

BRATISLAVA INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL OF LIBERAL ARTS

The policies of the USA and Russia Regarding Kosovo:

The recognition of Kosovo's sovereignty

BACHELOR THESIS

Andrej Kurucz

BRATISLAVA 2013

BRATISLAVA INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL OF LIBERAL ARTS

The policies of the USA and Russia Regarding Kosovo:

The recognition of Kosovo sovereignty

BACHELOR THESIS

Study program: Liberal studies

Study department 3.1.6 Political Science

Tutor: Mag. phil. Mag.iur. Dr. Simon Gruber

Degree of competence: Bachelor of Science (Bc.)

Date of submission: 30. 4. 2013

Date of defense: 12. 6. 2013

Andrej Kurucz

BRATISLAVA 2013

Declaration of Originality

I hereby declare that I have prepared the work by myself, only with the help of the tutor and all of the citations and sources used in the text are listed in References.

Andrej Kurucz

In Bratislava, 30. 4. 2013

.....

Acknowledgement

Foremost, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my advisor Mag. phil. Mag. iur. Dr. Simon Gruber for his wisdom, motivation and enthusiastic approach. His support helped me to push myself farther than I thought I could go.

I would like to thank defense committee members, Samuel Abrahám, PhD., Prof. František Novosád, Mgr. Dagmar Kusá, PhD., for granting me the honor to study at BISLA, which gave me an opportunity to become a member of a significant university.

My sincere thanks goes also to my family and friends, who always support me throughout my life.

Abstract

Author of thesis: Andrej Kurucz

Title: The policies of the USA and Russia regarding Kosovo : The recognition of Kosovo sovereignty

Name of University: Bratislava International School of Liberal Arts

Consultant: Mag. Iur. Mag. phil Simon Gruber

Defense Committee: Samuel Abrahám, PhD., Prof. František Novosád, Mgr. Dagmar Kusá, PhD.

Place, year, number of pages: Bratislava, 2013, 58 pages

Academic degree: Bachelor of Science (Bc.)

The aim of this study is to explain the position of the USA and Russia regarding the status of Kosovo. The new emerging state Kosovo plays a strategic role for both countries and both countries count with Kosovo within their sphere of influence. The declaration of Kosovo independence from 2008 divides the international community on the main question of state sovereignty. USA and Russia have played the role of hegemonic powers since the end of the Second World War, so their voices have a key role within the international scene. The study is designed to demonstrate the conception of the foreign policies of USA and Russia. Firstly, the thesis will try to investigate whether the different positions towards Kosovo status indicate different conceptions of state sovereignty in modern times. On the other hand, there is an option that the different positions of the great powers towards Kosovo are influenced by their self-interests in the whole region of the Balkans, so the status of Kosovo plays a key role within broader goals.

The first part of the thesis explains theoretical conceptions of the state interests based on the theory of realism and ideational liberalism. These approaches are necessary to be examined to hypothetically explain the foreign policies and the behavior of the great powers. The explanations of these concepts are necessary for further elaboration and exploration.

The thesis then moves to a brief description of the history of Kosovo. The chapter on history will inform about the times, when the first calls for Kosovo independence

were remarked, until the present situation in which Kosovo exists today. For the reader that is willing to better understand the current problem of Kosovo, it is necessary to understand its history because it has created the present picture of the region. Undoubtedly, historical facts are the inseparable parts of lives of people living in Kosovo today.

Moreover, the thesis will try to empirically demonstrate the relationships between USA and Kosovo, and Russia towards Kosovo. It is necessary to analyze the aspects of foreign policies of the great powers and try to empirically testify the status of Kosovo according to the conceptions of foreign policy of each power. This chapter should be the key part of the thesis, so it is necessary to make a deep analysis to deduce a conclusion.

In conclusion, the thesis does not try to give the basic answer on the recognition or non-recognition of Kosovo sovereignty. The different positions of the great powers may be caused by different interests of the powers in the region that are related to concrete reasons. However, there is an option that there is a different perspective on the meaning of sovereignty in the world today. USA could possibly more emphasize the right of self-determination for the nation that is oppressed, if it is based on the democratic principles. Russia, on the other hand, seems to follow a very traditional concept of state's sovereignty, wants to maintain the *status quo*, regardless of violation of human rights.

Abstrakt

Autor práce: Andrej Kurucz

Názov práce: Politika USA a Ruska týkajúce sa Kosova: Uznanie suverenity Kosova

Názov vysokej školy: Bratislavská medzinárodná škola liberálnych štúdií

Meno školiteľa: Mag.phil.Mag.iur.Dr. Simon Gruber

Komisia pre obhajoby: Samuel Abrahám, PhD., Prof. František Novosád, Mgr. Dagmar Kusá, PhD.

Predseda komisie: Samuel Abrahám, PhD.

Miesto, rok, rozsah práce: Bratislava, 2013, 58 strán

Stupeň odbornej kvalifikácie: Bakalár (Bc.)

Cieľom tejto štúdie je pochopiť, prečo sú rôzne pozície USA a Ruska týkajúce sa štatútu Kosova dôležité z hľadiska koncepcie ich zahraničných politík. Novo vznikajúci štát Kosovo zohráva strategickú úlohu pre obe superveľmoci, nakoľko obe krajiny územie Kosova zaraďujú do svojej sféry vplyvu. Vyhlásením kosovskej nezávislosti z roku 2008 sa medzinárodná komunita rozdelila na koncepcií vnímania štátnej suverenity. Od konca Druhej svetovej vojny, USA a Rusko svojou hegemonickou pozíciou zohrávali kľúčové úlohy v rámci medzinárodnej scény. Práca sa bude zaoberať koncepciou zahraničných politík USA a Ruska. Téza sa bude snažiť zodpovedať otázku, či odlišné pozície veľmocí týkajúce sa Kosova naznačujú odlišné poňatie štátnej suverenity v novodobých časoch. Na druhej strane, existuje možnosť, že odlišné pozície superveľmocí sú ovplyvnené vlastnými záujmami v celej oblasti Balkánu, takže status Kosova zohráva kľúčovú otázku v rámci komplexnejších cieľov. Prvá časť práce popisuje teoretické koncepcie štátnych záujmov, ktoré vychádzajú z teórie realizmu a ideí liberalizmu. Tieto prístupy je potrebné podrobne preskúmať, aby sme boli schopní hypoteticky vysvetliť idey a kroky zahraničných politík oboch krajín. Vysvetlenie kľúčových pojmov je nevyhnutné pre ďalšie skúmanie a rozpracovanie tézy.

Následne sa práca presunie k stručnému popisu histórie Kosova. Súčasťou kapitoly histórie bude informovať o čase, kedy sa začali prvé výzvy za nezávislosť Kosova až po súčasnosť. Pre čitateľa, ktorý je ochotný porozumieť problematike Kosova, je potrebné najskôr pochopiť jeho históriu, nakoľko je to práve história, ktorá

predchádzala obrazu dnešnej situácie v regióne. Je preto možné tvrdiť, že i dnes sú historické fakty neoddeliteľnou súčasťou života ľudí žijúcich v Kosove.

Cieľom ďalšej časti bude empiricky dokázať vzťah USA ku Kosovu, respektíve vzťah Ruska voči Kosovu. Je potrebné analyzovať aspekty zahraničných politík oboch veľmocí a jednotlivito sa snažiť dokázať, či je štatút Kosova v súlade s koncepciou zahraničnej politiky danej veľmoci. Na základe kľúčovej kapitoly celej práce je možné vykonať hĺbkovú analýzu a následne vyvodiť záver.

V samotnom závere sa práca nebude uberať stanovením jednoduchej odpovede pre uznanie alebo neuznanie Kosovskej suverenity. Cieľom je skôr skúmať rozličné pozície USA a Ruska týkajúce sa Kosova, ktoré sú bezpochybne spôsobené rôznymi záujmami oboch mocností v regióne. Avšak, je tu stále možnosť, že v zmysle suverenity dnes neprevláda jednotný názor. USA môže vyzdvihovať právo na sebaurčenie utláčaného národa, pokiaľ je založený na demokratických princípoch. Na druhej strane, Rusko sa snaží riadiť tradičným konceptom štátnej suverenity, snaží sa zachovávať status quo, bez ohľadu na porušovanie ľudských práv.

Table of Contents

Declaration of Originality	iii
Acknowledgement	iv
Abstract	v
Abstrakt	vii
Introduction	10
Chapter 1: Theoretical part	12
Realism	12
Ideational Liberalism	14
Chapter 2: History of Kosovo Region	15
The Battle of Kosovo	15
Albanian National Movement and Balkan Wars	16
Kosovo and Albania during the Second World War	19
Kosovo in the second Yugoslavia	19
The era of Ibrahim Rugova until the declaration of independence	20
Chapter 3: The US Foreign Policy Concerning the Future Status of Kosovo	23
Formation of the US foreign policy	24
Operation Allied Force	27
Approaches on the US foreign policy-making	29
The conception of the US foreign policy after 9/11	32
Chapter 4: Russian Foreign Policy Concerning the Future Status of Kosovo	38
The Russian view regarding the Kosovo status	39
The concept of the Russian foreign policy	42
Russian Slavic Identity	43
Russian self-interests in the Balkan territory	45
Chapter 5: Conclusion	49
Resumé	52
References	55

Introduction

Still, if you will not fight for the right when you can easily win without bloodshed, if you will not fight when your victory will be sure and not so costly, you may come to the moment when you will have to fight with all the odds against you and only a precarious chance for survival. There may be a worse case. You may have to fight when there is no chance of victory, because it is better to perish than to live as slaves.

(Sir Winston Churchill, *The Gathering Storm*, p. 348)

As a result of the death of Marshal Josip Tito and Serbian president Milošević's hegemonic efforts for a strong Serbia, the miners of the autonomous province of Kosovo went on strike that has transformed into ethnic conflict. The following period of 1990s, Yugoslavia is significant only by one word-war. The war that has divided the whole territory of Balkan into separated zones that want to reach their international recognition. It was a conflict that was organized behind the desks of politicians that ruled to their great armies that were willing to die for their nation. Kosovo has not succeeded in this war. Other states within Yugoslavia- Croatia, Slovenia and even Bosnia and Herzegovina- reached their full recognition, but Kosovo is not successful even today.

Serbia, a historical friend and loyal ally of Russia, seemed to play a very important role for the whole region of Balkan during the previous years. But after the fall of USSR, Serbia had lost its strong supporter. The end of the Cold War brought the multipolarity of states. However, Russia's main opponent- USA - has been able to maintain the power. Even, the power of USA has extended to other regions through NATO.

Kurucz: The Policies of the USA and Russia Regarding Kosovo

Today, the question of Kosovo's sovereignty is still open. Both countries, USA and Russia, believe in the values and principles of their foreign policies. The policies that are so different on the main question of the Kosovo sovereignty.

This topic is interesting for scholars of foreign affairs because it shows the reality of the current international system. After the wars in Yugoslavia, the world has suddenly begun to perceive the problem of Kosovo sovereignty and its position within Serbia. Nowadays, the Kosovo question seems to cause a wave of emotions on both sides. Kosovo seems to split the international community into two camps. Once again, we are witnessing the situation in which the US and Russian politics are standing against their opponent and they are willing to defend their truth.

