How to Cite:

Ruda, V. V. (2021). Ukraine's experience in resolving the Balkan conflict. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5(S2), 785-794. https://doi.org/10.37028/lingcure.v5nS2.1420

Ukraine's Experience in Resolving the Balkan Conflict

Viktoriia V. Ruda

Lugansk State Medical University, Rubizhne, Ukraine

Abstract--- The development of a common foreign policy course and the creation of joint defence have become the main tasks of the European Community from the very beginning of its foundation, and the practical implementation of cooperation in these areas turns out to be rather difficult and runs into certain problems. Being part of the European Community, the member countries are aware of the necessity to pursue such a course in order to obtain the status of a full-fledged subject of international politics, but this does not deprive them of their fears about the loss of their national sovereignty and some foreign policy priorities. The purpose of the study is to study the process of formation and development of cooperation between Western European countries in the field of foreign policy, security and defence, as well as using the experience of the countries of the former Republic of Yugoslavia to resolve the situation on the territory of Ukraine. The comparative approach of peripheral areas emphasises the unsettled situation, which in some cases may seem better than internationally structured and is on the path of consolidation, while in other cases destabilization still strongly affects the development prospects of states. The author's comparative approach can also help to understand the potential that still exists in the Balkans to achieve convincing results in both conflict resolution and peace-building within the framework of the European security system, which is becoming increasingly interconnected and subject to space-time compression and local-global polarization.

Keywords---annexation of Ukrainian territories, conflict in Yugoslavia, European Union, security policy.

Introduction

For a long time, discussions around the conceptual problems of European integration developed against the background of two opposite approaches – federalism and functionalism, which focused on a wide range of issues related to the forms and mechanisms of limiting or strengthening national sovereignty in

the process of integration. The Federalists saw the basis of Western European unity in a common cultural heritage, which was to lay the foundations for political unification. Representatives of this trend gave priority to the political sphere of integration, paying little attention to the economic one. The ultimate goal of the federalists was to create a supranational state in accordance with the principles of centralisation and transfer of political power to the highest level to replace existing countries that are constantly competing.

Denying the idea of creating a federation, representatives of functionalism tried to prove the inexpediency of forming an artificial federal union and insisted on the apolitical nature of integration processes. Considering it necessary to develop cooperation between states to solve problems of common interest, the functionalists viewed such cooperation as a prerequisite for political integration (Kokhanovska et al., 2021; Syafruddin et al., 2021). Federalism was criticized for not taking into account the national interests and goals of the United States, and in practice this could lead to the dominance of the strongest United States. Functionalism was based on the so-called cooperation model, while federalism provided a more rigid supranational model. Both models were later revised and neofunctionalism and neo-federalism emerged to distinguish between old and new theories.

In the 1960s, neofunctionalism became the leading theory of integration in Western Europe. The author of the main provisions of the revised functionalism is the American researcher E. Haas, who not only emphasised the decisive role of the political factor in the integration process, in particular as a factor in the creation of post-national political communities, gradual integration into "low" and "high" politics (Haas, 1958), but also defined European integration as a qualitative process that cannot be equated with interstate cooperation. On the contrary, the theory of the institutional approach to integration has its own differences. Representatives of this direction assign a special role in the interaction of states to its institutions. In their opinion, state institutions are not just instruments of political and economic activity, but special conditions to facilitate understanding by the participants of the integration process (Dubský & Havlová, 2017; Kibalnik, 2018; Minakov, 2018; Cierco Gomes, 2019).

Brzezinski also expressed his views on the global goals and objectives of the West, on the problems of European security and the role of Europe in world politics. After the defeat of the Soviet Union in the Cold War and its subsequent collapse, the only supercountry is the United States, and, according to Z. Brzezinski, the United States should maintain this status as long as possible. He is sceptical about both the economic situation and society in Western Europe and its ability to achieve the ultimate goals of integration. In his opinion, the creation of a politically united Europe, which could become a "world power" in the future, is impossible, since the development of Europe requires "stimulating support" from the United States (Brzezinski, 2000).

