. The dissolution of Yugoslavia was the crucial event that prompted the creation of a special common security identity of the then already established EU. There was a need to address the issue of strategic competence of the EU for acting its immediate surroundings, before everything else, thus also on the wider global scene. For this reason, the Amsterdam Treaty of 1997 reaffirmed segments that partially appeared already in the Maastricht Treaty – a firm commitment to a progressive shaping of a common security

policy that can lead toward joint defence. On that occasion, the Petersburg Tasks were also formally incorporated in the agreement on the European Union. European Security and Defence Policy was initiated *de facto* in 1998 in St. Malo (at the meeting between French President Chirac and British Prime Minister Blair), and *de jure* in June 1999, the EU Council in Cologne. These two events were the key moments for the creation of the framework for the development of the common European strategic culture. Since then, one of the main obsessions or major worry which frequently finds its place in debates about the sense, development and future of European security, is the possibility that the development of the European Security and Defence Policy could undermine NATO's credibility. The 2003 European Security Strategy is an attempt to define strategic priorities more precisely using a proactive approach, instead of the previously used reactive one. In other words, that was an attempt to create a doctrinaire base for a convincing role of the EU on the international scene. Exactly in this document it was very clearly stated, that it is necessary to develop a strategic culture which will form conditions for early, rapid, and when necessary powerful, intervention.

In any case, the EU has a series of visible deficiencies preventing it from becoming a decisive and efficient global player. On the other hand, one must acknowledge that European strategic culture as well as the means and capabilities at its disposal are still in their infancy, while a special problem is posed by the political will to use these means. In EU security activities there is the omnipresent need to respond to different and potentially opposing interests of member states. In its essence, the European strategic culture is a sum of different national strategic cultures of all twenty seven member states. Many among them are proverbially restrained. Scandinavian countries, for example, have a developed tradition of participating in peacekeeping missions. On the other hand, based on their legacy as colonial powers, France and Great Britain are prepared and have the capabilities to deploy in various parts of the world. In addition, European countries also differ in their manner of understanding trans-Atlantic relations: some see the strengthening of this relationship as the foundation of European security, while others advocate a rounding off of the concept of European autonomy in field of security and defence. A special topic is presented by the different economic potentials of member states, their differences in territory, in population, etc. For this reason, EU strategic culture is essentially built by harmonizing priorities of individual strategic cultures. However, when it is not possible to achieve harmony, there is the familiar lack of coherence, as well as paralysis of institutions and action. As opposed to national strategic cultures, that formed and developed through historical experiences, today's European strategic culture is more a product of a political will reflected in precise agreements, action initiatives and the building of appropriate institutions.

Deployment of troops from EU member states in the field is the primary issue, which frequently defies consensus. The deficiency of military capabilities of the Union led to the shifting of the focus of activity in the framework of the common foreign security policy towards mainly deploying civilian missions. If we recall those first steps of the European Security and Defence Policy, the St. Malo Declaration, the Helsinki Headline Goal, etc., we will see that the goals mainly focused on military deployment in EU operations. Over time, there came a shift toward civilian aspects of EU's operations within the framework of the CSDP. For this reason, the EU today is primarily engaged in rule of law missions, police missions, security sector reforms, etc.

Most changes and new provisions in the Lisbon Treaty pertain exactly to the field of security and defence, starting from the change of the name of the European Security and Defence Policy to the Common Security and Defence Policy, as the expression of the need for the strengthening and better coherence of this concept through a series of other introduced solutions. Above all there is the famous clause on mutual defence ((Article 42.7 of the Lisbon Treaty), which to a large extent brought into question the neutral status of some EU member states. Currently, the CSDP is one of the biggest challenges and tests for the overall external and internal credibility of the EU.

Finally, it is worth mentioning that the expansion of the European Security Community toward the Western Balkans, in other words the expansion of European norms, rules, potentials and scruples to this region, will help to make instability and the possibility of new conflicts in the broader European region less likely. Finally, I would like to add that these days, when discussions about the future of the EU are in progress and when some pessimistic analysts are speculating about its demise, I wish to express my personal conviction that even if such not very likely prognoses become a reality, the European Security Community will not cease to exist.

Dr. Sandro Knezović

Neutrality vs. Collective Security – Economic Dimension – A View from Croatia

Dilemmas about appropriate frameworks for national security of Croatia were part of a very important debate from the early 90s, for obvious reasons. In general, when one speaks about the collective security in Croatia, he/she speaks about NATO membership. The accession to NATO was definitely one of two main foreign policy goals of Croatia in past 20 years. With very complicated recent history and security environment, it was the issue that caused very important debates between the proponents of the opposed opinions. The question that was on the table was how is it possible for the small state with very limited strategic and economic capacities to insure the long lasting security and capability to find its place within international arena in a globalized world. There were two options – either to join the existing framework of collective security which is NATO, or to do something else. A very important issue in these debates was identity, due to strong feeling of belonging to the West, especially in the early and late 1990s. Neutrality as such was never a part of serious debate in Croatia, given the fact that there was certain amount of awareness that it requires certain capacities from the country in order to be able to claim neutrality. Also, the debates were conducted in, I would dare to say, very inappropriate way, since participants who were against the accession to NATO, were not offering any alternatives, while those who favoured joining NATO were not providing enough reliable evidence or information. Obviously, there was a significant lack of reliable sources of information and there was a need for a thoroughly research on the subject.

