



H.E. Ivan Jestřáb

Over the last fifteen years Europe has undergone a stormy period of development, which has altered the way it is structured, the relationships between nations, and the standing of these very countries. Primarily, this concerns the countries of Central and Eastern Europe, which in 1989 cast off the Communist ideology and have since been gradually returning to their roots. They have once again taken up their former traditions and are today building up a democratic society and an economy founded on market principles. The Czech Republic, if I may say so, is one of the most successful of these. Our entry into NATO and last year's accession to the European Union are but two examples of the truth of this statement.



However, development in Europe is less than uniform. Some countries, whether as a result of internal circumstances or due to unfavourable factors at the beginning of the process we have mentioned, have not yet grown into more successful states. It is, however, in the interests of all that these countries get the opportunity to resolve these difficulties and join the ranks of the stable and successfully developing countries on this continent.

It is this general interest that forms the foundations of the Czech Republic's relations with Serbia and Černá Hora. A great many words have also been written about the traditions which link our nations. It forms a very good basis, and one on which we want to continue building out mutual ties in all areas.

One of the most important areas, besides the issue of the economy, is doubtless that of collaboration on security. Recently a workshop was held on this very topic at the Czech Embassy in Belgrade, the course of which is contained in the publication you are holding. I believe that it will serve all of those who are concerned with the issue of security, and that at the same time this "record" will be seen not only as documenting the seminar that was held, but that it will also mark the start of further measures which will be further extended and strengthened by our collaboration in the field of security.

Ivan Jestřáb
Ambassador to the Czech Republic in Serbia and Černá Hora

Welcome to the Czech Embassy. I am the ambassador Ivan Jestřáb I will not take much time as I think it is more interesting to listen to our guests who came here from Prague and to my dear colleague Ambassador Hans Ola Urstad from the Norwegian embassy, who I am very glad to see here among us. Today workshop will be moderated by Mr. Klvaňa who was a spokesman for the president of the Czech Republic and who will also introduce our participants. So, once more, welcome to the Czech embassy and I hope that this meeting will be interesting for all of you.

Tomáš Klvaňa:

Thank you very much, Mr. Ambassador, and welcome to the Czech Embassy in Beograd, it is really a great honour that we have this distinguished panel here today as you have seen probably in the invitation. The title of today's workshop is cooperation for new partnership. It is organized by Czech Euro-Atlantic Council on which behalf I am going to speak. My name is Tomáš Klvaňa and I am a member of that council and this event is also supported by Czech Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Czech Euro-Atlantic Council is a non-profit, non-governmental organization that supports the Euro-Atlantic cooperation. Why do we call this workshop here today? Well, several beliefs underlie this workshop. The first is that we in the Czech Euro-Atlantic Council strongly believe that the Euro-Atlantic cooperation is really the key geo-strategic relationship of the present era and we hope that it will remain so despite some tensions that have occurred between the United States and Europe lately in connection with the war in Iraq and the war on terrorism. Another belief that we think is important and that also underlies today's workshop is that, as you know well, there have so far been two waves of post cold war enlargements of NATO and perhaps these two waves were not final ones. Perhaps they should not be final ones. If we can get to this remark.... And finally, last but not least, we believe that Euro-Atlantic structures are not only

important strategically, but also they contribute vitally to the European integration and lastly, to stability and prosperity. These are perhaps the three key ideas that this panel definitely is informed by but we will get to more specifics of this cooperation and to these topics during our panel.

Let me tell you briefly about the rules according to which we are going to proceed today.

The first half of our event today will consist of our guests speaking on respective topics that are in the program. Each of them will speak roughly for about 15 to 20 minutes but there are no strict deadlines it is really up to them and they are pretty much free to talk on things according to their interest and work. And after that, obviously the second half, we will devote to questions and answers. So we are strongly encouraging your participation, you will be asked to contribute, you will be asked to ask questions or to form your opinions. Today event is transcribed and will be published in Serbian and English and we hope that this is the start of an interesting and fruitful cooperation in this respect.

Let me introduce our first speaker, who will be speaking today, it is Mr. Jiří Schneider, who has a distinguished carrier in Czech foreign policy, nowadays he is the director of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Czech Republic. He was a member of the Czechoslovak parliament

in 1990 and after that the first post-communist parliament and he was a founding member of one of the strongest political parties in the Czech Republic, the ODS which is an essential party nowadays in opposition. Mr. Schneider was among the first spokespersons for this party and

he was also the Czech Ambassador to Israel and a fellow with the Central European University. Mr. Schneider will speak on Czech experiences from Euro-Atlantic integration. The subtitle of his talk is “A chance for cooperation.” The floor is yours.