Despite significant differences in methodological approaches to international integration processes in Europe, they have much in common. Almost all theoretical studies contain a hypothesis about the diversity of ways of development of the European integration process and calculate its final result: the

creation of a supranational entity, the preservation of the interstate structure, or some other division of powers between the national and European levels. Ukrainian historiography is also represented by a significant number of works on European integration. The study of the European dimension in Ukraine began after it gained independence and proclaimed a course towards integration into European and Euro-Atlantic structures. Many researchers have dealt with the formation of common European security as a result of various conflicts of the 20th and 21st centuries (Cooley, 2018; Sluga, 1998; Kulkova, 2019; Nikiforova, 2019; Kandel, 2020). The purpose of this research is to study the process of formation and development of cooperation between Western European countries in the field of foreign policy, security and defence, as well as to draw a parallel between the Balkan conflict and the annexation of Ukrainian territories (Kurbatova & Khlyap, 2015; Van de Graaf & Colgan, 2017).

Materials and Methods

As the theoretical and methodological basis of the research philosophical positions was chosen on the presence in each social process and phenomenon of several levels of knowledge – general, special and individual. The Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) of the European Union (EU) is considered at the general level of development of human civilisation as a whole, at the general level that determines the features of integration processes in Western Europe, at a special level that characterises the positions of the EU member states, and, finally, at the same level. Historical knowledge of the process of formation and development of a common foreign and security policy is carried out in the following dimensions: retrospective, aimed at understanding the past; presentable aimed at awareness and understanding of modernity; promising aimed at predicting and forecasting the future (Pasiouras & Kosmidou, 2007; Freixas, 2004).

The study was based on the use of civilisational approaches, i.e. recognition of the unity of a number of socio-economic, political, scientific, technical and cultural characteristics: the compatibility of scientific, technical and industrial development of different societies, the proximity of many democratic and legal foundations of social organisation, interaction that highlights common interests in solving global problems. The main principles of the research were the principles of historicism and objectivity. The principle of historicism, as one of the main ones, is associated with the philosophical categories of movement, time, space, but in contrast to the general scientific, philosophical meaning, its use in the historical process allowed revealing the chronological chain of events in the history of peoples, political parties, international organisations and much more. With the help of the principle of historicism, the process of developing the CFSP by the EU member states was revealed in a consistent development, which made it possible to make generalisations, to identify the main trends in the formation of a common foreign policy by the EU member states at the end of the last century. The principle of objectivity required starting only from the facts in their totality, insisted on impartial, truthful coverage of this or that issue when developing the CFSP of the European Union, regardless of stereotypes in society, personal or state interests, etc.

The study was also based on the principle of humanism, which made it possible to analyse certain phenomena in the indivisibility and unity of the interests of a person, ethnic group and humanity based on the priority of universal human values. In accordance with the purpose and objectives of the study, both special general scientific and interdisciplinary and historical methods were widely used. The historical and systemic method made it possible to consider the system of international relations as a whole, to analyse the influence of the geopolitical situation in the world and the national interests of the leading Western European countries on the integration processes. The use of the retrospective method and the method of periodization made it possible to establish the prerequisites for the formation of the CFSP by the member states of the European Union and the main stages of the formation and development of the CFSP. The texts of various agreements on the legal registration of the CFSP were analysed using a comparative historical research method. The problem-chronological method made it possible to identify problems in the formation and development of the CFSP of the European Union in 1991-2004. When studying the settlement of the Yugoslav crisis, the positions of the EU member states, the author used the statistical method and analysis of opinion polls.

Results

The most acute and dangerous from the point of view of international security was the conflict in the Balkans, the aggravation of which led to the first war on the European continent after World War II (Korac, 2006; Tuathail, 2010; Gruber & Verboven, 2001). That is why leading international organisations, including the European Union, tried to resolve the conflict as soon as possible. The events in the Balkans served as a kind of stimulus for a more thorough elaboration of the EU foreign and security policy ideas (Bollen et al., 2010; Knapp et al., 2009; Ifinedo, 2014). The nature of the EU's international activities in the republics of the former Yugoslavia is explained by the specifics of this region, therefore, to better understand the EU's position, it is necessary to take into account the complexity of the situation. The Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (SFRY), which in the 1990s was often called the country of "six republics, five peoples, four languages, three religions, two alphabets and one party" plunged into a continuous crisis that later escalated into a civil war. Its disintegration, as a multinational state, took place in several stages and in different territories in different ways.