This is exactly why the Institute for International Relations in Zagreb conducted the project entitled ***Cost and Benefits of Croatian Accession to NATO***. During its implementation, we have analyzed various factors that are relevant for this topic: macro-economic data, Foreign Direct Investments' (FDI) credit rating, GDP growth, military related spending in NATO and non-NATO countries and others. The main focus of the project was set on analyzing the impact of NATO membership on political stability, how it affects the preconditions for economic stability and growth, and how it influences the cooperation within the region of South Eastern Europe. I would start by quoting the Washington Treaty (NATO founding Treaty), and unlike the majority who quote Article 5, I would like to remind you on frequently forgotten, Article 2, which says that *Member countries will seek to eliminate conflicts in their economic policies and will encourage economic collaboration between any, or all of them*. One may conclude that analyzing NATO only through political-security lenses, while disregarding its capacity to contribute to economic stability, would be more than inappropriate, especially for transitional, post conflict countries such as Croatia. Therefore, one of main arguments in favour of NATO accession for these countries, with weak economy and the need to provide welfare and economic opportunities for the society as such, refers to the expectations that joining the allegedly only effective system of collective security will lead to the following: a) higher level of security, second, b) decrease of security or military related spending, c) it will set the country into favourable position for achieving significant economic, financial and developmental benefits. It

should be also mentioned that at the time when the research was conducted, there was a general feeling that the countries of South Eastern Europe have, at least to a certain extent, a consensus that NATO would be an appropriate framework to tackle long-lasting and still existing security dysfunctions within the region and one of viable solutions for the long-lasting political stability.¹⁰⁶

This is essential for economic growth of the countries of the region, for both their development, but also for their capacity to cooperate economically within the region. What is the rationale for such a statement? First of all, one of the main arguments for the accession of countries of the region to NATO is the fact that membership requires meeting tough criteria and, hence, stabilizes democracy. Furthermore, becoming a member of such a powerful political-military alliance means sharing the same, broadly accepted democratic values and means which leads to, at least to a certain extent, improved international legitimacy of each member state. On the other hand, there are general misunderstandings in the region about the logics of criteria to join NATO, due to a certain mismatch between the self-perception and current geo-strategic realities, as well as high, unrealistic expectation, especially those attached to short-term periods – almost everyone wants to have a change over night, which is highly unlikely to happen.

Of course, we have detected costs of joining NATO in our analysis, which are numerous: there are personnel costs, acquisition costs, operational costs, research and development and other costs that are measurable. Apart from those measurable, there are also costs that are not that easily to detect and measure, more psychological or, if you wish, hypothetical ones, such as: increased risk of terrorism, loss of sovereignty and other. And finally, there are certain obligations that NATO membership carries along. As first, there is the recommendation that defence budgets should be above the 2% of GDP (but this issue is rather questionable, we can speak about how the old, even the richer members of NATO are dedicated to this). The second one is commitment to military involvement in operations and missions around the globe, which opens a possibility of participating soldiers being killed or at least badly wounded. How to communicate this with the public in one post conflict state? Also, there is a requirement to modernize and restructure the troops in accordance with NATO standards. And there are political obligations/risks – indeed joining NATO means joining the powerful, but not always a popular alliance, which also indicates possible threats.

Costs of joining, not only NATO, but the EU, are more visible than benefits, which are much more illusive. However, still, there are certain direct benefits, in form of potentially reduced military costs (decrease in the number of military personnel), more favourable conditions for buying and selling military equipments, more favourable offset arrangements and others. And finally, being a member of collective security system means contribution to democratic reforms and stability, not only of the country in case, but of the region as well, hence justifying the Croatian accession to NATO and membership in the alliance as well. Also, these benefits, at least to a certain extent, may be transferred to the wider population of any given country, in form of so-called safety dividend - living under the NATO security umbrella may be an important factor for the quality of life of average citizens.

106) At the time, some of the South Eastern Europe countries were members, some of them were ready to join, and a considerable number of South Eastern European countries was already taking part in various NATO's frameworks - Partnership for Peace, Membership Action Plan etc.

All these benefits are directly or indirectly transferred to national economy. Without a doubt, political and military security is very important for business environment. By reducing the country risk, it may increase the credit rating of the country, bringing down interest rates for loans. Apart from this, as credit rating and security assessment are commonly used in any kind of investment decision, there should be a positive impact of NATO membership on FDI, as well as domestic fixed capital creation.

Coming back to Croatia as an example, as I previously said, NATO membership was one of two major policy goals. However, the public relations (PR) campaign from the side of government was done in a very inappropriate way, and therefore the public support towards the issue was one of biggest concerns, what was even clearly stated in a document from NATO Summit in Riga. Before the 2009 when Croatia joined NATO, the support to NATO membership was always somewhere below 50%. It was going up only as a result of some kind of detected security threat in surroundings, but this rise was evident only during the existence of the threat. What is more interesting is the fact that since Croatia became member of NATO, the support to membership never dropped below 55%.

It is obvious that the changes that country went through during the last decade in overcoming obstacles to join NATO were significant. Some of the examples include downsizing of military, in the late 1990. In that time, Croatian military had 270 - 280 thousand soldiers and officers. Today is downsized to a small, professional and deployable force, due to reforms of the whole security system. The process of depolitization of military was also very important for meeting the standards to join NATO, but this remains a constant process given the very nature of relation between the politics and security sector - tendency of politics wanting to control the security sector always exists.

When we speak about the costs and benefits of accession to NATO, one has to be very clear that usually process of accession to NATO goes hand in hand with the process of accession to the EU. It is sometimes very difficult to differentiate between the two, since these two process could be described as "two sides of the same coin", when it comes to meeting the standards. Therefore, the costs for meeting the NATO standards are often overlapping with those for meeting the EU ones. Without any doubt, we can clearly argue that the process itself has contributed to the general scale of country's stability, to its international reputation and to the overall change of the picture about the country - from a problem within the region to a partner within the region. Potentially, this change, politically and security-wise, can contribute to economic welfare and growth, even to improved cooperation within the region.