Jiří Schneider:

Good afternoon. It is a pleasure to be here and it is a pleasure to have a chance to open this event which I think is historical in framework of our relations. I dare to say historical also in the framework of the Euro-Atlantic integration, I hope at least that we will add some important building block into this framework. I would like to focus as the title of my presentation suggests to our experiences from Euro-Atlantic integration. It's my firm belief that if there is anything which we can offer then it is to offer our experiences, not to teach the principles but to offer our experiences from our process of accession and cooperation within this framework. I think there are a couple of similarities on which we can base assumption that the Czech-Serbian cooperation in this field might bear some fruits in the future. I would like to address some practical issues in the security field in which seems to me that there is a chance we can share these experiences. First of all, and I would like to underline this, this seminar is a sign that we would like not to lecture but to hear what is your view, what is perspective from Beograd, what you would like to address in our communication. And accordingly to design future projects, this is the first phase of the project, and we consciously asked non-governmental organizations to arrange this, to offer a free platform for communication. But I am here representing Czech foreign policy, the

Czech government, to show that this is an official policy also, which is behind, and which might bring some resources if they will be needed in the further development of this project. This project Prague-Beograd as we might call it might have a future and we would like to continue if there would be interest on your side. First of all, let me say that our foreign policy considers Balkan and especially relations of Serbia and Montenegro as its foreign policy a priority. We are interested in stability and security and good relations with this region. We are a member state of NATO and the European Union and we are eager to assist integration of this region into Euro-Atlantic structures and it is not going to be an easy process and our experience is that even in our case it was not easy and it is still not an easy process. But we think this is the only way how to contribute to the stability of the region and a better future of this region and Europe as a whole. You know that some others are already on this way, let me mention Croatia, Macedonia, Romania, and you are very much aware of this, we think our perception is that this is the problem that Serbia and Montenegro and also Bosnia and Hercegovina are not part of the Euro-Atlantic partnership program, the PFP, without them it would not be complete and I think the change needs some pre requisitions and I think the politicians in these countries know what is necessary to be done to open the way. I am not here to

repeat what has to be done. I am here to say that we are prepared to prepare the practical project which might assist, if all these conditions will be fulfilled and finally you will be on track as well. That is the main message I am trying to convey here. We are offering general communication of practical experiences. That is the reason why now here we have organized this seminar and we are grateful to Jagello 2000 to organize this seminar here and we are grateful that our embassy was useful in providing the facility for that.

We are aware that we are not the only ones which come with this offer, we are not the only member state. But as I said at the beginning there are some reasons why we think Czechs can offer something here. We have know-how and we have historical experience which leads us to this conclusion. And definitely it is not going to be one way street. If this is to be successful it has to be two way street. There should be a mutual interest as far as the concrete activities in this process. To be more specific, I know that talking about this, about the Euro-Atlantic integration, it has a political language, but it has also a security language, a very practical security language. I know that the Supreme Council here quite recently agreed on the process of reform of your army, reducing numbers and change of the structure of the army and the whole question of the management of the army. Equally, former Czechoslovakia, then the Czech Republic, we have inherited quite numerous army with the structure which was inappropriate for the current situation. I think that this is a topic which can be addressed. We are hoping that in the near future there will be a top-level visit of the Minister of Defence to our country and I think even this seminar can bring some ideas which might be then floated to the Ministries of Defence and vitally to the agenda of the Ministry of Defence to talk about complete steps. Let me mention also our experience from the "Partnership for peace" program. It had

two dimensions. You know that this program was launched in 1994 and I remember travelling together with Saša Vondra, who is here today, the deputy foreign minister, to Budapest, where we were informed about the whole program and at the time there were two schools of thought. One said well, this is going to be a substitute for membership and to those who wanted a quick and rapid accession of the Czech Republic into NATO that was seen as a kind of passifier for them. There were others who finally said well this is better than nothing and it is at least a way how to cooperate and not to stand still. So we finally acceded to this partnership and became quite active and within this program and the framework of the missions of the United Nations and later on NATO missions we have been quite actively involved in missions in Balkan as you know.

I think that even for Serbia and Montenegro this step - accession to the program "Partnership for Peace" would be remarkable assistance and of remarkable help. I think there are a couple of things which we can start already now, even before. Accession to NATO in 1999, five years after our accession to this program "Partnership for peace" was a multi-layer experience for our society, let me say. On one hand, it was a confirmation of our transformation process. It was the most visible confirmation of that process, that we had become members of the club. That was the message. The major slogan for us in all changes after the Velvet revolution in 1989 was "return to Europe" and membership in NATO for us was a confirmation that finally we had returned back. On the other hand, there was a group of people and relevant political forces in the Czech Republic who were arguing that after dissolution of Warsaw Pact, which we were members for decades, it is too early to become a member of another alliance and that was a challenge to explain that this is not just comparable, that we cannot compare in the optics or perspective of cold-war the