Chapter 1: Theoretical Part

The aim of the theoretical part will be to introduce the main concepts that will play a key role in this thesis. The first introduced will be the concept of realism and the second will be the concept of ideational liberalism. Through the mentioned key concepts, we are able to hypothetically explain the behavior of the super powers. Is the policy of the USA and Russia towards Kosovo driven by interests or ideology? Theory is intended to explain the complicated phenomena that happen in the real world. The aim of this study is to explain the behavior of USA and Russia regarding the Kosovo status. Therefore, it is important to look at the factors that shape the conception of their foreign policies.

Realism

Both super powers, USA and Russia, have interests all over the world, also in the Balkans. What kind of interests? If these interests are related to the security, stability, power, balancing other powers, etc., the behavior of the super powers can be explained by realism. Realism has been by far the most influential theory of world politics. It has been formulated by many thinkers of international relations, among them remain significant illustrious figures such as Thucydides, Machiavelli, Hobbes, Rousseau, or Mearsheimer. All of these realists offered an option that state leaders are mainly motivated by the doctrine of *raison d'état*, or reason of state (Baylis & Smith & Owens, 2008). However, the motives of states are affected by ensuring the security of the state. In fact, realists are sceptical of the idea that the international community is driven by moral principles, which can be applied on leaders of each country, therefore, the theory of realism retreats "from traditional morality, which attaches a positive value to caution, piety, and the greater good of humankind as a whole" (Baylis & Smith & Owens, 2008, p. 92). Realists work with the idea that the world is constantly threatened by anarchy. The type of anarchy presented here is not

the one related to the society organized in chaos or lawlessness, realists emphasize states as the actors, which are lacking a central legitimate authority (Baylis & Smith & Owens, 2008). According to an eminent representative of the realist school, Hans J. Morgenthau, international politics is led by the same principle as domestic politics. It is related to the constant struggle for power, however, the result of this struggle on international politics can be qualitatively different (Ibid). For example, the history has shown that even before and after the Congress of Berlin in 1878, the great powers were struggling for power on the whole territory of Balkan, trying to gain as much influence as possible. In such a situation, it is crucial for the state to reflect its much wider core of national interest, which is according to realists, an “iron law of necessity” (Baylis & Smith & Owens, 2008, p. 93). However, smaller and weaker states are threatened by a hegemonic state or an alliance of stronger states. In this case, weaker states are obliged to join an alliance, which is able to stand against the common enemy. Throughout the history, realists consider this act of preserving as a balance of power. A very symmetrical competition occurred during the Cold War, which culminated into the formation of the Warsaw Pact and the NATO. According to Machiavelli’s *Prince*, the security of the state is so important that it “may justify certain acts by the prince that would be forbidden to other individuals not burdened by the princely responsibility of assuring that security. The end- security of the state- is understood to justify any means necessary to achieve that end” (Kauppi & Viotti, 2010, p. 47). However, this act cannot be considered to engage only a harmful activity against the opponent. Machiavelli’s words can be used to avoid any armed conflict or intervention led by the outside power. Among other national interests, security and stability, which from the realist point of view are considered to be essential, are also necessary from the rational perspective to ensure the preservation.

Ideational Liberalism

Sometimes, the policy of the USA and Russia seems to be driven by certain ideas. For example, it seems that the USA tries to promote democracy across the world and support weak and oppressed people. These ideas may come from the possibility that the US policy is driven by the values, which concern the right of self-determination for the nations. On the other hand, Russia sometimes seems to be oriented towards the preservation of traditional international law and its policy may be influenced by the idea of Slavic brotherhood. This thesis is going to analyze these approaches as well. If they proved to be correct, the realist approach would not be sufficient to account for the policy of the two states. However, ideational liberalism might be able to explain their policy. According to Andrew Moravcsik from Princeton University, “ideational liberalism views domestic social identities and values as basic determinants of state preferences” (2010, p. 6). Going back to the history, John Stuart Mill and Woodrow Wilson, the protagonists of the liberal approaches, were promoting liberal social values, which can be for example applied on the foreign policy of the USA. In other words, the conception of foreign affairs stems from domestic values, so social actors support the government “in exchange for institutions that accord with their identity-based preferences” (Moravcsik, 2010, p. 6). Ideational liberalism counts with the option that some social preferences are more important than others, Moravcsik mentions “such as those pertaining to the proper location of national borders, the nature of political institutions, and the scope of socioeconomic regulation” (2010, p. 6). We can say that the aim of Andrew Moravcsik is to highlight the fact that predominant domestic values are behind the creation of foreign policy according to its own picture. Foreign policy is structured in terms of values, which are significantly performed within the political system or political culture of each state. Therefore, foreign policy can contain some elements of ideology.

Chapter 2: History of Kosovo Region

This part is going to mainly concern the history of the region of Kosovo. The aim is to try to make an interpretation of the significant historical events, which had culminated in the modern history of Kosovo during 1990s. The picture of the Kosovo region is infamously remembered for the period of ethnical cleansing. For this purpose, it is important to clarify the reasons that had led to the spread of violence, personal hostility and murdering. History plays an important role for understanding the Kosovo crisis and serves as the main argument for both Albanian and Serbian population. The beginning of this chapter is going to describe the period of Middle Ages, mainly the Battle of Kosovo, that plays a significant role for the Serb population even today. Other parts of this chapter will describe the Albanian national movement during the late 19th century, the Kingdom of Serbia and the Balkan Wars, Albanian Kingdom during the Second World War, Kosovo in the second Yugoslavia during the rule of Josip Broz Tito, the 1990s and the Declaration of Kosovo Independence from 2008.

The Battle of Kosovo

Rascia, the north of Kosovo, used to be a core of the Serbian Kingdom during the Medieval period. It was a centre for the cultural and religious life significant with hundreds of medieval monasteries (Warrander, Knaus, 2010). The most significant battle that had occurred during the Middle Ages in the region of Kosovo is known as the Battle of Kosovo that took place on June 28th, 1389. The Ottoman Empire, under the rule of Sultan Murad I., had not met an equal enemy on the European continent and caused a great potential danger for all the kingdoms in Europe. As it is written in the article *Kosovo: Legacy of a Medieval Battle*, "These early Turkish attacks were basically plundering expeditions organized to test the strength of the enemy forces, to exhaust those forces as much as possible, and to prepare for an eventual conquest

of the area” (Emmert, 1991). At this time, Kosovo used to be the part of Serbia under Prince Lazar that had already been preparing for the defence of his country. Prince Lazar could count on the help from Tvrtko I, the Bosnian ruler that had sent “...a large contingent under the command of Vlatko Vukovič, the commander who had defeated the Turkish force at Bileća” (Fine, 1994, p. 409). The Battle of Kosovo is often associated with the Serbian patriotism and the resistance against the Ottoman Empire. Although the battle ended as a draw, the Serbian population still commemorates the battle as a symbol of national heroism and the battle became a part of the Serbian traditions, myths and legends. Miloš Obilič, the man who assassinated Murad I., became a significant representative of the Serbian patriotic resistance and he is also a saint in the Serbian Orthodox Church (Fine, 1994, p. 410). The Serbian army was successful in delaying the invasion of the Turks into the Western Balkan and Europe for some time, but the number of Turkish soldiers fighting in the east had grown and the Ottoman Empire came back with twice as many soldiers as it used to fight in the Battle of Kosovo. Murad’s son, Bayezid, conquered a considerable part of the Western Balkan and he managed to penetrate into the rest of Europe. Kosovo has been politically and historically shaped by the Ottoman Empire, “...and the five hundred years of Ottoman occupation provide the key to understanding Albania today” (Vickers, 2001).

Albanian National Movement and Balkan Wars

For the period of five hundred years, the Albanian population was tested by the rough destiny of the geographical position of the country that lies in the centre of Christian, Orthodox and Muslim religion. This significant fact has marked the Albanian society which became the tool of various local landlords. It is known that the lords used to change their religions several times. “The Albanian saying “Ku eshte shpata eshte feja”- “Where the sword is, there lies religion” ” (Vickers, 2001, p. 17). This citation perfectly relates to the Albanian population because the country of Albania never had particular borders. It used to always participate in the sphere of

interest of the surrounding countries. However, the majority of the Albanian population has mostly inclined to convert to Islam (Vickers, 2001). The major problem of the Habsburg Empire was not the religion, but the maintaining of its power in the local governments and constant disagreements with local nobilities. As it is written in the book *History of the Balkans*, “Whereas, at least at the height of the empire, the Ottoman sultan in theory held absolute power from God over the land and the people of his domains” (Jelavich, 1983, p. 129). This fact meant that the Albanians were willing to convert to Islam rather than staying under the rules of catholic or orthodox noblemen. These noblemen were collecting taxes, they participated in the local administration and dominated in justice (Jelavich, 1983). However, in the Ottoman Empire, no one used to own the right that would be above the sultan’s will and the sultan dominated in all the spheres of the political, cultural and religious life.

The Russo-Turkish War from 1877 to 1878 and the following Treaty of San Stefano brought peace between Russia and the Ottoman Empire. Russia, the winner of the war should gain a huge power on the continent of the Balkan Peninsula. No one from the western powers wanted Russia to gain the power in the strategic territory and the West wanted to prevent the rise of a big Bulgaria. In the same year, the following Treaty of Berlin led by Otto von Bismarck reorganized the Treaty of San Stefano and the treaty brought a new drawing of the map with completely new states. The main purpose of the Treaty of Berlin was to minimize the gaining the power of Russia in the region and prevent the creation of a great Bulgaria. “It was, however, just what the statesmen of Britain and Austria-Hungary had feared. They saw the new Bulgaria as an enormous wedge of potential Russian influence in the Balkans and they demanded that the boundaries be redrawn”(Crampton, 1997, p. 85). On the other hand, the treaty legalized the interests of western powers in Balkan, Austria-Hungary gained Bosnia and Herzegovina and it created new independent states like Serbia, Montenegro and Romania. The Ottoman Empire remained only a small power in Macedonia and the western Balkans. The Treaty of Berlin did not try to solve the Albanian national state, it gave priority to other nations before the Albanian

population. As a result, the Albanians feared that the land which they had inhabited would be divided among the new states Serbia, Montenegro, Bulgaria and Greece. The fear from the division of territory formed the basic principles for the Albanian nationalism. As it is written in the book *Balkans Since 1453*, "The Albanian leaders of the period, being apprehensive of the decisions that might be made, organized on July 1 the "Albanian League for the Defence of the Rights of the Albanian Nation. " The aim of the League was twofold, to "resist until death" any attempt to annex Albanian territory, and to obtain an autonomous status within the Ottoman Empire" (Stavrianos, 2000, p. 502). The Muslim authorities met in the city of Prizren which was part of the Kosovo vilayet that used to be a province of the Ottoman Empire. After the Treaty of Berlin, the Kosovo vilayet became occupied by the Austro-Hungarian army, but the province was still under the sultan control. The territory of Kosovo vilayet is today part of Montenegro, Serbia, Kosovo, Macedonia and Albania. "When national resurgence became strong in the South Slav peoples, a small group like the Albanians tended to feel safer with the devil it knew best..." (Skendi, 1968, p. 498).

During both Balkan Wars, the relations of Serbs and Albanians worsened after the most of the Kosovo vilayet's territory had been taken by the Kingdom of Serbia that was willing to expel all the remains of the Ottoman Empire. After the end of the First Balkan War in 1912, the Treaty of London from 1913 internationally recognized Kosovo territory as part of Serbia. The Albanian population had to deal with difficult times that were directed on them by the Serbian majority within the official Serbian state. As it is written in the online document by the publicist Leo Freundlich, "But the Serbian thirst for conquest has now found a means of destroying the fair dream of this courageous and freedom-loving people before it can be realized. Serbian troops have invaded Albania with fire and sword. And if Albania cannot be conquered, then at least the Albanian people can be exterminated. This is the solution they propose" (Freundlich, 1913).