To conclude - Yes, NATO is primarily a politically-military alliance with significance for the stability of Trans-Atlantic community and with global relevance. However, one has to be aware that neglecting the NATO's potential to contribute to long-term economic stability while insuring political stability and security, would be more than inappropriate, especially for the countries in the process of post-socialist transition and moreover, for the post-conflict states. NATO accession, at least for Croatia, meant that this country has achieved recognized stability, it meant compliance with broadly accepted democratic standards and somewhat different strategic position in the region. That may open a perspective for increased FDI, better credit rating and other economic benefits as well. However, the region of South Eastern Europe economically is not that attractive, since

these are only small states with very limited markets. However, if you have a potential for a long term stability where countries can jointly approach issues like FDI, of course, they would be more attractive. As a result, there may be a completely different image not only of the country in question, but of the region as a whole, not underestimating still existing security deviation within it. In addition, there are examples in a wider region about the fact that NATO can serve as a form of peaceful resolution of serious problems. Examples of Greece and Turkey and Hungary and Romania tell us about that. Just take a look at Turkey and Greece. For more than 50 years these two states have problems in their mutual relations, but during the membership, the thing never bursted into flames.

It is obvious that costs of joining NATO were great, and in addition there are obligations when country becomes a member. Nevertheless, being a part of collective security framework has very visible benefits and this is also significant for the region which is still burdened with severe security dysfunctions from the past. One can conclude that this type of framework seems to be opening many opportunities for political and economic stabilization within the region. On the other hand, it is very difficult to imagine small countries, with limited economic and strategic capacities (such as Croatia and others in the region), being able to insure stability and economic prosperity on their own, in the period when even countries of greater importance in international relations are joining forces to do so.

Post Cold War World and “new neutral states”



Dragan Štavljanin

Post Cold War “neutral” states - Moldova, Turkmenistan, Ukraine

Turkmenistan

Soon after gaining independence, President of Turkmenistan at the time, Saparmyrat Ataýewiç Nyýazow, disclosed the intention for Turkmenistan to become a neutral state. Inspired (at least declaratively) by the examples of Switzerland and Austria, President Nyýazow based his political doctrine, entitled *Positive Neutrality*, on the following postulates: respect of sovereignty and territorial integrity of other states, avoiding the use of force in relations with other states, priority of the authority of the United Nations in international relations, cooperation with all countries in the world, avoiding membership in military and military-political blocks, the right of self-defence, etc. This doctrine was recognized by the United Nations in 1995.¹⁰⁷

Since becoming an independent state in 1991, Turkmenistan mainly adhered to an isolationist policy, which was also symbolized by the *Declaration of Permanent Positive Neutrality*. Since then, Turkmenistan has rejected engagement in any regional alliance or organization with a military component, although it participates as a guest at meetings of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, is a member of the UN, OECD, the Non-Aligned Movement, as well as an associate member of The Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS). In addition, it was the first Central Asian country to become a member of the NATO Partnership for Peace program in 1994, one year before neutrality was recognized by the UN. However, its membership still remains only on paper.

Turkmenistan consists mostly of deserts and has the smallest population of all former five Central Asian republics of the Soviet Union. A territory of almost 500 thousand square kilometres has a population of only approximately 5 million. Although Turkmenistan has no border disputes, the foreign policy doctrine of this country is built on concerns regarding the internal conflict in Tajikistan, the instability in Northern Afghanistan, and the traditional tensions in its relations with Iran. On the other hand, the leadership of Turkmenistan neglects the fear that Islamic fundamentalism from Iran could be transferred to its soil, since Iran adheres to the Shiite version of Islam, while in Turkmenistan the Sunnite variant of Islam is practiced, which is in fact under the state control. Simultaneously, as opposed to other countries of Central Asia that more actively aided the USA in the war against terrorism in Afghanistan, Turkmenistan mainly remained on the sideline, allowing only air trespassing of its territory by US planes in cases of non-combat and humanitarian cargo transportation. Remaining sidelined has prevented the spread of the radical Islamist influence in Turkmenistan, otherwise active in this region, such as Hizb-ut-Tahrir which advocates a resurrection of the 7th century Islamic caliphate.

107) Editor's note: Having adopted a Resolution on the permanent neutrality of Turkmenistan in 1995, the UN General Assembly officially recognized Turkmenistan as a neutral country.

Turkmenistan authorities admit that their country is among the weakest in the region, and that, in essence, it does not have the capacity to defend itself. When it comes to military power, the one hundred eight thousand soldiers who were part of the ex-Soviet army in 1992, was reduced to only eleven thousand by 1996 as the new army of Turkmenistan.

In addition, this country is still dependant on its neighbours, primarily Russia, for gas exports, which are the main source of its income. Turkmenistan is the fourth country in the world when it comes to gas reserves, and it possesses approximately 4% of world reserves. The consequences of the position of this country in geopolitical sense vis-à-vis Russia were obvious in 2009, during the nine-month interruption of gas exports through Russia due to a price dispute. Even though the opening of alternative pipelines across Iran and China has reduced Turkmenistan's dependence on Russia, its leaders desire to secure that no foreign power will have a reason to think that they are distancing themselves from it.

In the meantime, authorities in Ashgabat have already during the time of President Nyýazow undertaken certain unofficial initiatives, primarily by preventing the US air force to fly over the territory of Turkmenistan to supply troops in Afghanistan. Russia claims that US forces were able to approach almost all air bases in Turkmenistan, including the airport in Nebit-Dag near the border with Iran, previously reconstructed with the financial support of Washington. In addition, authorities in Moscow emphasize that US military experts also refurbished part of the international airport in Ashgabat for the needs of the US army, and that not only humanitarian, but also military shipments are being transported across Turkmenistan's air space.

For this reason, Russian media posed a question if Turkmenistan had relativized its concept of independence, accusing the USA of taking advantage of the situation, given the fact they were dealing with an autocratic society that was lacking any form of control and had a closed flow of information. Such speculations gained momentum when the new President Berdimuhamedow attended the NATO Summit in Bucharest in 2008. At that time, he also met the then US President George Bush.