Warsaw Pact and NATO. That was a specific political experience in the process in my country. I think it wasn't as difficult to explain that because the main argument was that there are really fundamental differences in the way how the decision-making in these organizations was done. But that was an important political exercise. The public support for the membership was not overwhelming initially but let me say that nowadays, five years after our entry, there is a solid support, more than 60%, and only the Communist Party is against our membership nowadays. I think it is a success story for us. NATO membership has brought us stability, security, confirmation of our efforts and for some paradoxically, but at the second thought not paradoxically, it brought us even better and improved relations with Russia, which some critics said that it is going to be the opposite, worse relations with Russia. And this is experience of all post-communist countries that became members. More importantly then there is political security but also economic level of our topic, it increased attractiveness of

the country in the eyes of foreign investors and it improved our rating.

So our experience, there is an important element in our experience about public communication of this process. How to communicate these processes the cooperation, the partnership and then the membership with NATO to the public. And let me repeat that the organizers of this seminar are quite experienced in this field and they are very active and I think they are right persons and right organizations which can address this problem if that would be needed. I think there is an enormous role which Atlantic Councils of our countries can play in this field.

Well, I said that it is our hope and it is priority of our force to get Serbia and Montenegro contract if it should be, I do not know, we want it. So we are here to listen what you see, what are some of the blocks on the road to achieve this goal and what you expect from the Czechs as a contribution in this effort.

Let me also mention that the security element of this is not only army, the military element, but in the current

international environment, it is very difficult to make a distinction between the internal and external security and therefore it includes also other security agencies, security institutions, police, security services and so on. I think that we embarked only on good cooperation also in this field. Our current Prime Minister has signed a cooperation agreement in this field and I think we have a lot to do also in non-military, non-military-security field. We have some experiences and we have our own deficits which we can share with you to show the problems on this way. Let me mention the problems e.g. of the civilian control of the whole security sector not only including military but also other agencies. We would like to, and we have a project prepared, to provide funds into a Trust Fund which can provide finances for the projects in this field. And the Trust Fund is not established and now is the time to

formulate the principles and priorities of this Trust Fund if there would be interest on your side. We are waiting for projects coming from our dialogue from your side. And we have welcomed the document, which was prepared earlier, so-called "Tailored cooperation program – Serbia-Montenegro-NATO" for three years and I think this document which has been prepared here, indicates your priorities already, so we are not at zero point, we can build on something. I hope that today's seminar will bring some topics, ideas, which we can later on use on the governmental level, but I hope it will be maybe more in the policies of the cooperation on a non-governmental level, maybe in the economic field related to security later on as well. Thank you for your attention and I wish that we will have a lively and deep debate, not a superficial one. Thank you.

Tomáš Klvaňa:

Thank you Jiří for those introductory remarks and now I would like you to hear another presentation from the man on my left hand side who is Alexandr Vondra, nowadays the president of the Czech Euro-Atlantic Council. Mr. Vondra has a distinguished career also in the Czech Foreign Policy, even before the communist regime fell in 1989, Mr. Vondra was one of the leading Czech dissidents opposing the communist regime, he was a member of the Charter 77 organization and then in the first years of the free and independent Czechoslovakia he was the key advisor to the Czechoslovak president Václav Havel

on foreign policy issues and he was also the Czech Ambassador to the United States, deputy foreign minister, and before the Prague Summit of NATO in 2002, the historical summit of NATO, he was the chief organizer, he was the governmental element, he was responsible for organizing that major event of the Euro-Atlantic Alliance. Today, Mr. Vondra is the president of the Czech Euro-Atlantic Council and his remarks are entitled "NATO and Serbia and Montenegro, the possibilities of cooperation with regard to NGOs".

Alexandr Vondra:

Good afternoon. I am no more with the government that is a huge advantage, I am a free man after 15 years of serving for the Czech government in various capacities and perhaps it gives me opportunity to concentrate on my few remarks and two specifications. Jiří Schneider gave you the general picture of what the government is doing, what is the mechanic of this step-by-step approach and I think it is very important to follow that, at least from my experience. I am going to concentrate on two issues. One is, let's say, a few strategic bases, I would like to join Jiří in his introductory statement that I am not here to give you some lectures but to initiate certain dialogue so I will try to respond why for the Czechs this Transatlantic dimension of these policies were and have been so important in the past 15 years and the second part of what I am expected to do is to give you a certain picture about the various NGOs activities in my country and how it could be relevant for the Czech-Serbian cooperation.

The Transatlantic relations, as you can see now, are in an era of certain disputes. It is lately the war in Iraq, it is lately this European Constitution process, to sum up the state of the effect is not easy on the one hand. On the other hand, NATO is continuing. It is present very much in Afghanistan, the debate about its presence in the Middle East in general not only with regard to the future of Iraq but also with regard to the future of the peace process in the Middle East. It is just what the subject of the debates in the corridors in Brussels is.