Kosovo and Albania during the Second World War

In April 1939, Mussolini's Italy invaded Albania and made Albania a collaborative fascist state. The German army invaded Yugoslavia two years later and Kosovo became part of Great Albania that was under the Italian protectorate. Albanians were organizing massive offensive campaigns against the Serb Orthodox population. According to the book of Noel Malcolm, the number of Serbs who were forced to emigrate was between 30,000 to 100,000 (Malcolm, 1998, p. 313). With the help of German soldiers, Albanians were free to execute the brutal violent acts on the Serbian population. In Kosovo, according to the image of German troops, the Kosovo Albanians created the Skanderbeg Division. "The Skanderbeg Division was formed and trained in Kosovo and was made up mostly of Muslim Shqiptar Kosovars. There were only a small number of Albanians from Albania proper in the division, about one-third. The Skanderbeg Mountain Division of the Waffen SS was thus essentially a Kosovo or Kosmet division. The division was stationed and operated in Kosovo and other Serbian regions almost exclusively" (Savich).

Kosovo in the second Yugoslavia

After the retreat of the Axis army, the new socialist Yugoslavia that was headed by Josip Broz Tito gave Kosovo the status of an autonomous region within the Republic of Serbia. Kosovo could establish an autonomous government and during the 1970s, Kosovo was granted the right to have more language, administrative and education competences. The Albanisation of the education meant that the Kosovo Albanians could create the University of Pristina. Along with Vojvodina, the north part of Serbia, Kosovo gained the status of an autonomous province in 1974 which meant that Kosovo could own a seat on the federal presidency, it had its own assembly and police. "As a result of Serb migration and higher Albanian birth rates, the Albanian share of the population rose from half in 1946 to three-fourths in 1981 and to four-fifths in 1991, by which time the proportion of Serbs had fallen to less than one-fifth" (Britannica). Kosovo, the poorest region of Yugoslavia, suffered from the economic situation and the situation got even worse after Tito's death in 1980.

The capital city of Pristina became the center of massive riots against the poverty and living conditions that had culminated after the Serbian authorities disliked the position of Albanians in the official position. Thousands of non-Serbs lost their jobs and others were arrested and interrogated. As a result, the Albanian resentment grew and it even took violent tendencies. As it is written in *The New York Times* from November 1987, "Slavic Orthodox churches have been attacked, and flags have been torn down. Wells have been poisoned and crops burned. Slavic boys have been knifed, and some young ethnic Albanians have been told by their elders to rape Serbian girls"(Binder, 1987). Growing Albanian separatism led to open conflicts between Serbs and Albanians in Yugoslavia. The Memorandum of the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts (SANU) was successful in shocking the Yugoslavs. It propagated a new re-centralization of the federation and showed the Serbs as the discriminated ones in their own state. "The Memorandum broke every rule in the proverbial rule book of post- Tito Titoism" (Ramet, 2006, p. 321). The voice of the Memorandum expanded into other republics of Yugoslavia and could count on the support of the local Serbian politicians. As Detlef Pollack and Jan Wielgohs wrote in their book *Dissent And Opposition In Communist Eastern Europe: Origins Of Civil Society And Democratic Transition*, "These aggressive politics and propaganda quickly found a receptive audience among the Serbian residents of Kosovo, Bosnia-Herzegovina, and Croatia (where they composed 12 per cent of the population and were overproportionally represented in the state and party apparatus), and, as a result, the foundations of the multi-nation state were rapidly infiltrated " (Pollack & Wielgohs, 2004, p. 190).

The era of Ibrahim Rugova until the declaration of independence

In March 1989, after Slobodan Milošević became the president of Serbia and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, Milošević took Kosovo autonomy and declared the state of emergency in Kosovo. As a result, his decisions erupted into street violence, so he had to send his military special forces to solve the situation. The

Albanian population in Kosovo was oppressed, the basic human rights were violated and Albanians lost their right to education. Official TV channels and radio stations of Kosovo were forbidden. The Albanian language ceased to be the official language of the province and Albanian military troops were replaced by the troops of Yugoslavia.

The following years, under the rule of President Ibrahim Rugova, most of the Kosovo Albanian population followed the policy of passive resistance. The dissatisfaction of the Albanian population led to the referendum. In September 1991, Kosovo declared independence. However, Serbia and the international community did not recognize the independence. Western countries were watching the events that spread in Slovenia, Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina. Rugova's nonviolent resistance was not successful and opposition created a separatist unit, known as the Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA). KLA stood behind the attacks on the police. "Especially in the diaspora Kosovo Albanians could be heard expressing skepticism about nonviolence, and inside Kosovo in 1993 preparations began for the formation of the Kosovo Liberation Army (UCK)" (Clark, 2000, p. 64). Serbian and Yugoslavian special forces led the operations against suspected Albanian separatists and defeated them fairly quickly. The price of the war operations was largely paid by the civilian population of Kosovo. Consequently, their invasion left thousands of houses burned and some villages were completely evacuated. Many experts said that the "complete cleansing of Kosovo would probably not take more than several weeks" (Troebst, 1998, p. 26), and it was assumed that "the Turkish minority in Kosovo, the Roma (including the so-called "Egyptians") and the Serbian-speaking Muslims in the Gora region would be cleansed together with the Albanians" (Ibid).

After unsuccessful negotiations between the representatives of Serbia and Kosovo during the Rambouillet Agreement in 1999, NATO began the Operation Allied Force, which was a name for an airstrike mission against Yugoslav strategic positions. The Resolution 1244 adopted by the UN Security Council ended the Kosovo war and provided for Kosovo under the UN administration. After the end of the war, conflicts did not stop. Tensions gradually escalated in Mitrovica, in northern Kosovo, when in 2003 Albanian population attacked the Serbian citizens and destroyed hundreds of

ancient orthodox monasteries. Negotiations led by the UN diplomat Martti Ahtisaari set the principles of stabilizing the situation in Kosovo and the Kosovo Parliament declared the independence in 17th February 2008. This act caused a wave of resentment by Serbia and Russia, which consider the declaration as an illegal act that undermined the integrity of the existing state. However, the International Court of Justice declared that the declaration was not contrary to the international law and countries of the West along with the US recognized the independence of Kosovo.

Chapter 3: The US Foreign Policy Concerning the Future Status of Kosovo

At the time of the declaration of independence from 17th February 2008, Kosovo already knew that it could count on the strong support of the United States. One day after the declaration, the USA recognized the new state as an independent entity. This chapter is going to analyze the foreign policy of the United States of America relating to Kosovo. The US does not only play the role of a huge economic partner, but it has an establishing and supervising role in the administration of new Kosovo. For understanding the US position towards Kosovo, we have to analyze treaties, historical events, and military actions, which formed the US foreign policy into the present form. However, there is a need to concentrate on the steps made by the US before the Kosovo crisis and compare it with the policy after 9/11. There is a possibility that after the terrorist attacks from 2001, the conception of the US foreign policy significantly differs from the previous concepts. USA could possibly try to establish security among the territories, which are structurally fragile and are able to cause future conflicts. The first part of this chapter is going to inform about the development of the US foreign policy during the 20th century. Secondly, Operation Allied Force is important in terms of NATO airstrikes, and therefore it is necessary to analyze the US position towards the attacks against the Serbian army. However, the thesis is mainly going to work with the US policy after 9/11 and try to examine the US steps towards Kosovo, which were predominantly inspired in terms of reaching local security and stability on the whole Balkan territory. In 2009, US Vice President Joseph Biden declared that Kosovo independence is a “priority” for the US administration (Woehrel, 2013). Since the Kosovo conflict, the policy of the US has been shaping a complete new international policy on Kosovo, which includes strong domestic policy with effective jurisdiction and autonomous structures, which should guarantee the functioning of a democratic state within the territory of southern Europe.

Formation of the US foreign policy

Since Woodrow Wilson's period, USA fosters the ideology of national states based on the right of self-determination. The period of time after the First World War was significant by the creation of national states. Mostly in Central Europe, with the fall of the Austro-Hungarian Empire and partly the Ottoman Empire, new nation states came into existence. In the case of Czechoslovakia, the eighth largest state in Europe in that time, politicians like Tomáš G. Masaryk and Milan R. Štefánik were coordinating with the US government for reaching the full independence and international recognition. We have been witnessing this "enthusiasm" (Diesling, 1967, p. 85) several times in other places outside Europe and America. In the case of Kosovo, the foreign policy of the US may be led by the same principle, which has been presented many times before and has shaped modern self-determined states, which share common democratic values.

The United States of America plays a leading role in all international missions around the world. It is a member of the UN Security Council that guarantees the right of veto and thus gives the foreign policy of the US a great responsibility and opportunity. If we are about to talk about humanitarian missions or missions, which deal with stabilization and security, the foreign policy of the US has always played a leading role. US officials have always been conscious of the fact that instability of any kind can undermine the national interests. Today, USA abounds with the greatest political, economic, military and humanitarian influence around the world.

The case of the Kosovo crisis was not an exception of the US influence. Although the conflict unleashed on the European continent, it was the USA that took part of all initial dialogues and positioned itself as a leader of negotiations and international superintendent. Today, the foreign policy of the United States reaches "pervasive and multidimensional" (Marcella, 2008, p. 3) power. In general, the USA wants to

increase its credit by sharing democratic principles, which include the protection of human rights in particular. As it is written in *The National Security Strategy of the United States of America* from September 2002, “We seek instead to create a balance of power that favors human freedom: conditions in which all nations and all societies can choose for themselves the rewards and challenges of political and economic liberty” (2002).

In fact, the great influence of the US is a “phenomenon” of the twentieth century. The USA has not always played a major role in the sphere of foreign affairs. The USA did not step into the European conflicts, which used to have only selfish purposes of gaining as much power as it was possible even at the cost of human lives. USA did not want to run into the conflicts because the US officials had already been instructed with pitfalls, which erupted on the European continent and they were strongly influenced by the liberal philosophy. The ideology of liberalism, which contains the concept of human rights, has been a significant strategy of the US foreign policy in gaining its goals and it is characterized in aiming at the protection of rights for an individual or a minority. The USA used to follow the policy of so-called isolationism, which meant that it tried to care only about its domestic affairs and did not want to directly step into an open war. However, advocating peace through democracy is popular even today. In fact, political studies say that democratic regimes go to wars only rarely against each other. As Henry Kissinger expresses, “The idea that peace depends above all on promoting democratic institutions has remained a staple of American thought to the present day” (1994, p. 29).

During the years of Woodrow Wilson, the USA began to promote collective security with the common democratic principles. According to Wilson, alliances are not able to guarantee peace and the only solution will be a collectively formed security, which will try to share democracy elsewhere. Wilson’s creation of the League of Nations was a direct consequence of his plan to share common values across the world. Only a few years later, the League of Nations transformed into the United Nations. The

principle of self-determination appears in the universal treaties and declarations such as the United Nations Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), and International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and International Covenant on Economic and social Rights. These principles can be found under the UN administration in Kosovo- United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo- which ensures peaceful life and stability in Kosovo.

Even before Wilson's period, during the early days of the Republic, the USA was aware of its status as a symbol of liberty and individuality. In the book *Diplomacy*, Kissinger uses Thomas Jefferson's words that America was "acting for all mankind: ...that circumstances denied to others, but indulged to us, have imposed on us the duty of proving what is the degree of freedom and self-government in which a society may venture to leave its individual members" (1994, p. 29). During Jefferson's period, no one would believe that after less than two hundred years, the USA would hold the position of the defender of human rights worldwide. In fact Jefferson's words have been fulfilled to the letter. The USA deals with a wide range of problems, which involves peacekeeping missions to assure international security, stability, and democratic institutions.