Socio-economic, ethnopolitical and ethno-confessional conflicts between representatives of different nations and peoples in Yugoslavia have reached a level at which territorial unity has become impossible. Domestic researcher of Balkan A.V. Shilova identified several factors that caused the crisis of Yugoslav statehood: first, after Tito's death, the contradictions between the political elites in the republics and regions intensified; Secondly, the collapse of the Union of Communists of Yugoslavia, which for a long time was the only federal political force, increased nationalism, thereby endangering the integrity of the Yugoslav federation; third, the economic difficulties of the SFRY due to debts to foreign countries as a result of a decline in living standards; fourthly, due to the lagging behind the democratization processes in Central Europe, the Yugoslav Federation has somewhat lost its significance as a unifying state between East and West.

On March 18, 1994, with the assistance of the United States of America, the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina was proclaimed, covering predominantly Muslim and Croatian territories. The new state was to consist of cantons, each of which had its own leadership. Taking into account the complex multinational composition of the population, a Constitution was developed, the institution of the presidency was defined, and the existence of a single parliament, government and army was announced. In the American version of the agreement, some elements of the Vance-Owen plan can be seen. However, unlike the latter, whose goal was to somehow preserve the integrity of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Dayton Accords were aimed at splitting it. It clearly presents a different formula for resolving the crisis than European peace projects, and therefore European leaders have constructively criticized the principle of the integrity of Bosnia and Herzegovina in accordance with the terms of the treaty. The EU members considered it necessary in the negotiation process to rely on the provisions of the plan developed by the EU. In addition to borrowing, another factor that influenced the attitude of the European Union to the document was the actual exclusion of one of the parties to the conflict from the process of forming the Federation, the Serbs, which only exacerbated the disagreements in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The remark of French Foreign Minister A. Juppe that the trilateral problem cannot be resolved by only two sides became pertinent.

Already at the initial stage of NATO's peacekeeping activities, there was a noticeable discrepancy in the methods of overcoming the crisis and the basic principles of peace plans for resolving the conflict in the former Yugoslavia of the European Union and the North Atlantic Alliance. By creating the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the latter showed a desire to control the course of events in the Balkans. Objectively assessing the American agreement, it should be noted that the project of forming a federation did not become a universal solution to the problem of national-territorial delimitation, which led to the conflict in the former Yugoslavia. The most significant achievement of the federation initiative in terms of an overall Bosnian settlement should be the cessation of hostilities with the Croats. Increasing pressure from the international community, coupled with the threat of bombing, has forced the Serbs to return to the negotiating table.

At the present stage of development, the European Union faces new global problems that cannot be solved in isolation from the world community, neighbouring regions and states, therefore cooperation with the countries of Eastern Europe in this area is an important component of the EU's foreign policy. Ukraine as a representative of Eastern Europe is a fairly young independent state, the appearance of which practically coincides in time with the signing of the Treaty on the European Union, which is fateful for Western Europe. At the time of the signing of the Maastricht Treaty (Maastricht Treaty, 1992), Ukraine defined itself as a neutral and non-aligned state, enshrining this in the Declaration of State sovereignty (Declaration of State..., 1990) and the Act of Independence (Declaration of Independence ..., 1991).