For us in Prague the Transatlantic dimension has always been important and it's still very important and there are at least three elementary reasons for them. Number one, the United States-European cooperation and the American engagement in Europe for a country, which is a mid-sized country, located

where it is in central Europe, this is something what is of the primary importance, so what is the subject of even what I would say vital interests. And it is not only the specifics of the Czechs, the Poles for example are in a very same situation, too. The US Secretary of Defence once divided Europe in new and old. And probably I would not agree with that simplistic approach, I would say that Europe, European strategies, European maps give you a much more complicated picture. However, there are certain divisions in Europe. There are those who would like to build the European Union as some kind of a neo-empire of the western Christianity as a strong future superpower contradicting the United States. And there are those who have a much broader picture, who are much more inclusive in favour of a more structural approach. And I think that the Czechs, like Poles, British, Dutch, and Scandinavians, simply belong to this second camp. And we can discuss this on the example of Turkey, if there is somebody from the Turkish embassy. There is only one party in the Czech political spectrum which is seriously opposing the Turkish accession to the European Union and those are the small Christian Democrats. All others are basically in favour of that. Take the situation in Ukraine, it was president Klaus who just a few days ago said in Berlin, that the European Union could look seriously into the countries like Ukraine. We have a contact embassy in Israel and so on.

So this is the first reason that in those considerations the United States engagement is a very welcomed balancing factor in European affairs and that whole means that is the reason why the NATO project has been launched after WW2. The second reason is something what I would call, despite all the progress in the European integration, despite the progress

of present constitution debate it is still rather weakening certain aspects. And just the EU reaction of what is happening in Ukraine we compare the influence of Moscow on one hand and Washington on the other hand, I see it can serve as a very good example. President Putin was visiting Kiev each time before those rounds of the elections, President Bush had his personal employee there. We were trying to propose that the high representative of Sudan would go there, no chance. Just a phone call was the maximum what we were able to achieve. So, in certain aspect of the foreign policy defence we in the European Union are still weak and we are deeply convinced that we need the confirmation of NATO and the transatlantic relationship. And last but not least, the third reason, which is related to the previous two, is the assessment of the common threats. In the past it was Soviet Communism and it is no more the major threat. But the current major threat is the combination for three things – this radical Islam, weapons of mass destruction and international terrorism. Again, we are deeply convinced

that only Europeans and the Americans together can be ready to cope with those major threats. So, let us say, those three are the key reasons why we are remaining transatlantic and where almost all the Czech political elites are in agreement with the exception of a few people on the radical left.

The Czech road into NATO and those ideas of paving the roads to the Czechs as well as the Polish, Hungarians and as well as the other roads into NATO throughout the 1990s and Jiří has mentioned a few mile stones here to be at the end and so on. It was not a straight line but finally we were able to make it and I am just happy to be present during all those major breakthroughs. So I was with President Havel in early 1990s when the coup in Moscow in summer of 1991 had very much influenced the intensification of cooperation among the Czechs, Poles and Hungarians, when we first articulated our desire to get into NATO, it was a time when everybody was against that. Then we had another mile stone in the middle of 1990s, the debate about the “Partnership for peace” and I am not going to repeat



what Jiří Schneider has already said. Then finally, the confirmation of that, and I spent four years as the Czech ambassador to the United States, so the content of the United States' Senate was the major achievement and finally we did not stop our activities with fulfilling our goals but we have continued with our force to help the others to gain it. And the Prague Summit which I had the privilege to co-organize was a mile stone for the people in Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Slovakia, Slovenia, too, Bulgaria and Romania.

And of course, once the entering countries express their desires we are willing to extend our helping hand to provide you know-how and to offer, most of all, our entire support and I cannot imagine anybody in my country now to oppose the Serbian aspiration even with regards to the EU or NATO. But of course certainly, this is not the issue for just the political elites, it is by no means as important as to work among the public.

And that is my understanding of organizing all this gathering here in Beograd. I see that the credits go not to us, but to Zbyněk Pavlačík, who is the director of the executive arm of the Czech Euro-Atlantic Council, the organization which is called Jagello 2000. He and his organization was very helpful e.g. to me when I was organizing the NATO Summit in Prague and we were not in an easy situation. The public in Prague was generally influenced by two factors – number one, those anti-globalist gatherings which began in Seattle in 1999 and which were continuing and Prague itself has been the target when we were hosting the MMF and World Trade meeting in 2000. So, there are a lot of things what it means for the citizens of Prague. And then most of all, when we were granted the hosting of this gathering, 9/11 happened and the fear among the public “are we responsible for doing that” and we were doing that to support all those Latvians, Lithuanians, Estonians, Bulgarians, Romanians, so that was the

logic why it was in Prague and not e.g. in Paris or Madrid or wherever.