Since that Turkmenistan shares an 800 kilometre long border with Afghanistan, the interest of Washington to expand cooperation with the authorities in Ashgabat is understandable. In addition, in 2010 Turkmenistan adopted a five-year program of modernization of its army, through accepting foreign aid.

However, all these initiatives are realized through the informal channels, and were never disclosed and formalized, thus enabling Turkmenistan authorities to preserve at least a semblance of credibility when they find themselves in a situation to deny allegations of violating neutrality. They permanently leave the possibility that initiatives as ones mentioned above could be cancelled, if the international situation changes, or if their more powerful neighbours criticize such an engagement.

Turkmenistan's key foreign policy goal is the preservation and stabilization of the ruling regime. Although after the election of Gurbanguly Mälikgulyýewiç Berdimuhamedow (after the sudden death of Saparmyrat Nyýazow in 2007), there was a certain will for wider cooperation with the international community, Turkmenistan mainly retained its isolationist foreign policy, by using the proclaimed concept of neutrality as a shield to avoid undesired international meddling in its affairs.

During the reign of Nyýazow, western media jokingly labelled Turkmenistan as a “Stalinist Disneyland”.

The concept of neutrality is an excuse that the leaders of Turkmenistan use to mask the essential weaknesses of the country. In addition, this enables them to reject any form of cooperation that they feel could lead to excessive dependence on any foreign power. Although in this respect Russia represents the biggest threat, authorities in Ashgabat are also concerned about the possible influence of the USA, Iran, and increasingly China. In addition, neutrality enables the regime in Turkmenistan to reject the criticism of international organizations because of repression of opponents on the domestic political scene. Appeals from the EU and OECD to improve human rights are always greeted with declarations from Ashgabat authorities that this is interfering in internal affairs of a neutral country. These reasons for neutrality are also being used by the new President to strengthen his rule in a country that is weak according to many parameters.

Turkmenistan was always more ready for international cooperation in the field of economy. The authorities of this country have always given priority to bilateral cooperation related to multinational organizations and projects. This is especially important for the country's economic development, since Turkmenistan lacks domestic expertise in key economic sectors. The majority of foreign investments in Turkmenistan is in energy and the construction industry. Turkmenistan does not have a sufficient number of experts and capacities to exploit oil and gas from the sea, therefore, this country engages companies from other countries, primarily from the United Arab Emirates, USA, Russia, China and Germany. In addition, most gas pipelines for exporting this utility were built by foreigners. Recently, China and Iran have built gas pipelines in order to be able to import this utility.

Without gas from Turkmenistan, the Nabuko pipeline – an EU project – will not be able to start functioning. However Turkmenistan is still assessing if it pays off to participate in this project, fearing from the reactions of Russia and Iran. For this reason, Turkmenistan is not prepared to join the consortium until the construction of the pipeline finally begins. In addition, authorities in Ashgabat are also not willing to participate in other international economic projects that would antagonize other countries in the region, primarily China.

The security of the Caspian basin is one of the fields where Turkmenistan seems to be willing to participate in multilateral initiatives, but only to a certain extent. This country always participates at summits of Caspian coastal states, and has indicated readiness to sign an agreement on the determination of a border on the Caspian Sea if this is accepted by all five interested states. Simultaneously, Turkmenistan is persistently refusing to join multinational security initiatives, such as the Russian Caspian force (CASFOR)¹⁰⁸ or the Caspian Guard¹⁰⁹, under USA patronage.

108) Editor's note: Caspian Force is a project for forming joint maritime forces of the five Caspian states: Iran, Russia, Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan and Turkmenistan. This project was proposed by Russia in October 2005, in order to prevent terrorism and trafficking in arms, narcotics and weapons of mass destruction in the Caspian Sea.

109) Editor's note: Caspian Guard is a regional security program started in 2003 and supported by the US. The aim of the program is assisting Azerbaijan and Kazakhstan to prevent and respond to transnational threats, such as terrorism, nuclear proliferation and human and drug trafficking

Starting from the fact that inclusion in any of these and other international initiatives and organizations could create problems for Turkmenistan in relations with countries that would remain outside such groups - this only reinforces the focus of Ashgabat authorities on the use of foreign policy in a manner that ensures the preservation of the current position. Given that Central Asia is the scene of rivalry between the great powers and potentially of the global war on terrorism, immediately after the death of the first President of Turkmenistan, Niyazov in 2006, competition began for influence on the foreign policy of this country, in terms of it abandoning neutrality. The interest of Washington, Moscow, Beijing and Tehran for influence in Turkmenistan is understandable given its importance because of huge gas reserves, the proximity of the Caspian Sea, as well as of Iran and Afghanistan.

Even though Turkmenistan partially opened up to the international community during the presidential mandate of Berdimuhamedow, its engagement is focused on economic projects and fields where it lacks domestic expertise. When it comes to security, Turkmenistan mainly remained isolated, using the concept of permanent neutrality as a shield in keeping its distance from its powerful neighbours, fearing the possibility of becoming a satellite state.

Therefore, in the case of Turkmenistan, neutrality is mainly a synonym for self isolation, i.e. it serves the function of preserving an autocratic regime. However, having in mind the mentioned turbulence and reconfiguration of international relations, in the future Turkmenistan will increasingly face a challenge to preserve its neutrality.

Moldova

Moldova is the only country in Europe (except for the Republic of Serbia) that has proclaimed the status of permanent neutrality since the end of the Cold War. This status was unilaterally proclaimed through its 1994 Constitution.