The rapid recognition of Ukraine at the international level has given impetus to the careful development of the concept of its foreign policy. The principles of Ukrainian foreign policy, defined by the Declaration of Sovereignty, had to be specified taking into account the problems facing the republic after its proclamation. In the first years of independence, the main efforts of Ukrainian diplomats were aimed at achieving international recognition of Ukraine, establishing its international legal personality, and establishing relations with neighbouring countries, with former Soviet republics and the most influential countries of the world. The basic principles of Ukraine's foreign policy are reflected in the document "On the main directions of Ukraine's foreign policy" adopted on July 2, 1993 by the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine (Resolution of the Verkhovna..., 1993). The resolution stated that "given its geopolitical position, historical experience, cultural traditions, rich natural resources, strong economic, scientific, technical and intellectual potential, Ukraine should become an influential world power capable of playing a significant role in ensuring political and economic stability in Europe. An indispensable condition for the successful realization of Ukraine's potential is its active and full-scale entry into the world community. In addition to defining the range of national interests of Ukraine in the field of foreign policy, the basic document also sets out the basic principles and principles on which foreign policy should be based, identifies the priorities to be achieved and defines the main directions in which it should be implemented. However, the political and economic difficulties of the transition period have become a serious obstacle to the European development of Ukraine.

The presence of underdeveloped ties with Western European countries also, in the author's opinion, for some time significantly hampered the process of Ukraine's integration, so it was reasonable to look for its place in a united Europe through the gradual development of strategic partnership with Western European countries. Already in the first half of the 1990s, the state stepped up the creation of bilateral relations with the largest member states of the European Union. Thus, the Interstate Agreement on Mutual Understanding and Cooperation initiated the dialogue between Ukraine and France (Agreement on mutual ..., 1992), the Agreement on the principles of relations and cooperation established relations between Ukraine and Great Britain (Agreement on the Principles ..., 1993), and on September of 1993, the foundations of partnership between Ukraine and the Federal Republic of Germany were laid, on May 2, 1995, the legal foundations of Ukrainian-Italian relations were laid, and on October 7, 1996 - Ukrainian-Spanish ones. Further development of bilateral relations with all members of the European Union is one of the main conditions for Ukraine's participation in the European integration process.

For a long time, Ukraine's foreign policy was based on the aforementioned document and was carried out in accordance with its provisions. Subsequently, changes in the world arena influenced the further evolution of Ukraine's foreign policy and forced redistribution of emphasis in this area: along with the economic aspect of external relations, national security interests arose. With the development of integration processes in Europe, a logical question arose about Ukraine's involvement in cooperation with European structures. From a geopolitical, economic, socio-cultural, military-strategic point of view, Ukraine is one of the states on which peace and stability depend both of Central and Eastern Europe and of Europe as a whole. On December 2, 1991, Hans Van den Broek, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands, the country holding the Presidency of the European Union, recognized Ukraine's independence on behalf of the European Union. The prerequisite for the recognition of the new independent

state that emerged after the collapse of the USSR was not only compliance with the UN Charter, the 1975 Helsinki Act and the 1990 Paris Charter, but also the confirmation of its non-nuclear status. The European Union welcomed Ukraine's accession to the Lisbon Protocol (1992), in accordance with which Ukraine undertook to comply with the provisions of the Strategic Offensive Reduction Treaty.

The territorial conflict between Serbs and Kosovar Albanians has some similarities with the situation in the Donbas of Ukraine. The author can draw parallels and draw certain conclusions, given that Europe has become the arena for both conflicts, and the US, EU and Russia are the leading influential actors. This was evidenced by the fact that during the operation, the Kosovo police faced armed resistance: 5 police officers were injured, one with firearms, and six Serbs were also injured.

Discussion

It is in contradictory, if not conflicting, conditions that the Western Balkans (and partly also Ukraine) pin their hopes on stabilisation, progress, democratisation, and the prospect of integration with the EU. Despite the complexity of the conflicts in Yugoslavia and Ukraine, the specifics of their course and the methods of their settlement, there are some similar points of contact that manifest themselves in diplomatic issues, relations with neighbouring countries, in matters of trade, human mobility, cultural ties. On the contrary, they are deeply imbued with mutual dynamics that relate to trade, diplomacy, human mobility, tourism, cultural ties and political closeness with their neighbours. In some cases, they have also established forms of military cooperation with Euro-Atlantic institutions or established military bases. In fact, and for a long time, the main comparative approach to the post-Yugoslav and post-Soviet countries was associated with communist federalism and the dissolution of these federations during democratisation attempts. The comparison was later expanded to include other post-communist countries assessed during the period of democratization and capitalist transition. However, as post-Soviet Eastern Europe plunges into a new era of internal and international conflict, the comparative perspective has changed again: the experience of war and conflict resolution in the Western Balkans and Eastern Europe is again of interest.