Of course then we needed to have a strong coverage to the people, not just to the politicians. And Jagello 2000 and Zbyněk personally, was very much helpful in that extensive coverage to the people. They were organizing, e.g. various contests, competitions including the students and young people, taking this into the media. But not only this – what they were trying to do in a very successful way is to bring the people and the army closer together. Maybe now it is not so much actual here in Serbia because you have a different experience from the 1990s. But in the countries like my country, the depth between the ordinary people and the military after the fall of communism was huge. And the military was very passive in opening their barracks to the people and offering some interesting things. But it is very important, so there is an example that Jagello is organizing each year a major gathering of the people with the Czech military in the City of Ostrava, which is a major town in Northern Moravia. So, that is just a few words about how we are doing this in Prague and now let me say my last few words about where I can see the possibilities in cooperating between the Czechs and Serbians here. I would say on the general level this. The background of the basis here is great. But also I can understand that there can be some emotions standing out of the situation in the past ten years. But I am deeply convinced that the tradition of cooperating with each other in the past, more than 100 years, it is more than just some bad emotions standing out of the experiences from the last ten years. I think that we are moving forward. This building that we are in today can provide this certain inspiration that is its right location in the city, in the centre of this great capital, the history – Masaryk and your King working together here already in the middle 1920s of the last century, the story of the Nazi occupation. In fact, as a bit of a provocation, the young madam

Albright was walking as a little child through this building.

But I think that the future gives us a lot of opportunities. There are some ideas what we would be willing to do with you in support of achieving your goals, either with regards to the PFP or some other issues. Zbyněk Pavlačík has some ideas about the student exchanges and beyond my engagement in the private sector and in some universities, I am also working for PSSI – Prague Secondary Studies Institute, it is a special arm of the program for Atlantic security studies, so probably we would be willing to introduce some program of the student exchanges, Zbyněk had some ideas about extending his program of high school competitions,

which is going on in Poland, Ukraine, also to Serbia as well, and last but not least, we were interested in having a NATO contact point embassy, our friends from Norway had wanted that. Instead of that we are now filling that role in Israel, what is another country of our top interest with regards to NATO and other relations. But there are some ideas because Jagello is managing the NATO office in Prague to do something similar in Beograd in cooperation with the NATO office in Brussels. Let's be clear, those are not the prescriptions, those are the ideas and we would be very much interested in listening to your views. Thank you very much.

Tomáš Klvaňa:

Thank you Saša for those remarks and let me move on to our next participant who sits at the very left wing of this table, I hope it means nothing politically, but we will see from his presentation. His name is Vladan Živulović, he comes from Beograd so I am not going to welcome him here at his home. Mr. Živulović is president of the Atlantic Council of Serbia and Montenegro. His background is in law. During his successful carrier as a lawyer, he was also director of the Institute of Geopolitical Studies between 1996 and 1998, at that time the institute printed many distinguished titles. From 1998 to 2000, Vladan Živulović was chairman of the Council for Democratic Changess. This NGO united Serbian, Diaspora and democratic forces in the country. Through the period of three years, the Council for Democratic Changes had many activities against the Milosevic regime, such as the organization of the conference in Szaint Andrea in Hungary, where all opposition forces, all opposition

parties against Milosevic met for the first time. This NGO in 1999 published the “Handbook for Democratic Government in Serbia”. Prominent experts from most important fields proposed in this handbook how to solve short term and long term political and economic problems after the fall of the Milosevic regime. Since 2001 Mr. Živulović is the president of the Atlantic Council of Serbia and Montenegro, that council is a member of the Atlantic Treaty Association as is our organization in Prague. Through many activities this NGO promotes Euro-Atlantic values and Euro-Atlantic integrations. And the last interesting thing from his CV is that he is legal adviser to his Royal Highness Prince Alexander II Karadžordžević. His specialization is corporate law. Mr. Živulović will speak on the priorities of the Atlantic Council of Serbia and Montenegro within the sphere of integration into Euro-Atlantic structures.

Vladan Živulović:

Thank you for your nice introduction. The topic that I am supposed to speak about today concerns the priorities of the Atlantic Council in Serbia and Montenegro within the processes of integration into Euro-Atlantic structures. I believe that many of the participants know quite a lot about the activities of the Atlantic Council, so I'll be very brief. It was founded in spring of 2001, and in October 2001 it became a member of AT. Initially the Atlantic Council gathered a number of experts, employees, retired army officers and academics specialized in the field of reform, strategy organization and resocialization in the military. After listening today, at this panel, to the respectable speakers, I would first like to stress how pleasantly surprised and pleased I am. After a long time, I have heard what I believe to be a clear-cut thesis. Namely, that government agencies and nongovernmental organizations, provided, of course, that they follow the same line, need to cooperate, to work together, without any kind of monopoly in the sense of some sort of jealousy, that we, as members of the Atlantic Council in Serbia and Montenegro, occasionally experienced at the beginning of our work. This is precisely what a thesis of US intelligence services confirms, which argues that over 70% of future foreign policy relations will be mediated by nongovernmental organizations. Why is this the case? Because nongovernmental organizations can communicate in an easier, less formal manner, and the outcome of this type of informal communication that yields good results is, among other things, the relationship between the two Atlantic councils, the Czech Atlantic Council and the Atlantic Council of Serbia and Montenegro. These informal meetings and getting-together brought these two Councils first to organize this conference, on the initiative of the Czech Atlantic Council, of course,