At that time, this seemed as a wise option for at least two reasons. Firstly, Moldova, which was a part of the USSR until the beginning of the 1990s, had no history, in other words no legacy of any army, therefore, the proclamation of permanent neutrality was to serve as a substitute for the strong army that it did not have, as it was the cheapest and most efficient way for it to defend its sovereignty and independence. Consequently, in the case of Moldova, neutrality can be defined also as a strategy of survival, above all of survival between the powerful neighbours (Ukraine, Romania), as well as a response to the pressure of Russia to be included in various security structures formed by the Kremlin. The second reason to proclaim neutrality is the presence of Russian troops on the left bank of the Dniester River, i.e. in the separatist region of Transnistria.

Even though the Constitution of Moldova prohibits the presence of foreign troops in its territory, Russian troops have been stationed there ever since the dissolution of the Soviet Union and will apparently remain for a long time, regardless of the many times repeated promise to withdraw pronounced at OECD summits. For this reason, some authors regard the proclamation of neutrality as a means of stimulating the departure of Russian troops (in a similar context as in the case of Austria after World War II), although the Moldovan

version of neutrality more resembles neutralism¹¹⁰ than the West European model of permanent neutrality.

In addition, the military neutrality of Moldova is treated by many only as an academic concept. Basic documents and foreign policy, security and defence strategies do not elaborate this concept of neutrality further. Furthermore, to date no country has recognized Moldovan neutrality.

Russia did not succeed in getting Moldova into various security structures that it has formed, such as the Collective Security Treaty Organization (in addition to Russia, members of this organization are also: Byelorussia, Armenia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan and Tajikistan), and the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (established in 2001 by the leaders of China, Russia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan). However, regardless of this, Russia has retained its troops on the territory of Moldova, thereby violating international law and demonstrating a lack of respect for the Moldovan concept of neutrality. This fact is being ignored by some countries that claim that the recent military exercises within the Partnership for Peace framework have violated the military neutrality of Moldova.

In this moment, conditionally speaking, Moldova is moving closer to NATO. This political course was confirmed by the statement of the Minister of Defence of Moldova, Vitalie Marinuta, at the beginning of this year, who said that NATO membership is crucial for accession to the European Union and that becoming part of the North Atlantic Alliance is no longer a taboo topic in his country.

Moldova has participated in Partnership for Peace since 1994, from the same year as Russia. However, just like in the case of Moscow, this membership was mainly only formal. Still, in September 2006, two exercises within the PFP framework were organized in Moldova. Some months earlier, in July 2006, the Government of Moldova adopted its (PFP) Individual Partnership Action Plan. This program was initiated in 2002 at the NATO summit in Prague and is open for those countries that have the political will and are able to deepen the relationship with NATO. The goal is to deepen cooperation in various segments in order to support reform efforts of the country that enters into such an arrangement. The Moldovan IPAP is fully harmonized with the European Neighbourhood Policy Action Plan entered into by the EU and Moldova. Neutrality was twice mentioned in the very text of the IPAP, but this does not mean that Moldovan neutrality has been internationally recognized. In addition to Moldova, Georgia, Azerbaijan, Armenia and Kazakhstan joined this program too.

Of course, due to its declared neutrality, the discussion about the eventual membership of Moldova in NATO was long a suppressed topic, so that while approximately 60% of citizens support accession to the EU, only 25% feel that Moldova should enter the North Atlantic Alliance. Approximately 35% of citizens feel that neutrality is the best way to secure Moldovan security, while 15% feel that it is better for the country to enter the

110) Editor's note: Neutralism is usually defined as a formal military and political non-alignment of a state, which is not obliged to follow the rules and practices of neutral states. Italy at the outbreak of World War I (1914-1915) and Tito's Yugoslavia during the second half of the fifties of the twentieth century are a good example of the states in the status of "neutrality".

Collective Security Treaty Organization, headed by Russia. All this indicates the division, even confusion, within the Moldovan community, as well as the lack of information.

Therefore, the neutrality of Moldova can be treated as a strategy for a more efficient realization of national interests, however, the problem is that its national interest is still not defined, let alone realized. Vladimir Socor considers neutrality of Moldova before all as an invention of the Russian Federation that desires a guarantee that Moldova will not join NATO in the foreseeable future. Ion Marandici from the Soros Center in Moldova and the editor of the Europa.md portal – feels that Moldova has no visible benefits from its declared status of permanent neutrality. Countries of Central and East Europe, that have joined EU and NATO, have declared this as their national interest in terms of securing a higher level of security.

In the case of Moldova, to retain neutrality may prove to be a more expensive option than to join a military alliance, which would simultaneously ensured better security for this country. In a certain sense, the position of Moldova reminds of the situation of Austria after World War II, which was partially occupied by Soviet troops. The USSR recognized Austria and withdrew its troops only after Austria offered guarantees that it will declare permanent neutrality.

On the other hand, there is little probability that Russia will ever withdraw its troops from Transnistria, a part of Moldova, because this is not only about endeavouring to thus prevent Moldova to join NATO – the stake is much higher. This is one of the rare cases where Russia has troops deployed outside its own territory, as an additional factor of deterring NATO from spreading to the East. Let's remind ourselves of the attempt of Ukraine and Georgia to obtain a Road Map (MAP - Membership Action Plan) at the NATO summit in Bucharest in 2008, and the Russian intervention in Georgia that happened that same year.

Therefore, the declaration of neutrality may have been the only option for Moldova to avoid being drawn into various security alliances led by Russia. On the other hand, as long as Russian troops are in its territory, Moldova cannot count on NATO membership, because the North Atlantic Alliance does not wish to incorporate countries that have not implemented fundamental political and security sector reforms, and especially not countries with territorial disputes or with deployed foreign troops. This was what Russia counted on with the intervention in Georgia, after which it strengthened its military presence in separatist regions of Southern Ossetia and Abkhazia, as well as in the case of its troops in Transnistria.