The case of Kosovo is not different. Actually one of many requisitions, which the new state of Kosovo must guarantee, is the improvement of relations with ethnic minorities. Among them are the "fighting against organized crime and corruption" (Woehrel, 2013, p. 11) and establishment of the rule of law. According to Woehrel, "he (Obama) added Kosovo had more work to do in ensuring that the rights enshrined in the country's constitution are realized for every citizen" (Ibid). Since the war in Kosovo, USA has been ruled by three presidents, but the US policy towards Kosovo seems to have the same direction only with small differences. A very similar theory has been brought by a theorist of *Realpolitik*, John Mearsheimer, who gives credit to his "billiard balls" effect. According to Mearsheimer, it does not matter, what is going on inside domestic policy, foreign policy is still the same (2003). If we

try to look at the case of Kosovo and view the US position from a theory of realism, Mearsheimer sees self-preservation as the most important because a state does not want to lose its position on the international scene. This includes the US strategy to gain long-term goals that will affect the security for its nation and its allies. However, if any country wants to count with the support of USA, it has to accomplish necessary conditions that are related to assumptions that the country will operate within the values of a democratic regime. A part of the international community recognizes the new state- Kosovo- in the belief that the new institutions will guarantee the original and inalienable rights of all people and depreciation on the human dignity will never happen again.

Operation Allied Force

After the Serbian part refused to sign the terms issued in the Rambouillet talks by the Contact Group, which is composed of the United States, United Kingdom, France, Italy, Germany and Russia, NATO launched *Operation Allied Force*, which should lead to the withdrawal of Yugoslav special forces from Kosovo. This NATO operation has been criticized for violating the international law and sovereignty. The strong position of the USA in NATO gives critics a chance to blame the USA for acting aggressively. According to Noam Chomsky, one of the biggest critics of the US foreign policy, "NATO bombings further undermine what remains of the fragile structure of international law" (1999, p. 151). However, NATO intervention found a huge support in the US Congress and many regarded it as necessary. Necessity in this case denoted the position of the international community under the US leadership to stop the crimes against humanity. It is important to mention that peace talks like Dayton and Rambouillet, which were submitted before the intervention, were initiated by the US side. However, both of them did not stop Serbian aggression against Kosovo Albanians. According to the document *From Kosovo to Kabul and Beyond Human Rights and International Intervention*, Donald Rumsfeld- the past US Defense

Secretary- stated that all military actions led by the US were, “ for the purpose of denying hostile regimes the opportunity to oppress their own people and other people”(Chandler, 2002, p. 8). From Rumsfeld’s words we can understand the position that the USA tries to act as a representative of basic human rights. In other words, the US foreign policy tries to protect the right of “physical security “even for citizens outside the USA (Shue, 1996). Possibly, the US foreign policy does perceive international law diversely than other actors. There is a chance that the US officials feel accountability in challenging the problems. If the US tries to act as a guardian of human rights, it has to act as a fair and relentless leader, which takes action in the effort to save human lives. John F. Kennedy’s adviser, Dean Acheson, spoke about the US purpose “...to gild our positions with an ethos derived from very general moral principles which have affected legal doctrines” (Chomsky, 1999, p. 151). The US foreign policy seems to take a serious responsibility for promoting security and peace worldwide and it takes into account moral principles, which are rooted in the UN Charter. As Henry Kissinger says in *Diplomacy*, “If anything, it has spurred America’s faith that history can be overcome and that if the world truly wants peace, it needs to apply America’s moral prescriptions” (1994, p. 14).

Other authors, Pierre Hassner and Gilles Andréani, advocate justification of international intervention. In the book *Justifying War?: From Humanitarian Intervention to Counterterrorism*, they described the situation, in which a state commits a crime on its citizens because of ethnical or other reasons (Gilles & Hassner, 2008). In the case of Kosovo, legal authorities committed a crime against its own citizens-Kosovo Albanians-whose rights were brutally oppressed and the international community had a right to intervene. In this case, it is clear that NATO intervention is justified by the need to intervene. The traditional view of *status quo* recedes into the background and the concept of human rights raises. In addition, NATO and the US officials were sufficiently advised from the previous conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina, where the peace negotiations did not bring effective fruits. Western partners have to face serious crimes on human dignity and did not want

“the greatest collective security failure of the West since the 1930s ” to happen again (The New York Times, 2011).

Approaches on the US foreign policy-making

Of course, we have to take seriously other approaches, which could possibly shape the US position towards taking action in Yugoslavia. David P. Auerswald explains the reasons for support of NATO intervention in various military conflicts. In general, if we are about to talk about NATO, we have to speak about its strongest army and the most influential member among others- USA- the leader, which invests most of the money and manages all military programs. Auerswald uses the theories of collective action, public opinion and balance of threat neorealism.

According to an analysis *Explaining Wars of Choice: An Integrated Decision Model of NATO Policy in Kosovo*, theories of collective actions count with the “premise” (Auerswald, 2004, p. 636) that general good produced collectively by the states or the members of alliances will bring a specific type of behavior among other states. Weaker or subordinated states will try to be “breathing” in the same way as their stronger partners. As Auerswald says, we can find many reasons for collective actions in the Kosovo conflict. One of the reasons is that the Balkans is an inseparable part of Europe and ethnic cleansing had to be stopped at all costs (2004). In this case, the executor of ethnic cleansing- Yugoslav government and army- had to be stopped and punished for acting against the doctrine of human rights.

States can possibly threaten the security of other states. In that case, the creation of alliances can rapidly balance the power between the states that are constantly threatened and the alliance can collectively face danger, which in fact has a power to minimize the open conflict. Theorists often call this act a balancing neorealism. It is hard to believe that the genocide, which happened in Yugoslavia would jeopardize the security in the USA or that Serbia would run into an open conflict with the strongest member among NATO. However, there was a chance that the instability in

the Balkans would expand to other places of Europe and that would certainly concern the USA because of European strategic position in all spheres of the US policy.

Thirdly, let us introduce a very general view that in democratic regimes, the elected ones- the parliaments and governments- should represent the views among the majority of the society. As Auerswald says, this “bottom-up” voice has a power to influence the foreign policy, so there exists a theory that the foreign policy of the US was strongly shaped by the public opinion (2004, p. 640). During the Kosovo crisis, media took a strong and decisive position to influence the public sphere. The public was horrified by the pictures of crimes, violations on Kosovars and deterioration of the human rights. In an official document presented by The Program on International Policy Attitudes (PIPA), which studies public opinion on international issues, 62% respondents prioritized the norm against genocide before the norm of respect for the national sovereignty of nations (1999).

National Sovereignty and Genocide

As a general principle, even if atrocities are being committed within a country, the international community should not intervene with military force because this would be a violation of the country's national sovereignty.



While respect for national borders is important, when large scale atrocities, such as genocide are being committed, this justifies military intervention by the international community.



Source: www.pipa.org (May 1999)

The Kosovo conflict in 1999 was a breakthrough in view of the size of NATO operation. "It also was the alliance's first major military intervention outside alliance territory, and represents the most recent time that a majority of alliance members collectively used force" (Auerswald, 2004, p. 633). Until the Kosovo crisis 1999, NATO had not joined any open conflict, even during the Cold War, NATO successfully held its position towards the army of the Warsaw Pact or its allies. However, the recent event in Kosovo did not remain unnoticed and NATO launched the operation, which suggested future directions of the alliance.

Before the thesis moves to the foreign policy of the US after 9/11, there is a need to demonstrate that the connotation within the sphere of foreign affairs of the US during the Kosovo crisis took on another dimension. The question is where can we apply realism or ideational liberalism? The thesis considers an option that the conception of the US foreign policy was strongly influenced by the domestic policy, in other words, the US policy was shaped by the ideational liberalism. One of the effects of the US domestic values was that the US foreign policy was interested in the right of self-determination for nation and in the prevention of large-scale human rights violations, the consequence was that the public called for an intervention.

However, the next part of the chapter is going to analyze the US foreign policy after 9/11, which brought significant changes in the whole conception of the US position in foreign missions. Books, official documents, and analysis serve as main resources, which help to demonstrate that the US policy after 9/11 is more oriented towards security, stability, and maintaining power in the region. From this perspective, the thesis is able to count with an option that the US foreign policy has gone through a process of transformation. Ideational liberalism has been replaced by realism, which is more oriented towards reaching of long-term national interests.

The conception of the US foreign policy after 9/11

The September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks brought a change in the conception of international policy. The attacks brought a new chapter of the US perception of the national security and war against terrorism. If we analyze the policies, which were adopted by the greatest powers after the terrorist attacks in USA and elsewhere, we will find a common concept, which unifies all of them. There was a need to redefine the traditional view of the international law with the effort to fight international terrorism more effectively. The classical approach of state sovereignty, the Westphalian concept from 1648, had to be more specified in the meaning of international security. In the era of globalization, the world seems to call for collective security because traditional sovereign state fails in preserving international serenity.

The United States of America after the series of attacks has assumed the position of a leader that tries to preserve peace and stability, spread the idea of democracy, and establishes the policy of free trade. If we look at the case of Kosovo, the foreign policy of the US has to deal with all three attitudes. The aim of the US foreign policy is to solve an unfinished business with instability in the Balkan territory. Kim and Woehrel write that "In 2006 and 2007, U.S. officials made repeated statements against maintaining an unstable status quo and in favor of resolving Kosovo's status in order to achieve long-standing U.S. goals for a Europe whole, free, and at peace" (2008, p. 5). Unpredictable conflict in Balkan can affect the stability in Europe, which can cause dramatic consequences between the US and European relations. Present decisions of the US foreign policy towards Kosovo seem to take a complex and multidimensional course, which sets USA into the position of the leader that tries to prevent attacks on the US citizens and its allies. The National Security Strategy of the United States 2010 deals with the question of maintaining stability and sharing democratic principles to Eastern Europe and the Balkans. To achieve this goal,

according to Richard L. Kugler, USA needs to preserve NATO in Europe as a “vibrant” and effective alliance, which will contribute to peace, security, and prosperity (2011).

From an analysis by the Heidelberg Institute for International Conflict Research, international conflicts after the WWII have a downward trend and intra-national conflicts are on the rise (2010). Today, the sphere of international community is arranged in an environment, where great powers try to emulate in peace. The world shares a common enemy that is the terrorism. The world powers have to act in unity and must be willing to stop the crimes on innocent people collectively, promptly, and effectively. We can consider the case of Kosovo as an intra-national conflict because there was living a huge Albanian population under the Belgrade government and Serbian authorities ruled them with a “heavy hand” (Malcolm, 1998). Consequently, the Albanian military revolt-UCK forces-took a series of attacks against army and police of Yugoslavia. Chaos and war in the region brought tremendous instability, from which the Kosovo region is still recovering. Terrorist groups like Al Qaeda exploited the wars in Bosnia and Kosovo as their main opportunity of infiltrating into the Balkan territory. According to Yossef Bodansky, the Director of Research at the International Strategic Studies Association and past senior consultant for the US Department of Defense, “radical Islamists decided to use the terrorism infrastructure of the Balkans as a “key facilitator” in the proposed escalation of conflict aimed at Europe, Israel and the United States” (WND, 2006). The supervision and disciplinary tools of the state failed and terrorist members penetrated into the Bosnian and Albanian armies. These “mujahedins” stood behind bombings in Riyadh and Saudi Arabia and their terrorist networks would potentially begin terrorist strikes in France, Belgium and other West European states (Bodansky, 1996).