followed by a number of projects, that I hope will be accomplished. These projects are of great importance to us, members of the Atlantic Council of Serbia and Montenegro.

In the last few years, we have placed the greatest emphasis on two aspects. The first is the work of experts, and in that phase, the experts from the Atlantic Council devoted their time mostly to the question of how to reorganize the Ministry of Defense and the Military Headquarters. Thus work has been done on this segment, some people were engaged on building the defense strategy, and others on the project of resocialization, that is, deciding what is to be done with the men that are going to become superfluous in the army, how to help them to resocialize and prepare for the change of profession, how to find them a job, how to secure their severance pay and provide them with enough money to get into some sort of private business.

At the same time the Atlantic Council was developing its youth branch, and now we can proudly announce that we have a youth organization stronger than its senior counterpart. This has been validated in particular by the election of young Marko Kovačević for vice-president of AT, that is the Atlantic Treaty Association, namely its youth branch. It was a great honor for the Atlantic Council of Serbia and Montenegro. At one point, right after Edinburgh, some of the members left the Atlantic Council to work for the Ministry of Defense, and the leadership of the Atlantic Council of Serbia and Montenegro was practically taken over by the young. I can tell you that these young people showed excellent results, far, far better than the seniors, so they raised our chances and I believe that if they continue like this, they will take over the Atlantic Council on the whole and make us retire very soon. This is the way I feel.

What are the priorities of the Atlantic Council of Serbia and Montenegro?

At this point, I would just like to emphasize that at the time the Atlantic Council started to operate in Serbia and Montenegro, a public opinion research conducted by "Gallup International", showed that 9% of the people in Serbia and Montenegro were in favor of NATO, and 27% of the NATO's Partnership for Peace program. It is obvious that these results were related to the events that took place during the NATO bombing, the NATO intervention in our country; the feelings of our citizens are certainly not in favor of the operation of the Atlantic Council.

What had to be done to change these percentages? As our respected speakers pointed out here, we cannot address history that happened four or five years ago by saying - well, now, now we will remember this until the end of our lives and we will never forgive anything to anybody. We have the positive examples of Germany and France, who buried their hatchets and are now living and working together without borders, etc. etc. That means that the approach of the European Union, namely the countries of the European Union, who live together, trade together, live without borders, is the most positive example for us and an example we have to follow.

The Atlantic Council embarked on an educational endeavor - with the help of the government of Netherlands, we toured more than twenty cities in Serbia and Montenegro, talking to different structures of people, from the academic public, members of the army, young people, and this is why I believe that we have accomplished a lot during a period of one year. Of course, there were pleasant and unpleasant scenes, and unpleasant questions, were you would start to sweat the same moment somebody asked you a question, but we had to explain to the people what the Atlantic Council stands for.

Naturally, I do not need to explain to you here what the Atlantic Council stands for.

Our work was based on the promotion of Euro-Atlantic associations, Euro-Atlantic values. We are fighting for and promoting human rights, a free market, freedom of the media, the state of law, struggle against corruption, life without borders, free circulation of people, goods and assets. Of course, in order to accomplish this - that is the goal of our country to enter the community of European countries - it is necessary that we attain

a certain level of security. In order to attain this level of security that would allow us to accomplish this in peace, our first step should be the membership in the Partnership for Peace, and later, of course, NATO.

I believe it is very clear to all of you who the opponents of the Euro-Atlantic integrations are, and this is something we do not need to discuss at great lengths. They are the people who, during this period that we went through, this Calvary during the last fifteen years, exploited the suffering and agony of the people and gained enormous wealth. They gained control over large monopolies in business, and it is certain that it is not to their benefit today to live in a country that is a member of the European Union, a country that applies European laws, in their strictest sense, and to carry out business with the competition of other European countries.

This means that these gentlemen, having made a lot of money in the meantime, will most certainly financially support certain political parties that will advocate the stance that Serbia and Montenegro should remain a black hole on the map. It is to their profit that this country stays out of all integrations, that it remains isolated from Europe and the world. This would, of course, enable them to continue their smuggling, and maintain the political instability in the country.