Today, as they say, the two regions have different situations and different dynamics. Yugoslav War of 1991-2001 ended, but at the same time became a kind of experience for other post-Soviet countries that faced similar problems: Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Moldova, Ukraine. Eastern Europe is one of the fastest growing regions, in which armies, elites and hostilities are growing. Thus, regional political and security trends are different in the Balkans and Eastern Europe (Shilova, 2001; Dinstein, 2017; Metushaj, 2018). However, while these regional trends are contradictory, there are common features that cannot be ignored and that require comparative analysis. Several of them should be noted: the Yugoslav and Ukrainian economies were the result of the state collapse and the collapse of certain federations – the SFRY and the USSR. The peoples, states and economies in both regions were born as a result of the state bankruptcy of two socialist federations, Yugoslavia and the USSR.

However, the Ukrainian crisis profoundly changed the dynamics of state and nation-building in Eastern European countries in the second decade of the 21st century: wars and conflicts became the leading factors of political, economic and social development here (Bianchini & Minakov, 2018). The significant role of non-state actors during the war is another common feature of the post-Yugoslav and post-Soviet conflict periods. During these periods, the emerging Balkan states and post-Maidan Ukraine could hardly meet the security challenges. Civil society organisations, paramilitary and radical groups, as well as intellectuals have been active participants in conflicts and their possible resolution. And this phenomenon requires proper comparative analysis. The ethnocultural aspects of war, conflict resolution and nation-building were clearly visible in both cases and also require careful study. That being said, the crucial role of external actors in managing and containing conflicts is also relevant to the comparative perspective. This study examines in more detail the role of the experience of the Balkan countries for resolving the situation in Ukraine.

Conclusion

One of the problems that the European Union faced in the process of resolving conflicts in the Balkans was the lack of adequate capacity to solve the problem on its own, which forced the member states of the European Union to act in the wake of NATO policy. During the Yugoslav crisis, Ukraine demonstrated its mediation skills and active participation in the negotiation processes of the European Union in resolving conflicts. The main contribution of Ukraine to the process of resolving the conflict in the former Yugoslavia was the participation of the Ukrainian contingent in the UN peacekeeping operations. Ukraine's cooperation with the European Union is a programmatic direction of Ukraine's European choice and a prerequisite for Ukraine's participation in the development of a new security system in Europe.

The comparative approach of peripheral areas emphasised the unsettled situation, which in some cases may seem better than internationally structured and is on the way of consolidation, while in other cases destabilisation still strongly affects the prospects of the nation and the state. However, the analysis also showed that both regions under study still suffer from an unstable and volatile environment, the strengthening of which can also develop in even more unpredictable directions, depending on how and why policy development processes are changing or evolving. Therefore, the author hopes that this issue will serve to better understand security, as well as the social, political and cultural problems of the Balkans and Ukraine. In addition, the proposed comparative approach can also foster awareness of the potential that still exists in these regions to achieve convincing results in both conflict resolution and peacebuilding in a global system that is increasingly interconnected and subject to accelerated pressure, space-time compression and local-global polarization.

References

Bianchini, S., & Minakov, M. (2018). State-Building Politics after the Yugoslav and Soviet Collapse-The Western Balkans and Ukraine in a Comparative Perspective: An Introduction. *Southeastern Europe*, 42(3), 291-304.