However, the years have passed, the Balkan has changed, but the potential threats are still present. The international community tries to eliminate transnational organized crime, which includes drug trade, corruption and financing militias. As it is written in the NSS 2002, the policy of the US against international terrorism includes

“using the full influence of the United States, and working closely with allies and friends, to make clear that all acts of terrorism are illegitimate so that terrorism will be viewed in the same light as slavery, piracy, or genocide: behavior that no respectable government can condone or support and all must oppose” and “using effective public diplomacy to promote the free flow of information and ideas to kindle the hopes and aspirations of freedom of those in societies ruled by the sponsors of global terrorism” (2002, p. 5).

Kosovo and its strategic geography is an important chapter for the US foreign policy. If USA tries to prevent the Balkans from being a “conflict-ridden region”, it also means that USA tries to maintain economic and political relations with its traditional partners like Greece, Turkey and Italy. The USA also tries to protect new members of NATO. Among them are states like Hungary, Romania and Bulgaria, which are located in the close proximity to Kosovo (Metz, 2001, p. 13). Security among all NATO members can be useful for the US operations in the Middle East and also as far as the US undertakes anti-terrorism efforts in the Balkans.

The recent decision of the Czech parliament, which led to the rejection of the US radar facility in Czech Republic, created a new proposal putting “SM-3 ground-based interceptors” in Romania by 2018 (Eagle World News, 2011). It will be an aim of the US to keep an eye on its strategic radars that should bring security for its traditional European partners. Uncertainty about the status of Kosovo, which includes weak institutions, failure of state apparatus, corruption and drug trades, gives a chance to threats that can cause serious damages on the national security of the US and its allies. Although the opposing countries have been criticizing the recognition, the “architects” of the independence of Kosovo talk about prevention that does not give any possibility for further expansion of the conflict (Caplan, 1998, p. 749). The estimations that a non-recognition of Kosovo independence would bring reasons for further radicalization of the Kosovo Albanians, seem to be legit. International scene would then fail in finding a required peace and stability in the southern Europe.

However, Europe needs a leadership unified in democratic principles, which bring regional stability.

The United States and the Western partners are convinced that the establishment of Kosovo will bring the stability in the Balkan. However, there is still a serious danger that an independent Kosovo would potentially destabilize the region of northern Macedonia, where the huge minority of Albanians is still unhappy with their status within the state apparatus. In 2000, Strobe Talbott, the Deputy Secretary of State, published a concept to define self-determination in a way, which does not bring disintegration. According to him, this concept should aim on bringing lasting peace, which meant that the borders would not be changed by war or any aggression (Bose, 2002, p. 278). In fact, Talbott's words meant that the US did not want to rewrite the existing borders. However, essential decisions had already been made by bringing UNMIK and KFOR into existence in 1999, long before Talbott's words.

Many opponents of the recognition of Kosovo's status blamed the US of bias policy against Serbia, however, it is hard to imagine the return of Kosovo under Serbian control. Today, Kosovo is composed by a majority of Albanians with the proportion of 90%. The instability, which spread during the Kosovo crisis and the whole Balkans, generated thousands of refugees and displaced people. In fact, this precedent threatened the respect for human rights and the peaceful resolution of conflicts. Although the conflict erupted in the Balkan territory, it could easily violate wider European security, the security of the European neighbors and all its allies.

During the US Congress held on 30th March 2000, Secretary of State Madeleine Albright stated, "History teaches us that America cannot be secure if Europe is not secure, and events have reminded us repeatedly that Europe cannot be secure when conflict engulfs the Balkans" (Metz, 2001, p. 10). The US national security seeks a strategic partnership with Europe, which should deal with the prevention of all threats around. The fear of spread of violence, which the US has learned from the history, suggests steps that the foreign policy of the US will potentially take.

According to an analysis, *The Impact of Analogical Reasoning on US Foreign Policy towards Kosovo* by Aidan Hehir, the human race perceives certain events through equations with history (2006, p. 71). That means that radicalization of both sides- Kosovo Albanians and Serbs- which would be an outcome of non-recognition of Kosovo, would bring another conflict. Analogical reasoning can potentially be a key reason, why the US foreign policy views Kosovo as an independent entity. In addition, the state of sovereign and independent Kosovo would guarantee the fact that both countries will be bound by international law. Most countries that recognize the independence of Kosovo suppose that there will not be a change in the future borders of the new state. Kosovo achieved a degree of political autonomy within the borders of Serbia. Even though the UN Resolution 1244 guarantees non-separation of borders of the existing state- Serbia - Ahtisaari's plan appears to be a means of achieving independence for Kosovo.

The US foreign policy is concerned with the creation of a self-sustaining stability in the region of the Balkans, which does not require further military intervention led by NATO forces. Washington tries to bring the remaining states of the Balkans close to Euro-Atlantic institutions, which can minimize the spread of conflicts. As an independent state, Kosovo is building its own police and army under KFOR trusteeship. Kosovo may probably try to join NATO in the future, but its position may be blocked within NATO members that do not want to recognize Kosovo's independence. The position of the US in the Balkans has slightly changed since the end of the conflicts during 1990s (mainly the number of US troops has been reduced as a consequence of their need in Afghanistan or Iraq), the foreign policy of the US gives Kosovo aid in selected areas, "such as reform of intelligence and internal security bodies, military reform, and rule of law assistance" (Woehrel, 2009). However, Washington is aware that it is necessary to fight against the threats and crisis beyond the US territory. As Steven Metz states, "US objectives in the Balkans are: (1) maximizing the chances that the region will become stable, prosperous, and integrated into Europe, (2) sustaining NATO's leading role in European security, and,

(3) doing so in such a way that the US military remains able to implement the National Military Strategy, in particular to fight and win two nearly simultaneous major theater wars” (2001, p. 10).

Kosovo suffers from being a country with the highest poverty and unemployment in the whole Balkans territory. According to the World Bank, about 45% of Kosovo’s population is poor and about 15% of the population is very poor, which means that this population cannot meet its basic needs. Kosovo is heavily dependent on international aid. During Bush’s administration, Kosovo has been included under the Generalized System of Preferences, “... a program that cuts US tariffs for many imports from poor countries” (Woehrel, 2010). As David Chandler writes, “*For Michael Ignatieff*, the lesson of 11 September was that in a globalised world, the global rich and powerful have a duty to assist the poor and disempowered, not just out of altruism but also self-interest” (Chandler, 2002). The present globalised environment is marked by serious threats that we cannot ignore. Among them are international terrorism, trade with nuclear weapons or multinational organized crime. The US foreign policy makers are aware of their position, which makes them responsible for the needs of other countries. It does not matter how distant the country is, history has taught us that USA must care about interests of others in preserving its own national security.

Chapter 4: Russian Foreign Policy Concerning the Future Status of Kosovo

Since the end of the Cold War, Russia has been trying to conduct its foreign policy with the aim to achieve its interests. Since the 1990s, Russia tries to develop its enduring interests among territories in Europe and Asia and tries to maintain good relations with its partners. However, the declaration of Kosovo independence from 17th February 2008 has opened the debates about the main purpose of international law, more accurate it has opened the question of perception of state sovereignty. Russia, a member of the Security Council, possesses a different view than the other three members of the Security Council (except the People's Republic of China) on the case of the Kosovo's independence. The position of the Russian foreign policy seems to take steps towards checking the US unilateralism. There is an option that Russia wants to reach a status of being a fully recognized balancing power. Rather than being a strong opposition to the US foreign policy, Russia seems to adopt a traditional view of international law. In fact, Russian attitude toward being a reliable partner is clear, the case of Kosovo could possibly play a potential dangerous precedent for further mutual decisions that will be needed in the future to be discussed on the international scene. Kosovo is not the only case in which Russia has valued a different view than the USA and the EU. The purpose of this chapter will be to possibly demonstrate the position of the Russian foreign policy towards Kosovo. Russia has not recognized the new state of Kosovo, so if we want to answer the question why Russia holds its position, it is necessary to analyze the orientation of its foreign policy. There is an option that Russia seems to follow a very traditional concept of state sovereignty, which means that it wants to maintain the status quo, regardless of violation of human rights. On the other hand, this chapter is going to demonstrate the position that modern Russia does not follow any ideological doctrine, which markedly shapes its type of the foreign policy. Rather than the classical approach of Russian dogmatism, the thesis will try to prove that the Russian

foreign policy in Kosovo is based on the estimation that Russia seeks to achieve the interests of its own.

The Russian view regarding the Kosovo status

Among the countries that refuse to recognize the new state Kosovo is the member of the Security Council- Russia- the state that takes a leading role in arguing the present status of Kosovo. Russia holds a Serbian position that strictly refuses Kosovo's independence because it considers Kosovo as a province of Serbia. Russia insists that important decisions cannot be taken without Serbia's consent. Most of the EU countries have already recognized Kosovo, but there are some that are against the independence. These are Cyprus, Greece, Spain, Romania and Slovakia. These countries have significant minorities within the states. As the opponents of the Kosovo independence say, there is the possibility that states with problematic minorities could possibly follow the example of Kosovo in the future and it could create a precedent that could lead into far more open conflicts which will have a more serious impact on the stability in Europe. Since June 10th 1999, Kosovo has been put under the international protectorate. The United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo- UNMIK- provides an interim administration for Kosovo, under which the people could enjoy a substantial autonomy and self-government. The United Nations have also adopted the Resolution 1244, which does not mention the final status of Kosovo. However, the resolution preserves the borders of Serbia and adversaries of Kosovo independence demonstrate their arguments on preserving the Resolution 1244, which in fact does not provide further recommendations. Russian politicians claim that the international community must respect the international law. Moscow wants to avoid the breaking of notable resolutions and international law, which could potentially lead into a disharmony or anarchy. The international scene would lose the common concept of a peaceful and solution finding diplomacy. Also, there will not be a need for having international treaties and covenants anymore. As the director of the American Council for Kosovo,