These are also interest groups, which gained certain statuses in the country, precisely on basis of the war and the misfortune that have befallen us. Those are the groups that come forward with their

ideas about anti-globalism, accusing us of promoting integrations that are going to swallow us. We find there the notorious accusations: if we join the Partnership for Peace we will have to change our weaponry, and this will cost us dearly; the accusations that if we join the Partnership for Peace we will have to send our children to Iraq, to Afghanistan, to die. Of course this is not true and those are just cleverly invented verbal schemes aimed at diverting the citizens of Serbia and Montenegro from moving in that direction.

What are the priorities of the Atlantic Council? The young people are the ones who started the actions, the education of other young people, university and high school students, for a period of four years, in cooperation with their friends, young people from other Atlantic Councils of Europe, especially from the region. Here you can see the example of the Czech Republic.

What does education mean to us? It means that we need to explain to these young generations, which are not burdened but have lived through the wartimes, which left the country in great numbers, went to other western countries, and those who stayed and could not obtain a visa, who did not cross the border and did not see how life functions in the European Union, the importance, and how should they, as current and future voters, know who to vote for, what to support...

The Atlantic Council is not alone in its strive to integrate Serbia and Montenegro into the Euro-Atlantic structures. I have to say that way back in December 2000, Goran Svilanović, the Minister of Foreign Affairs at that time, had set in the program of the state union of Serbia and Montenegro, as its prime task, as the goal of foreign policy, the admission of our country to the NATO and Partnership for Peace programs.

This means that the state policy is also directed towards this initial step. We are all aware that the road to the European Union, at least if we observe the experience of our neighbors and friends, is precisely through the Partnership for Peace and the NATO,

which means: first the security segment and then the economic one, and that is the European Union.

Thus at this moment 35% - which might look like a small percentage to you, but is huge for me - 35% of the citizens, according to "Gallup", support the admission of Serbia and Montenegro to the NATO. Taking into consideration the bombs, the dead, the damage, for me this is a huge percentage, with the addition that 63% would immediately vote for the Partnership for Peace, thus Partnership for Peace is something the citizens of Serbia and Montenegro do not perceive as a threat and a danger. That percentage was even 71%, but in the meantime, due to various political events in the country, it dropped to 63%, which is a very respectable percentage for me.

Thus, the priority of the Atlantic Council, let me emphasize once more - I will not keep you any longer - is to benefit from the relations with the Atlantic Councils of other countries by strengthening the relationships in the region, by strengthening the relationship with friends from the Czech Republic and other European countries that are close to us and that we consider to be our neighbors, work jointly on the education of young people in the first place, where ever they are, even in the military. And then: perform the education of instructors, teach young people how to address others, how to find answers to all those questions that the adversaries of these ideas pose so cleverly and prepare seriously. Thus, no spontaneity, but a lot of serious work on this program.

One of the priorities of the Atlantic Council is also, I am proud to say, the relationship with faculties here in Belgrade. The Atlantic Council, especially our young members, have an excellent relationship and cooperation with the Faculty of Philology, where students who study English and other foreign languages gratuitously offered to translate NATO brochures and brochures about the Partnership for Peace, which makes it

easier for us to obtain good publications in Serbian that would be very useful for people who deal with defense and security. We also have an excellent cooperation with the Faculty of Civil Defense, with the Megatrend University. Thus, one of the priorities is the relationship with the academic public. That would be about all, not to keep you any longer, I believe it is much more important that we discuss possible dilemmas through questions. The forum of

the Prague summit and the forum of the AT conference in Edinburgh showed that the fundamental priority of the Atlantic Council of Serbia and Montenegro is to work with young people. Thus, to let you know, it is the young people who are now running the Atlantic Council, with our discreet support, and who are working on the education of other young people and, of course, all other citizens of Serbia and Montenegro. Once more, I thank you all!

Tomáš Klvaňa:

Thank you, Mr. Živulovič. We in the Czech Republic have a custom to feature the best at last, so unlike the Americans who usually want to hit you with their best at first, we are saving the best performance for the last moment and such is going to be I am sure the performance and the discussion, the remarks by the Ambassador of Norway to Serbia and Montenegro, Mr. Hans Ola Urstad. Mr. Urstad holds a university degree in political science and international relations from the University of Oslo. He joined the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in 1980 and served at the embassy in Poland from 1982 to 1985 and at the Norwegian delegation to NATO in Brussels from 1985 to 1988. From 1988 to 1990 he served in the Ministry in Oslo as head of division for

personnel, than he held the combined post at the Norwegian parliament as the chief of staff to the foreign affairs committee and the head of the international department. From 1995 to 2000 he served as the council general in San Francisco covering the 12 western states of the United States. From 2000 to 2001 he again worked for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Oslo on stability pact issues until he took up the assignment as ambassador to Yugoslavia and later Serbia and Montenegro in February 2001. Mr. Urstad will be speaking on the Norwegian experiences, the role of the Norwegian embassy as a NATO contact point embassy in Serbia and Montenegro and the title of his remarks is "Purpose, principles and practice".