- Bollen, J., Hers, S., & Van der Zwaan, B. (2010). An integrated assessment of climate change, air pollution, and energy security policy. *Energy policy*, 38(8), 4021-4030. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2010.03.026
- Brzezinski, Z. (2000). *Great chess board.* Moscow: Mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya. Cooley, L. (2018). *The European Union's approach to conflict resolution: Transformation or regulation in the Western Balkans?*. Routledge.
- Dinstein, Y. (2017). War, aggression and self-defence. Cambridge University Press. Dubský, Z., & Havlová, R. (2017). The Role of European Security Organisations in the Conflict in Ukraine. Central European Journal of International & Security Studies, 11(1).
- Freixas, J. (2004). The dimension for the European Union Council under the Nice rules. European Journal of Operational Research, 156(2), 415-419. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0377-2217(02)00903-7
- Gomes, T. M. R. C. (2019). The European Union Accession and Climate Change Policies in the Western Balkan Countries. In *Climate Change and Global Development* (pp. 153-173). Springer, Cham.
- Gruber, H., & Verboven, F. (2001). The diffusion of mobile telecommunications services in the European Union. *European Economic Review*, 45(3), 577-588. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0014-2921(00)00068-4
- Haas, E. B. (1950). The Uniting of Europe: Political Social and Economic Forces, 1957(2).
- Ifinedo, P. (2014). Information systems security policy compliance: An empirical study of the effects of socialisation, influence, and cognition. *Information & Management*, 51(1), 69-79. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2013.10.001
- Kandel, P. (2020). The EU's Balkan dilemmas. Sovremennaya Evropa, 2(95), 123-130.
- Kibalnik, A. G. (2018). Where Is The International Criminal Justice Going?. Russian Journal of Criminology, 12(2), 275-287.
- Knapp, K. J., Morris Jr, R. F., Marshall, T. E., & Byrd, T. A. (2009). Information security policy: An organizational-level process model. *Computers & security*, 28(7), 493-508. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cose.2009.07.001
- Kokhanovska, O. V., Verbytska, A. O., & Kokhanovskyi, V. O. (2021). Updating the civil legislation of Ukraine in the field of intellectual property in the modern information society. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, *5*(S2), 375-386. https://doi.org/10.37028/lingcure.v5nS2.1360
- Korac, M. (2006). Gender, conflict and peace-building: Lessons from the conflict in the former Yugoslavia. In *Women's Studies International Forum* (Vol. 29, No. 5, pp. 510-520). Pergamon. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wsif.2006.07.008
- Kulkova, M. (2019). From Negative to Positive Peace in Western Balkans: A Case for Eclectic Theory. Central European Journal of International & Security Studies, 13(3).
- Kurbatova, T., & Khlyap, H. (2015). State and economic prospects of developing potential of non-renewable and renewable energy resources in Ukraine. Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, 52, 217-226. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2015.07.093
- Metushaj, M. (2018). Albania, a Stabilizing Factor in the Western Balkans Region Favored by Its Geostrategic Position. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 7(2), 61-61.
- Minakov, M. (2018). Development and dystopia: studies in post-Soviet Ukraine and Eastern Europe. Ibidem-Verlag.

- Nikiforova, S. (2019). Economic Problems in the Balkans on the Eve of the Balkan Wars. *Bulgarian Historical Review*, 47(3-4), 153-202.
- Pasiouras, F., & Kosmidou, K. (2007). Factors influencing the profitability of domestic and foreign commercial banks in the European Union. *Research in International Business and Finance*, 21(2), 222-237. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ribaf.2006.03.007
- Shilova, A.V. (2001). Yugoslav crisis and problems of its settlement. *International Relations of Ukraine: Scientific Research and Findings*, 10, 144-154.
- Sluga, G. (2018). Balkan Boundaries: Writing History and Identity into Territory. In *Europe: Rethinking the Boundaries* (pp. 105-120). Routledge.
- Syafruddin, S., Thaba, A., Rahim, A. R., Munirah, M., & Syahruddin, S. (2021). Indonesian people's sarcasm culture: an ethnolinguistic research. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5(1), 160-179. https://doi.org/10.37028/lingcure.v5n1.1150
- Tuathail, G. Ó. (2010). Localizing geopolitics: Disaggregating violence and return in conflict regions. *Political geography*, 29(5), 256-265. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2010.01.011
- Van de Graaf, T., & Colgan, J. D. (2017). Russian gas games or well-oiled conflict? Energy security and the 2014 Ukraine crisis. *Energy Research & Social Science*, 24, 59-64. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2016.12.018