Therefore, Russia regards Transnistria in the context of its broader strategic goals which imply the restructuring of the current security framework in Europe and the reduction of NATO influence, primarily in its own neighbourhood, the so called “near abroad”.

Positions of Serbia and Moldova are similar to the extent that by declaring neutrality, they both strive to prevent or buffer being drawn into the security orbit of major powers. Simultaneously, by giving up a clear determination to join NATO for the time being, Moldova is attempting to avoid giving an excuse to the Kremlin to have even more influence in its affairs, as had transpired in the case of Georgia, which had provoked Russian intervention by playing the NATO integration card. When it comes to Serbia,

by the concept of neutrality and by sending unofficial signals that it can remain the last Russian stronghold in the Balkans – which is the essence of the story about the real character of the Russian Centre for Emergency Situations in Nis – it is trying to raise the stakes in negotiations with the West also about its European integrations, more precisely to separate this issue as much as possible from the status of Kosovo, which Brussels and Washington are apparently linking.

Neutrality is not a guarantee of security. On the contrary, it can only make a country's position more difficult, having in mind the emergence of new increasingly global security challenges that even much more powerful countries cannot resolve on their own, primarily in the case of terrorism.

Ukraine

The idea about Ukrainian neutrality was mentioned in its Declaration of Independence in 1990, while it was still part of the USSR. At that time this meant separation from the Union and the maintaining of the status of a country without nuclear arms. When Ukraine became independent, the idea of neutrality implied striving to secure conditions for strengthening the state (state building), which is a very important project having in mind not only national, political, regional, but also religious, and even linguistic divisions (primarily the large, approximately 10 million strong Russian community), the big influence of Russia, and the presence of its Black Sea fleet in Sevastopol. Subsequently, the intention was also to prevent a revival of the former USSR and simultaneously to express a desire for European integrations, which is not opposite to the neutral status, if the concept of neutrality is regarded in a new, and not the classical manner.

However, the efforts of pro-Western authorities in Ukraine at the NATO summit in 2008 in Bucharest, together with Georgia, to obtain a Road Map – ended unsuccessfully. Individual members of the North Atlantic Alliance, primarily France and Germany, refused to support such an initiative, apparently not wishing to provoke a strong reaction of Russia, with which they otherwise have numerous business interests, primarily Berlin. One could say even that the goal of the intervention of Russia in Georgia was in fact to send a message to Ukraine, which was much more important for Moscow, that its approaching NATO would have unforeseeable negative consequences for Russian interests. At that same summit, Putin told Bush that Ukraine is a nonexistent state.

After the government change in Kiev, in 2010 the new pro-Russian President Janukovich initiated the adoption of a law preventing this former Soviet republic to join NATO and confirming its "neutral status". However, cooperation with military alliances and economic integration with Europe are permitted.

For this reason this concept of neutrality in essence means if not leaning toward Russia, then at least leaving space for the spread of its influence in Ukraine. In this regard one could speak of false neutrality, i.e. of neutrality as an ideological myth, not a political reality.

Ukraine, which stands at a boundary between the East and the West, and was through history mainly a pawn in geopolitical games, is obviously forced to balance between Russia and the West. Therefore, it does not want membership in NATO, but even its pro-Russian

President Yanukovich, during last year's elections proclaimed European integrations as a goal (he anticipated the signing of the Stabilisation and Association Agreement with the EU during 2010). Simultaneously, he refused to join the Customs Union of Russia, Byelorussia and Kazakhstan, suggesting a free trade agreement instead.

Therefore, the concept of neutrality in the case of Ukraine mainly means manoeuvring between two powerful players – Russia and the EU – striving not to come too close or go too far from either of them, in order not to antagonize the other. As much as this may seem as a clever policy, it lacks a long term strategy, but is rather reduced to day to day tactics where moves by Kiev often depend on positions and mutual relations between Moscow, on one and Brussels and Washington, on the other side.

Žarko Petrović

Russia's perception of Serbian neutrality

Russia looks differently at neutral states in the post-Soviet space and at the neutrality of Serbia. States in the post-Soviet area have understood one of NATO's messages, that Jiří Kyrián reduced to the maxim "*neutrality cannot be an excuse for noncooperation*" in his presentation at the conference, and they behave in accordance with this position. For example, Turkmenistan is not a member, but actively participates in bodies of the Commonwealth of Independent States, such as the Cooperation Council for Border Policy. Moldova is a CIS member state, and Ukraine is an associate member, therefore the neutrality of these states is balanced in a manner that does not mean their isolation from the fundamental trends pertaining to security in their regions. Namely, post-Soviet states cooperate with Russia as the dominant factor of security in the region.

Serbia is not a post-Soviet country, and has not, nor does aspire to be a part of integration projects taking place today in that area. Serbian neutrality is useful to Russia, whose basic security paradigm is to halt NATO expansion. Neutral Serbia is (one of the) barrier(s) to NATO's expansion eastwards.

Even though Russia does not intend to return strategically to the territory of Serbia, it will continue to oppose the accession of Serbia into NATO. The reason for this approach is based on a standpoint that the further expansion of NATO towards the East should be stopped. Russian interests in Serbia are defined by the informal Russian foreign policy concept from 2010, published in May 2010 in the Russian issue of Newsweek. Russian interests are narrowed down to economy, energy sector, and a certain level of military cooperation. This document does not mention any strategic vision for Serbia. I am one of those who do not agree that Russia has such a plan with Serbia. I do not think that the construction of the joint Serbian-Russian Base for extraordinary situations in Nis represents a sign of the return of Russia. I do not think that conferences organized in Belgrade about Russian integration projects are something that represents the return of Russia to this area. On the contrary, I think that these initiatives represent more of a support for Serbian neutrality than a plan for any strategic action.