James George Jatras, expressed his opinion, "It still seems underappreciated the extent to which the US action would shred any semblance of legality in the international system. It may be the first time a group of countries has purported to separate part of a state's territory without its concession of that fact. (To be sure, many countries have been defeated and occupied and forced to sign treaties ceding land. Even Edvard Benes signed away the Sudetenland in 1938. No Serbian hand will ever sign away Kosovo). International guarantees of territorial integrity such as the UN Charter and the Helsinki Final Act would be a dead letter" (Top Political Analysts on Lavrov's End of Europe Kosovo Warning, 2008). The position of Russia, which sets the primacy on the observation of the international law in Kosovo is remarkable. Russia seems to follow the policy of maintaining the international rule of law, which recognizes the inviolability of state borders. "The rule of law is intended to ensure a peaceful and fruitful cooperation among States while maintaining the balance of their often conflicting interests as well as safeguarding the interests of the world community as a whole" (The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, 2008). The Kosovo precedent has a power to open a dangerous "pandora's box", which can transform into far more sophisticated conflicts in or outside Europe. To mention the minorities, which used to struggle less or more for independence in Europe and some of them will even today are: the Catalans and the Basques in Spain, the Flanders in Belgium, the Scots and the Northern Irish in the UK, the Hungarians in Romania and Slovakia, or the citizens of Northern Cyprus. Although the European Union and Russia seem to share the interests in the international rule of law and international security, they disagree on the fundamental principles how to reach their goals. Russia seems to follow the policy of adherent to the international law and espouses the importance of non-intervention in other countries' domestic affairs. The co- author of the book, *Russia: The New Cold War?*, John Laughland, said that "Kosovo would have had more real independence within Serbia than it has had under the UN or will have in Europe. If the EU and the US override that resolution, which says Kosovo is part of Serbia, they will have once again demonstrated their

contempt for international law and shown themselves to be unreliable international partners ”(Top Political Analysts on Lavrov’s End of Europe Kosovo Warning, 2008). Previously mentioned, the UN Resolution 1244 actually does not provide any information about the final status of Kosovo. It specifically does not mention the referendum on its status and does not clearly set the time limit for establishing the international civil administration (UNMIK). Between other main tasks of UNMIK, it is important to mark the significant ones. Along with other duties, UNMIK has an authority in securing civil law and order, ensuring the basic civil and administrative functions, allowing the political processes that will define the future status of Kosovo, coordinating the humanitarian assistance to all international organizations, supporting the reconstruction of key infrastructure, safeguarding the human rights and others (UN, 1999). The question is, when will be the right time, when can UNMIK leave and Kosovo would become a sovereign state with own administration? Before the Kosovo crisis in 1999, Russia belonged to the majority of states, which did not want to re-write the map of the Balkan. Thus, there is a possibility that Russia remained in its conviction because it does not see Kosovo as an effective entity, which owns a monopoly on implementing the power. However, under the rule from Belgrade, Kosovo would get a right of being an autonomous province of Serbia. In fact, this cannot be considered as an attempt to create a blockade for the western community or somehow re-establish the policy of the Soviet Russia. There is a chance that since the end of the Cold War, when Russia lost its strong position, Russian officials try to be seen as a complete new entity, which can fulfill all the expectations that are relevant to the fact that Russia is a regional power. Russia shows that it calls for the reconsideration of its status for being an equal partner to the West and it uses the importance of respecting the international law for its own sake.

The conception of the Russian foreign policy

Under the Vladimir Putin's era, Russia has fully transformed from the collective economy to the free-market economy. While things have moved on, strong supporters of the Slavic values believed that Russia holds its traditional cultural practices that were significant for the Russian *spetsifika* (Lo, 2002, p. 15). On the other hand, Putin follows a very different policy from the policy of Boris Yeltsin. Putin seems to be successful in the transformation of Russia's perception outside the country and in its relations with other states. The present Russian foreign policy shares the same problems with the western countries, which means that Russia seeks the international security and strongly opposes any attempts of international terrorism. After the attacks from 11th September 2001, Russia supports the idea that the world community is obliged to fight against terrorism. After the presidential elections in 2000, Putin has quickly adapted in a world of global politics and declared new approaches to regional and international security. "Russian foreign policy has become more real, more confident and diversified" (Voľanská). Putin began to develop a policy toward the West and his policy is more or less considered to be constructive, which means that it is not in a conflict with the western countries. Although, the Russian foreign policy has shifted towards the developed West, Yeltsin's era is still marked among some of the public institutions.

The issue, which resonated during the fall of the former Yugoslavia, Kosovo 1999, elicited a huge criticism and strong public reaction from Russia. Especially from nationalist and former communist officials, the responding voices to resist the West became the most controversial during the Yeltsin's era. In the work, *Russia and NATO Toward the 21st Century: Conflicts and Peacekeeping in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Kosovo*, it is stated that "Post-Soviet Russian political party platforms left, center and right have evolved over the past several years to include unified opposition to NATO enlargement" (Cross, 2001, p. 5). NATO enlargement became interpreted as an effort of the West to take advantage of the Russian weakness, instability in domestic affairs

and bad economic situation. Russia could not agree on its strategic because the Duma was composed by the pro-reformist politicians that focused their policy toward bilateral relations with the West and the second group composed by the former communist and national politicians could count with the huge support of the Russian public. "This had led to discussions within Russian foreign and military/security policy circles concerning the formation of counter alliances among the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS)" (Cross, 2001, p. 7). Today, the Commonwealth of Independent States comprises nine states: Russia, Belarus, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgystan, Moldova, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan. None of the members of CIS, along with Georgia, has recognized Kosovo. The appearance that Russia owns one of the biggest armies in the world can be true, however, the US spends more on its army than the whole world together and USA has the biggest army in men in NATO and it is also the biggest sponsor. The policy of the US represents the world hegemony, but Russia under Putin transformed into the present form, when the Russian foreign policy is not so weak that it cannot enforce its word. Russia is treated as a great power and therefore it may feel a need for equilibrium.

Russian Slavic Identity

It is important to mention that Russia helped as a member of the UN Security Council and Contact Group to end the ethnical cleansing in Bosnia. However, NATO's decision to use airstrikes in Kosovo aroused resentment by the Russian officials. As Sharyl Cross says, Russia did not want to be connected with the "pariah states" of the world community in any attempt, but Russian officials viewed the conflict as a civil war within Serbia and intervention could not take place because the conflict rose on the territory of a sovereign nation state (Cross, 2001).

Along with the historic geostrategic interests in the Balkan, which culminated in the Crimean War (1853-1856), the Russian and Serbian population is characterized by the common Eastern Orthodox Slavic identity. As the Soviet Army officer Victor

Gobarev says, "Russian-Yugoslav (Serb and Montenegrin) ties represent an historic, 1,500 year-long alliance that began with the first joint military campaigns of the Eastern and Southern Slavs long before the year 1000. The alliance endured the 500 years when the Turks oppressed the Serbs and Montenegrins, a period when Russia represented the only hope of liberation for their fellow Orthodox Slavic brothers " (1999, p. 3). The Kosovo conflict rose during the period, when Russia faced a challenge with its post-Soviet era and NATO enlarged its influence in the strategic post-Soviet territory. Serbian officials, along with the Orthodox church, appealed to Russia for the support of Serbian population. Serbian Bishop of Bach Iriney stated, "Russia ought to play the part not only of peace mediator in the Balkans, but also a kind of defender of the Serbs. As the Germans defend the Croats, and the Americans the Moslems, so the Russians must defend the Serbs" (INTERFAX, 1994, p. 14). Even though the Russian public called for the open support for Serbia, the Russian officials did not want to disrupt the relationship between Russia and the West. In fact, Russia did not call for any anti-NATO alliance or anti-aircraft mission to stop the Operation Allied Force. Moscow constantly pressured Serbian officials to withdraw its army from Kosovo. As a result, Moscow could have protective feelings for Orthodox Serbs, Russian officials were not free in their aim of expressing their support for the Serbian population. If we look at the policy made by the Russian government, its concrete steps were influenced by the consequences that would emerge later. As Cross says, "Some discounted Russia's opposition as insignificant suggesting that while Russians may have expressed dissatisfaction with the bombings, they were not prepared to support rendering assistance to the Serbs. While recognition on the part of Russian citizens that providing support to Serbs may not have been possible given Russia's current domestic problems, or that the risks in terms of Western responses would be too great, still the NATO air campaign would make a significant and lasting impact in Russian perceptions of the Alliance and its intentions" (Cross, 2001, p. 12).

There are clear tendencies that Russia wants to remain a strategic player in the international area and by the fact that it has already learnt from the Soviet past, the present foreign policy will take different steps. Thus, we are able to exclude any doubts that Russia follows the policy of the Slavic or Orthodox brotherhood. In fact, the thesis works with the option that Russia, along with other great powers across the world, is influenced by the concept of realism and it looks forward to reach its own long-term strategic goals in world politics. On the one hand, Moscow considers the recognition of the Kosovo independence as a dangerous precedent, on the other hand, this precedent was applied by the Russian recognition of Abkhazia and South Ossetia.

Russian self-interests in the Balkan territory

The current situation in Russia suggests that Putin wants to avoid international isolation and re-gain the power in the sphere of the global community. Moscow arguing its position that the case of Kosovo would create a precedent in other countries of the Balkan and elsewhere in the world cannot remain unnoticed. If we want to understand the position of Moscow towards Kosovo, we need to look at the parallel situations, which the Russian Federation had to face. Along with the recognition of Kosovo, Moscow had to oppose the independence from Chechen guerillas in Chechnya. Given the situation in Chechnya, which was not favorable to the territorial integrity of the Russian Federation, Moscow could not support the Kosovo proposal that would go against each other. As Lukáš Holas is stating, there are significant similarities in Kosovo with the relationship to Chechnya. "Residents of both areas claim the right to self-determination of nations, both areas have become difficult after the collapse of integration, and both territories have active paramilitaries, which operated in the dominant state and were financially and militarily subsidized from abroad" (2010, p. 61).

Therefore, it is essential for Russia that Europe has stability. If there is not a stability in the Balkan territory, Russian security is potentially threatened by the escalating

conflict in Chechnya and other states, which feel the need to separate. Moscow met its expectations and war in Chechnya became true. On the other hand, during the war with Georgia in 2008, Moscow stood on the side of Abkhazia and South Ossetia, the provinces of Georgia that did not want to remain under the rule of Tbilisi. "Abkhazia was left with no effective constitution or legal ties to Georgia. As a result, while war was raging in South Ossetia, the Abkhazian parliament decreed a return to the constitution of 1925 which had been instituted when Abkhazia was a sovereign republic within the Soviet Union" (Jackson, 2004, p. 113). After the war, only Russia and very few states recognized Abkhazia and South Ossetia. After such steps have been taken by the Russian foreign policy, we are able to say that Russia looks for the effort to weaken the position of Georgia and Moscow tries to maintain its position within the whole territory of the Caucasus.

In the analysis, *Russian Foreign Policy in Transition* by Andrei Melville and Tatiana Shakleina, the authors claim that an economically and politically weak Russia might potentially become an unprecedented source of destabilization in Europe (2005). Today, the bilateral relations between Moscow and Europe are primarily based on energy. Secondly, Eurasia needs constant stability. Russia, along with Europe, wants to reach the partnership that should bring the prosperity to both of them. Even after NATO enlargement in the southern Europe, Russia retains its position of the international law supervisor and tries to keep a positive dialogue with the West. "The post-Soviet version of geopolitics may have been less harsh and confrontational than its Cold War predecessor, but the geopolitical mindset became stronger if anything" (Lo, 2002, p. 8). The assumption that Moscow responds to defend its position towards Kosovo to reach its long-term interests in the Balkan is more than expected. Energy ties with the European powers such as Germany, France and Italy are inevitable for Moscow to maintain its role as the greatest gas supplier on the continent. The lessons from the collapse of the Soviet Union have taught the Russian officials that financial stabilization, diplomacy and modern technologies are necessary to reach the position of a balancing power. As Andrei Tsygankov states, at

the turn of the millenniums Putin highlighted the Russian objectives. The objectives that Putin considers as the most important for Russia are “economic modernization, political stability, and the enhancement of security” (2009, p. 144).

Instead of the voices that the Russian foreign policy is influenced by the socialist or nationalist lobby in the Duma, Russia needs to form a complete policy based on the good bilateral relations with other partners. It is clear that Russia under Vladimir Putin wants to be seen as a state, which vindicates global priorities. Along with the USA and Europe, Russia seeks to reach the security and stability in Kosovo. Only the peaceful Balkans would bring an economic prosperity and other goals for Russia.