In 2009, Russia presented the initiative for forming a new European Security Treaty. It stressed the need to change the OSCE by creating a new security system. It justified the need for this new system by the fact that there are various levels of security in Europe, i.e. that there are countries in Europe that do not strive for membership either in NATO or in other security integrations (such as the Collective Security Treaty Organization). For this reason, a comprehensive "umbrella agreement" is required which would secure that these states have a certain level of certainty and guarantee of security.

Serbia, as well as Moldavia and Ukraine, fits perfectly to this vision of a new European Security Treaty. In principle, from this perspective, Serbia's neutrality is still fairly important for Russian foreign policy. While during the Cold War the USSR considered the position of the neutral states as a strategic wedge within the territory of European NATO members

nowadays these new “neutral” states in Europe represent a barrier for the expansion of an order that is being established in Europe since the end of the Cold War.

This order changes the post- Cold War system in Europe. Russia does not see itself as the defeated side in the Cold War, but as a side that had voluntarily given up the policy of confrontation and that has adopted a certain system of values. Russia now feels that the order is being changed without its participation and perceives it as a certain threat, since spreading of this order implies also its territorial expansion to the area which was before under the strong influence of Russia, which is now becoming weaker. Also, there is the propagation of norms, standards and values that considerably reduce manoeuvring space for Russia, in a situation when its own norms, standards and values are not as acceptable for populations of the neighbouring countries. And finally, it perceives this order as a threat because both territorial expansion and the expansion of norms bring it in close proximity to Russia’s borders, thus completely changing the security equation inside Russia. It would not be possible to wage the antiterrorist campaign in Chechnya and Dagestan as it is done today, if there was NATO territory on the Russia’s borders.

Serbian membership in NATO is more important as a principle, rather than as a strategic threat. From the strategic aspect, Russia has withdrawn from this region in 2003, when it withdrew its last contingent from KFOR in Kosovo. Russia withdrew in a strategic sense, and potential limitations that would appear with the eventual membership of Serbia in NATO and the EU cannot effectively harm Russia. There are no projects like some large arms exports contracts, or some spectacularly large investment possibilities as would be the case with Ukraine. (Russia made clear long ago that the membership of Ukraine in NATO would be a sort of *casus belli*).

One should not confuse the potentially good cooperation between Russia and NATO within the Partnership for Peace programme or in certain joint actions, with the fact that NATO is a constant “headache” for Russia. The restraining of NATO via Serbia is possible primarily by preventing the rounding off of this order, and then by restraining of NATO itself, which is forced to spend its resources in Kosovo. Thus Kosovo becomes a frozen conflict, and to support Kosovo remaining in the current status is something that Russia can and has the capacity to do, even though it lacks the capacity to help finding a permanent solution for this issue.

Several times, when a discussion about NATO was initiated in Serbia, Russia reacted very energetically. Here, I primarily mean the reaction after the statement of Minister Šutanovac at the beginning of 2010 about potentials and the deliberations relevant to NATO, after which an anti-NATO campaign followed. Russia is aware of its popularity in Serbia, and aware that Serbs and Serbian policy have no negative experiences with Russia, especially lately. Russia is, therefore, ready to carry a general course of support for neutrality at the level of the media and citizens, which is an ideal platform for an uncontroversial policy in Serbia.

The public opinion in Russia, which was never before too important factor in shaping of Russia’s relations and the behaviour toward Serbia, has now become an important factor. This transformation happened in 2008, when Kosovo declared independence without the participation of Russia, and also since the parallel was drawn with and situation in Georgia with Abkhazia and South Ossetia issues. Since then, Serbia has acquired a certain

image in Russia. Although it does not occupy the high post in the list of Russia's interests, and it is not frequently mentioned in the media, it is still better position in the public conscience than it was the case before 2008. Even more importantly, public opinion in Russia has been polarized in such a manner that the eventual abandoning of neutrality and the membership of Serbia in NATO would be perceived negatively, and in the light of the forthcoming electoral process in Russia, this is a very important issue.

To conclude: NATO expansion to Serbia and other states is not something that is linked with some conjuncture with relations between Russia and NATO. NATO expansion as such is unacceptable for Russia and no *reset* will change the Russian standpoint. I personally do not believe that Russia could accept Serbian membership in NATO in any case. However, such changes have already happened in other countries in East Europe, and have shown that the Russian reaction was short-term, because the challenges that exist in relations between Russia and NATO are of such nature, that Russia needs constant support within the organization from member states that have more positive attitude towards it. For this reason, in my conclusion, I would like to say that a potential Serbian membership in NATO would be a major short-term problem in relations with Russia.

BIOGRAPHIES

TANJA MIŠČEVIĆ

Dr. Tanja Miščević is the Chief Negotiator for Serbia's EU Negotiating Team and a professor at the Faculty of Political Science, University of Belgrade. She also teaches at the Diplomatic Academy of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Serbia, and at several foreign universities as a visiting professor. Since 2000, she held posts of the Director of Serbia's EU Integration Office (2005-2008) and of the State Secretary in the Ministry of Defence of the Government of Serbia (2010-2012). In addition, she is the current Vice-President of the European Movement in Serbia.

H.E. MS. METTE KJUEL NIELSEN

H.E. Ms. Mette Kjuel Nielsen, Ambassador of the Kingdom of Denmark to the Republic of Serbia and Republic of Montenegro from 2007 until 2013. Ms. Kjuel Nielsen began her career in the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs in 1983. She served as the First Secretary at the Permanent Mission of Denmark to the UN, covering decolonization, peacekeeping and Security Council Affairs. Afterwards, she was Head of the Section at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in charge of the UN and NATO peacekeeping operations and arms control etc. Prior to her position as Ambassador to Serbia, Ms. Kjuel Nielsen was the Head of the Department for Russia, CIS, the Western Balkans, OSCE, CoE and Council of Baltic Sea States.

OVE BRING

Dr. Ove Bring is the Professor emeritus in international law at Stockholm University and the Swedish National Defence College. Formerly he served as a legal adviser (in public international law) at the Swedish Ministry for Foreign Affairs. Dr. Bring is a Member of the Permanent Court of Arbitration in The Hague. He has an extensive experience in the fields of United Nations peace operations, collective security and human rights.

THOMAS FISCHER

Dr. Thomas Fischer, PhD, studied History, Political Science, and Public and International Law at the Universities of Zurich and Bruxelles. Most recently he was a Research Fellow and a Visiting Lecturer at The Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies (IHEID) in Geneva. Before, he also lectured at the Universities of Zurich, Vienna, and Helsinki. His research interests include Swiss Foreign and Security Policy, Neutrality and the Comparative History of Neutrality, Mediation and Good Offices, International Cold War History and the History of International Organizations.

DRAGAN BOGETIĆ

Dr. Dragan Bogetić holds a Ph.D. in International Relations which he obtained in 1988 at the Faculty of Political Sciences in Belgrade. He works as a scientific counsellor at the Institute for Modern History in Belgrade since 1984. Dr. Bogetić's scientific work is concentrated on the topics of Cold War history and post-World War II diplomatic history of Yugoslavia, with the main focus on Yugoslav relations with the West (in particular with the USA and NATO), USSR and the member states of the Non-Aligned Movement.

JACOB WESTBERG

Dr. Jacob Westberg is a lecturer at the Department of Security and Strategy at the Swedish National Defence College since 2008. In the period 2004-2008 he was a lecturer at the Department of Political Science at the Stockholm University. His research interest encompass the following areas: Nordic defence cooperation (past and present), European integration and transformation (esp. defence cooperation), and Security policy of Sweden.

CHARLY SALONIUS-PASTERNAK

Charly Salonius-Pasternak is a researcher at the Finnish Institute of International Affairs. Since 2005, his research work has been focused on crisis management operations, transatlantic relations and Finnish foreign and security policy. He has served as the international affairs adviser to the senior leadership of the Finnish Defence Forces. He lectures at national and regional defence courses.

FRIDHELM FRISHENSLAGER

Dr. Fridhelm Frischenschlager, PhD, is the Administrative Head of Balkan Studies (Post Graduate Master Program) at the University of Vienna (in co-operation with the Institute of the Danube Region and Central Europe) and president of the Union of European Federalists in Austria. During his political career, Dr. Frischenschlager was the Minister of Defence of Austria (1983 – 1986), Member of the Austrian Parliament (1977-1986), and member of the European Parliament (1996-1999). In addition, in period 2005 -2007 Dr. Frischenschlager was the Secretary General Union of European Federalists, Brussels.

KAREN DEVINE

Dr. Karen Devine, PhD, is a lecturer in International Relations at Dublin City University, Ireland. Her research interests are small state foreign policy, in particular the politics of neutrality in Europe; public opinion on foreign policy in the Europe and the USA; the evolution of the EU's CSDP; and the use of methodological pluralism within critical constructivism in IR.

JIŘÍ KYRIAN

Jiří Kyrian is the deputy ambassador of the Czech Republic in Serbia since 2012. In 2002 he joined the Czech Foreign Service and his career has been closely linked with security policy. He has worked at the Czech Delegation to NATO, Permanent Mission of the Czech Republic to the UN, OSCE and other International Organisations in Vienna. In the period 2010-2012 he served as a Deputy Director of the Security Policy Department, MFA, Prague.

SRĐAN GLIGORIJEVIĆ

Srdan Gligorijević is the Senior Political Officer at the British Embassy Belgrade. Mr. Gligorijević is one of the founders and former Director of Analysis of the International and Security Affairs Centre (ISAC Fund). He has been a Visiting Research Fellow at the NATO Defence College – Rome, as well as at the EU Institute for Security Studies - Paris (2006). His special interests are Common Foreign and Security Policy of the EU (primarily Common Security and Defence Policy of the EU), NATO/PfP, and regional security.

SANDRO KNEZOVIĆ

Dr. Sandro Knezović, PhD, is a Research Fellow at the Department for International Economic and Political Relations of the Institute for Development and International Relations in Zagreb (Croatia). His scientific work is focused on various topics from international relations, especially those related to international and European security (CFSP/CSDP), the EU and NATO enlargement and its impact on the region of Southeast Europe. Until recently, he was the editor-in-chief of Croatian scientific journal 'Croatian International Relations Review'.

DRAGAN ŠTAVLJANIN

Dragan Štavljanin is a journalist in Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty's Balkan service (RFE/RL). He holds an MA in European Studies and International Relations from the Central European University in Prague/Budaest. In 2008 he ran the radio and Internet project on "frozen conflicts", i.e. the possible wider effects of Kosovo independence vis-à-vis Abkhazia, South Ossetia, Nagorno Karabakh and Transnistria. During 2010, Mr. Štavljanin lectured at the Sarajevo-based Peace Support Operations Training Centre (PSOTC) on the Western-Russian relationship. Apart from journalism, in 1992 he served as an assistant to the Minister of Information in the FR Yugoslavia's Government led by Milan Panic.

ŽARKO PETROVIĆ

Žarko Petrović is the Research Director of ISAC Fund. In the period 2010 – 2011 he was a Conflict Analysis Expert to the European Union in Kyrgyzstan. In 2008 – 2009 he served as a Political Officer at the OSCE Mission to Georgia (during the 'five day war') seconded by the Serbian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and in 2007-2008, he served as a Human Rights Officer with the UN Observer Mission in Abkhazia, Georgia. His earlier posts include serving as a Senior Program Officer at Freedom House in Uzbekistan and Kazakhstan. Mr Petrović is a member of the Serbian Bar Association.