Recent events that indicated that Ukraine and Belarus can cause future problems for the flawless supply of the Russian gas to Europe, did not remain unnoticed. Therefore, the Russian diplomacy tries to take all necessary steps that would guarantee the supply. New projects- Nord Stream and South Stream- mean for Moscow to get rid of the dependence on Ukraine and Belarus. However, the South Stream should have a 400km section going through Serbia. The South Stream pipeline is projected by the Russian Gazprom, German Wintershall, French EDF and Italian Eni. Gazprom now controls 51 percent stake in Serbia’s state oil company (Atlantic Council, 2008). In addition, Gazprom already received positive support from Bulgaria, Hungary, and Serbia (Centre for Eastern Studies, 2012). The pipeline should be completed by the end of 2015 and it will be laid on the floor of the Black Sea from Novorossiysk to the Bulgarian port Varna. In Bulgaria, it will be divided into two parts. The first branch will flow to Greece and Italy, and the second branch will go through Romania, Serbia Slovenia, Hungary and Austria. The area of the Balkans, by which the pipeline should flow, is strategic to Moscow. Russia stresses the importance of a stable region and seeks a reliable partner, to whom it may trust. From the Russian point of view, there is only one longtime historical and cultural partner- Serbia- that is able to guarantee the Russian economic interests. Therefore it seems that Russia’s policy on Kosovo is based on far wider interests rather than

Kurucz: The Policies of the USA and Russia Regarding Kosovo

Kosovo itself. Moscow is concerned with the dangerous threat that can disrupt its interests, and its foreign policy looks for all the ways that can guarantee the stability on the Balkan that are necessary for its economic interests.

The orientation of the Russian foreign policy seems to be influenced by the realist approach because it seeks self-interests in the Balkans. Kosovo is a necessary part of the Balkans region. However, Russia may possibly consider the way how to secure the region differently than the USA. Therefore, we are able to reject an idea that the modern Russian foreign policy is shaped by Slavic doctrines.



Source: www.energy.eu

Chapter 5: Conclusion

In the conclusion, the thesis is going to summarize all the acquired information and take an opinion on the question, whether the different positions of the US and the Russian foreign policy towards the status of Kosovo indicate different view on state's sovereignty today or whether the positions of the superpowers are influenced by self-interests.

The thesis is able to illustrate that the US foreign policy has significantly changed after the terrorist attacks from 9th September 2001. Rather than the ideational liberalism, which prevailed until the terrorist attacks, it seems that the theory of realism is more likely to be true according to the conception of the US policy towards the status of Kosovo. Uncertainty about the status of Kosovo, which includes weak institutions, failure of state apparatus, corruption and drug trades, gives a chance to threats that can cause serious damages on the stability of Europe. Europe is an ally of the USA, which means that the vague status of Kosovo can undermine the national security of the US. Chaos and war in Kosovo brought tremendous instability, from which the region is still recovering. As it was previously explained, the supervision tools of the state failed and terrorist members penetrated into the Bosnian and Albanian armies. Even though the years have changed the picture of the Balkan, the potential threats are still present. The aim of the international community is to eliminate all kinds of transnational threats and establish an effective state apparatus. As it is written in the US National Security Strategy 2002, the US policy is directed towards the elimination of threats of all kind. However, the international terrorism after the series of attacks is among them. Kosovo and its strategic geography is an important chapter for the US foreign policy. The USA also wants to protect new members of NATO. Among them are states like Hungary, Romania and Bulgaria, which are located in the close proximity to Kosovo. Security among all NATO members can be useful for the US operations in the Middle East and also as far as the US undertakes anti-terrorism efforts in the Balkans. Today, it is hard to imagine the return of Kosovo under Serbian control. Recent information from

Serbia shows that the Serbian leaders are now more pragmatic towards the independence of Kosovo, while Serbia is still interested in joining the EU (Sme, 2013). Today, Kosovo is composed by a majority of Albanians and Serbian minority lives mainly in the northern part of Kosovo. Until the recent events, this area was considered to be the most controversial. Both parties were unable to find a common language. However, under the EU led negotiations, the tenth meeting in Brussels from April 2013 will go down in history. Kosovo Prime Minister Hashim Thaci and Serbian Prime Minister Ivica Dačić found a consensus. According to Catherine Ashton, the head diplomat of the EU, “the agreement is a step towards a closer Europe” (Sme, 2013). It is important to mention that the foreign policy of the US seems to retreat from a leadership position in Kosovo and the EU takes on the responsibility towards a more sovereign Kosovo. Actually, the presence of the US army in Kosovo is still significant. The present globalised environment is marked by serious threats that cannot be ignored. Among them are international terrorism, trade with nuclear weapons or multinational organized crime. The US foreign policy is aware of this situation, therefore it seeks to provide the whole region of Balkan with security and stability. Kosovo is not an exception. It does not matter how distant the country is, history has taught us that USA must care about the interests of its allies in preserving its own national security.

There are clear tendencies that Russia wants to remain a strategic player in the international area and by the fact that it has already learnt from the Soviet past, the present foreign policy will take different steps. Thus, we are able to exclude any doubts that Russia follows the policy of the Slavic or Orthodox brotherhood. In fact, the thesis prefers an option that Russia, along with other powers across the world, is influenced by the concept of realism and it looks forward to reach its own long-term strategic goals in world politics. For example, Moscow considers the recognition of the Kosovo’s independence as a dangerous precedent, on the other hand, this

precedent was applied by the Russian recognition of Abkhazia and South Ossetia. By the fact that the Russian foreign policy would recognize Kosovo's independence, Moscow would undermine its interests in maintaining Chechnya being the part of a Russian federation. Therefore, it is essential for Russia that Europe has stability. If there is no stability in the Balkan territory, Russian security is potentially threatened by the escalating conflict in Chechnya and other states, which feel the need to separate. Secondly, energy ties with the European powers such as Germany, France and Italy are inevitable for Moscow to maintain its role as the greatest gas supplier on the continent. The lessons from the collapse of the Soviet Union have taught the Russian officials that financial stabilization, diplomacy and modern technologies are necessary to reach the position of a balancing power. Along with the US and Europe, Russia seeks to reach global security and economic prosperity. Therefore it seems that Russia's policy on Kosovo is based on far wider interests rather than Kosovo itself. Moscow is concerned with the dangerous threat that can disrupt its interests, and its foreign policy looks for all the ways that can guarantee the stability on the Balkan that are necessary for its economic interests.

Resumé

Cieľom Resumé bude stručne a prehľadne informovať o jednotlivých kapitolách, ich obsahu a taktiež opísať myšlienky, ktoré jednotlivé kapitoly bakalárskej práce, *The policies of the USA and Russia Regarding Kosovo: The recognition of Kosovo's sovereignty*, ponúkajú.

Teoretická časť prvej kapitoly sa zameriava na vysvetlenie kľúčových pojmov, ktoré hrajú významnú úlohu v rámci celej práce. Teória sa zameriava na koncept realizmu a koncept myšlienkového liberalizmu, ktorý predstavil Andrew Moravcsik. Je možné sa hypoteticky domnievať, že správanie veľmocí USA a Ruska je možné vysvetľovať prostredníctvom spomínaných kľúčových pojmov. Sú zahraničné politiky USA a Ruska ovplyvnené ideológiou alebo skôr vlastnými záujmami na území Kosova? Empirické kapitoly, ktoré sa budú zaoberať charakterom zahraničných politik oboch mocností, sa budú môcť oprieť o ponúknuté teoretické pojmy a vyvodiť tak plnohodnotný záver.

Nevyhnutnou súčasťou Kosova je jeho komplexná história, na ktorú sa obe z dotknutých strán zvyknú odvolávať. Je preto dôležité informovať o významných historických faktoch, ktoré sa podieľali na vytvorení dnešnej pomerne vypätej situácie medzi srbským a albánskym obyvateľstvom. Dramatická situácia vyvrcholila v 90. rokoch 20. storočia, kedy sa oblasť Kosova neslávne preslávila trpkým obdobím etnických čistiek. Historické fakty hrali pomerne dôležitú úlohu v rámci kosovskej krízy. Začiatok prvej kapitoly sa venuje stredovekému obdobiu, konkrétne bitke na Kosovskom poli, ktorá má pomerne významnú úlohu pre srbské obyvateľstvo. V ďalších častiach kapitoly sa práca venuje albánskemu národnému hnutiu, srbskému kráľovstvu, obdobiu balkánskych vojen, Albánsku pod protektorátom Talianska počas druhej svetovej vojny, Juhoslávii počas vlády Josipa Broza Titu, obdobiu deväťdesiatych rokov a obdobiu, ktoré predchádzalo vyhláseniu nezávislosti Kosova z roku 2008.

Nasledujúce kapitoly sa budú venovať empirickým analýzám zahraničných politík supervelmocí a ich následnému aplikovaniu na príklade Kosova. Cieľom prvej empirickej kapitoly bude analyzovať zahraničnú politiku Spojených štátov amerických. Je potrebné zamerať sa na koncept politiky USA pred kosovskou krízou a porovnať ju s konceptom, ktorý americká vláda prijala po útokoch zo septembra 2001. Prvá časť kapitoly o politike USA sa venuje myšlienkovým smerom, respektíve ideám, ktoré boli symbolické pre zahraničnú politiku USA pred kosovskou krízou. Je možné, že po teroristických útokoch z roku 2001 sa koncepcia zahraničnej politiky výrazne líši od tých predošlých. Práca sa preto opiera o adekvátne zdroje, ktoré opisujú koncept zahraničnej politiky USA po 9/11. Po nadobudnutí potrebných informácií, následnej podrobnej analýze a aplikovaniu na Kosovo, je možné demonštrovať, že cieľom USA je predovšetkým dosiahnutie bezpečnosti a stability na území Balkánu.

Ďalšia kapitola sa venuje zahraničnej politike Ruska, ktorá sa týka Kosova. Od konca studenej vojny sa Rusko snaží získať renomé suverénneho a tradičného partnera. Tak ako ostatné štáty, pre dosiahnutie tohto cieľa Rusko využíva zahraničnú politiku. Po vyhlásení nezávislosti Kosova z roku 2008 sa Rusko razantne postavilo na stranu Srbska, svojho tradičného partnera, ktoré s nezávislosťou Kosova nesúhlasí. Ako tvrdia poprední predstavitelia zahraničnej politiky Ruska, uznanie Kosova môže mať vplyv na vytvorenie nebezpečného precedensu. Ak by sme chceli porozumieť pozícií Ruska týkajúcej sa Kosova, bude nutné analyzovať koncept jeho zahraničnej politiky. Na rozdiel od názoru, že ruská politika je riadená určitou ideologickou doktrínou, sa téza bude snažiť dokázať, že moderná ruská politika týkajúca sa Kosova je založená na vlastných záujmoch.

Záver práce sa venuje potvrdeniu alebo vyvráteniu stanovenej hypotézy. Stanovisko, ktoré sa práca snažila potvrdiť je, že oba štáty v Kosove vidia svoje záujmy, ktoré sú nevyhnutné v rámci svojich zložitejších záujmov. Je logické, že pre obe krajiny je

v Kosove potrebná bezpečnosť a stabilita. Tieto faktory sa javia ako správne nástroje pre zabránenie budúceho konfliktu na tomto území . Potvrďuje sa teoretická časť venovaná realizmu, nakoľko práve realizmus vidí vlastné záujmy štátu ako kľúčové. Avšak, práca nevyvracia názor, že obe krajiny boli donedávna silno ovplyvnené určitými ideami, ktoré súviseli aj s konceptmi ich zahraničných politík. Nakoľko sa dnes prihliada na ďalšie faktory, akými sú nepochybne ekonomický stav krajiny, medzinárodný terorizmus, bezpečnosť a stabilita, obe štáty boli dostatočne poučené úskaliami, ktoré môžu nastať, ak sa im nebude prikladať dostatočná pozornosť.

References

- Atlantic Council. (December 2008). *Pipeline Politics: Gazprom Seals Serbia Deal*. Retrieved on March 5, 2013 from the link http://www.acus.org/new_atlanticist/pipeline-politics-gazprom-seals-serbia-deal
- Auerswald, D.P. (2004). *Explaining Wars of Choice: An Integrated Decision Model of NATO Policy in Kosovo*. *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 48. No. 3.
- Baylis, J., Owens, P., Smith, S. (2008). *The Globalization of World Politics*. Oxford University Press. ISBN 9780199297771.
- Binder, D. (November 1987). *In Yugoslavia, Rising Ethnic Strife Brings Fears of Worse Civil Conflict*. *The New York Times*.
- Bodansky, Y. (1996). *Some Call It Peace: Waiting For War In the Balkans*. International Media Corp. Ltd.
- Bose, S. (2002). *Bosnia after Dayton: Nationalist Partition and International Intervention*.
- Britannica. (2012). *Kosovo in Yugoslavia*. Kosovo. Retrieved on December 27, 2012 from the link <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/322726/Kosovo/283792/Kosovo-in-Yugoslavia>
- Caplan, R. (October 1998). *International Diplomacy and the Crisis in Kosovo*. *International Affairs (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1944-)*. Vol. 74. No. 4.
- Centre for Eastern Studies. (2012). *Progress in the preparations for building South Stream*. Retrieved on March 5, 2013 from the link <http://www.osw.waw.pl/en/publikacje/eastweek/2012-11-07/progress-preparations-building-south-stream>
- Clark, H. (2000). *Civil Resistance in Kosovo*. Pluto Press. ISBN 0745315690.
- Crampton, R. J. (1997). *A Concise History of Bulgaria*. UK. Cambridge University Press.
- Cross, S. (2001). *Russia and NATO Toward the 21st Century: Conflicts and Peacekeeping in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Kosovo*. NATO-EAPC Research Fellowship Award Final Report. NATO/Academic Affairs 1999-2001.
- Chomsky, N. (1999). *The New Military Humanism*. Common Courage Press. ISBN 1567511775.

Kurucz: The Policies of the USA and Russia Regarding Kosovo

- Chandler, D. (2002). *From Kosovo to Kabul and Beyond Human Rights and International Intervention*, Pluto Press. ISBN 0745325041.
- Diesling, P. (January 1967). *National Self-determination and US Foreign policy*. Ethics. The University of Chicago Press. Vol. 77, No. 2.
- Eagle World News. (2011). *Czech Republic Rejects Obama Missile Plan*. Retrieved on January 25, 2013 from <http://www.eagleworldnews.com/2011/07/06/czech-republic-rejects-obama-missile-plan/>
- Emmert, T. A. (1991). *The Battle of Kosovo: Early Reports of Victory and Defeat*. Kosovo: Legacy of a Medieval Battle. Minnesota Mediterranean and East European Monographs. V. 1. Retrieved on October 17, 2012 from the link <http://cmes.arizona.edu/sites/cmes.arizona.edu/files/Background%20-Battle%20of%20Kosovo%20poetry.pdf>
- Fine, J.V.A. (1994). *The Late Medieval Balkans: Critical Survey from the Late Twelfth Century to the Ottoman Conquest*. Michigan. University of Michigan Press.
- Freundlich, L. (1913). *Albania's Golgotha: Indictment of the Exterminators of the Albanian People*. Retrieved on January 27, 2013 from the link http://www.albanianhistory.net/texts20_1/AH1913_1.html
- Gilles, A., Hassner, P. (2008). *Justifying War?: From Humanitarian Intervention to Counterterrorism*. MacMillan. ISBN 13:9780230600423.
- Gobarev, V. (September 1999). *Russia-NATO Relations After the Kosovo Crisis: Strategic Implications*. The Journal of Slavic Military Studies. vol 12.
- Holas, L. (2010). *Kosovo v kontexte ruskej zahraničnej politiky [Kosovo in the context of the Russian Foreign Policy]*. Almanach. Actual Issues in World Economics and Politics. Faculty of International Relations. University of Economics in Bratislava. Bratislava. Volume 5.
- Hehir, A. (January 2006). *The Impact of Analogical Reasoning on US Foreign Policy towards Kosovo*. Journal of Peace Research, Vol. 43, No. 1.
- Heidelberg Institute for International Conflict Research. (2010). *Conflict Barometer 2010. 19th Annual Conflict Analysis*. Heidelberg. Retrieved on January 7, 2013 from the link http://www.hiik.de/en/konfliktbarometer/pdf/ConflictBarometer_2010.pdf
- INTERFAX (October 1994). in FBIS-SOV (October 11, 1994).
- Jelavich, B. (1983). *History of the Balkans: Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries*. UK. Cambridge University Press.

Kurucz: The Policies of the USA and Russia Regarding Kosovo

- Jackson, N. J. (November 2003). *Russian Foreign Policy and the CIS*. London. Routledge. ISBN 0415305772.
- Jatras, J. G. (2008). Rianovosti. Top Political Analysts on Lavrov's End of Europe Kosovo Warning. Retrieved on November 15, 2012 from <http://en.rian.ru/analysis/20080215/99319479.html>
- Kauppi, M., Viotti, P. R. (2010). *International Relations Theory*. Longman. ISBN 9780135076217.
- Knaus, V., Warrander, G. (November 2010). *Bradt Kosovo: The Bradt Travel Guide*. USA. The Globe Pequot Press Inc. Second Edition. ISBN 9781841623313.
- Kissinger, H. (1994). *Diplomacy*. ISBN 9780671510992.
- Kim, J., Woehrel, S. (June 2008). *Kosovo and US Policy: Background to Independence*. Congressional Research Service.
- Kugler, R. L. (July 2011). *New Directions in U.S. National Security Strategy, Defense Plans, and Diplomacy*. Institute for National Strategic Studies By National Defense University Press, Washington, D.C.
- Laughland, J. (2008). Rianovosti. Top Political Analysts on Lavrov's End of Europe Kosovo Warning. Retrieved on November 15, 2012 from <http://en.rian.ru/analysis/20080215/99319479.html>
- Lo, B. (2002). *Russian Foreign policy in the post Soviet era*. PALGRAVE MACMILLAN. New York. ISBN 0333775937.
- Malcolm, N. (June 1999). *Kosovo: a short history*. Harper Perennial. ISBN 19780060977757.
- Marcella, G. (December 2008). *Affairs of State: The Interagency and National Security*, Strategic Studies Institute. ISBN 1584873698.
- Melville, A., Shakleina, T. (2005). *Russian Foreign Policy in Transition*. Central European University Press. Budapest. ISBN 9637326170.
- Metz, S. (2001). *The American Army in the Balkans: Strategic Alternatives and Implications*. Strategic Studies Institute. ISBN 1584870427.
- Mearsheimer, J. J. (2003). *The Tragedy of Great Powers*. W. W. Norton & Company ISBN 978-0393323962
- Moravcsik, A. (2010). *Liberal Theories of International Relations: A Primer*. Princeton University.

Kurucz: The Policies of the USA and Russia Regarding Kosovo

- Nikolic, T. (2012). *International Radio Serbia*. Nikolic: Kosovo's independence would be a dangerous precedent. Retrieved on September 19, 2012 from <http://voiceofserbia.org>
- PIPA. (May 1999). *Americans on Kosovo: A Study of US Public Attitudes*. Retrieved on December 17, 2012 from the link http://www.pipa.org/OnlineReports/Kosovo/Kosovo_May99/Kosovo_May99_rpt.pdf
- Pollack, D., Wielgohs, J. (December 2004). *Dissent And Opposition In Communist Eastern Europe: Origins Of Civil Society And Democratic Transition*. Ashgate Pub Ltd. ISBN 9780754637905.
- Ramet, S. P. (2006). *The Three Yugoslavias: State-Building And Legitimation, 1918-2005*. Woodrow Wilson Center Press.
- Savich, C. K. *Albanian Nazi troops in WW2 Launched a Wide Spread Terror Against Kosovo Serbs*. Retrieved on January 9, 2013 from the link <http://www.kosovo.net/skenderbeyss.html>
- Shue, H. (1996). *Basic Rights: Subsistence, Affluence, and U.S. Foreign Policy*. Princeton University Press. ISBN 9780691029290.
- Skendi, S. (1968). *The Albanian National Awakening, 1878–1912*. Princeton and London: Princeton University Press.
- Sme. (March 2013). Srbský premiér: Klamali vám, že Kosovo je naše [Serbian Prime Minister: They were lying that Kosovo is ours]. Retrieved on March 2013 from the link <http://www.sme.sk/c/6728948/srbsky-premier-klamali-vam-ze-kosovo-je-nase.html>
- Sme. (April 2013). Srbsko a Kosovo dosiahli v Bruseli kľúčovú dohodu [Serbia and Kosovo have reached a key agreement in Brussels]. Retrieved on April 2013 from the link <http://www.sme.sk/c/6773767/srbsko-a-kosovo-dosiahli-v-bruseli-klucovu-dohodu.html>
- Stavrianos, L.S. (2000). *The Balkans since 1453*. UK. C. Hurst & Co Ltd.
- The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation. (2008). *The Foreign Policy Concept of the Russian Federation*. Approved by Dmitry A. Medvedev, former President of the Russian Federation, on 12 July 2008. Retrieved on February 2013 from <http://www.mid.ru/nsosndoc.nsf/1e5f0de28fe77fdcc32575d900298676/869c9d2b87ad8014c32575d9002b1c38?OpenDocument>

Kurucz: The Policies of the USA and Russia Regarding Kosovo

The National Security Strategy of the United States. (September 2002). Retrieved on January 10, 2013 from

<http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/63562.pdf>

The New York Times. (December 2011). *Remembering Richard Holbrooke*. Retrieved on January 5, 2013 from

<http://www.nytimes.com/2012/01/01/books/review/the-unquiet-american-richard-holbrooke-in-the-world-edited-by-derek-chollet-and-samantha-power-book-review.html?pagewanted=all&r=0>.

Troebst, S. (1998). *Conflict in Kosovo: Failure of Prevention? An Analytical Documentation, 1992-1998*. the European Centre for Minority Issues (ECMI).

Tsygankov, A. (2009). *Russophobia: Anti-Russian Lobby and American Foreign Policy*. PALGRAVE MACMILLAN. New York. ISBN 0230614183.

United Nations. (June 1999). *UNMIK Mandate*. Retrieved on January 6, 2013 from

<http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/missions/unmik/mandate.shtml>

Vickers, M. (2001). *The Albanians: a Modern History*. I.B.Tauris & Co Ltd.

Voľanská, I. (n.d.). *Niektoré aspekty zahraničnej politiky Vladimíra Putina [Some aspects of Vladimir Putin's foreign policy]*. Retrieved on November 7, 2012 from http://www.pulib.sk/elpub2/FF/Chovanec3/pdf_doc/politologia/8.pdf

WND. (2006). *Terrorists from Balkans Could Reach Into Europe*. Retrieved on February 9, 2013 from <http://www.wnd.com/2006/09/37894/>

Woehrel, S. (2009). *Future of the Balkans and U.S. Policy Concerns*. Congressional Research Service.

Woehrel, S. (January 2013). *Kosovo: Current Issues and US Policy*. Congressional Research Service.

Woehrel, S. (April 2010). *Kosovo: Current Issues and U.S. Policy*. Congressional Research Service.