Hans Ola Urstad:

Well, thank you very much Mr. Chairman, I think that you forgot my birth weight but anyway...

It is a great honour ladies and gentlemen to be allowed to speak a little bit on our new task here as the contact point embassy for NATO, the task that we have

got we are really proud of as it is not a secret that there were several countries as was mentioned, who wanted this and I guess one of the main reasons for that is there are so many countries that have already established any partnership for peace relationship, Serbia and Montenegro are one of few that have not got there yet but is well on the way I think we can say. There are of course numerous ways of contact between NATO and any partnership country or any country seeking partnership at all. And I think that this workshop we are in this afternoon is one of the examples of that. So I would already like to congratulate you on that and I think my role here will be more or less to bring let us say things down on the ground than they were in these wonderful introductory sets we have heard. Because now it is time to start practical cooperation on day-to-day things that we work on. First of all, I would like to say that we are also – I must say having just taken over this task which is a big task for a small embassy - we are most grateful to the British embassy and we are happy to see Colonel Nowosielski here today, he has helped us tremendously in taking over this role and I just hope that we can fulfil it. And I think we have managed a smooth transform.

Principles and purpose of the contact point embassies, well, NATO contact point embassies were really created if we can call it that in 1992 as one of several mechanisms to support the activities of the North-Atlantic Cooperation Council, the NACC. The role of NACC in 1997 was transformed into the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, the EAPC, and today consists of 46 members. The terms of reference regulating NATO contact point embassies or CPEs and those core purposes remained really unchanged. In essence that purpose is to assist partner countries getting closer to NATO and NATO closer to partner countries. The CPE mechanism however for that mechanism it is important to stress that this task is to be achieved in a non-political

manner because the contact point embassy as such cannot speak on behalf of NATO. Instead our role and function is to work as a practical facility enabling NATO and the partner country to optimize their partnership relations corresponding to the political parameters defining the framework of this relationship. Thus, the role and function of the contact point embassy is predominantly practical. It involves providing NATO with information and knowledge about the needs, opportunities, modalities for how to contact the public diplomacy activities in the partner country. It also includes helping NATO with the logistical conversation including media relations. This is undertaken in partner countries by NATO civilian and military representatives. And it involves assisting the partner country in its communication with NATO, building transparency, opening up new links between host country - Serbia and Montenegro - and NATO.

A few words about our experiences after two months. Although Norway has only had this task for a short time as I have mentioned now several times, we can nevertheless confirm that our experience as CPE largely corresponds to the tasks as they are described in the co-called terms of reference for such embassies. As a contact point embassy we have had the pleasure of facilitating already a number of NATO expert team visits to Serbia and Montenegro. We have also had the great pleasure of providing assistance and help in the planning and execution of NATO's first unit-level visit to Serbia and Montenegro when six NATO ships visited the ports of Bar and Kotor. We are pleased to see that both NATO international staff and Serbia and Montenegro Ministry of Defence actively make use of the contact point embassy and actively support using this embassy as a mediator in planning activities taking place in Serbia and Montenegro and in this way we also believe that the other NATO embassies in Beograd will get the direct benefit and

thus help to provide transparency in the ongoing activities involving NATO and Serbian and Montenegro relations. With the reasons of adopting the defence strategies and the outgoing work with defining the parameters of the “Tailor cooperation program” between NATO and Serbia and Montenegro for 2005, we look forward to the months ahead and the tasks this will involve for our embassy. We are also pleased to see that non-governmental organizations and societies in Serbia and Montenegro are actively engaged in the dissemination of information regarding the benefits for joining the Euro-Atlantic structures including partnership and membership as we have just heard so well expressed. Normally as a contact point embassy recognize that we have the particular responsibility to support this activity. Therefore support to NGOs working for the promotion of the Euro-Atlantic integration in general and closer integration with NATO in particular will represent one of the key dimensions of our approach to this goal as a contact point embassy. Few words about perspectives and priorities. Although the role and function of a contact point embassy is meant to be a non-political and predominantly practical function as I have already

mentioned, we recognize that in reality the execution of the role will inevitably be influenced by and reflect the way Norway see the situation and our ideas about how the further cooperation between NATO and Serbia and Montenegro could be further developed.

Thus to the extent of the role as a contact point embassy is more than a practical role and function I would like to underline that our approach to the role as a NATO contact point embassy is based on a clear commitment to use the idea of “Partnership for peace” as a framework for our practical cooperation. Using this idea of “Partnership for peace” as a framework for our practical cooperation is not a peculiar of course Norwegian idea, but NATO current policy, operation lies in the “Tailored cooperation program” between NATO and Serbia and Montenegro.

As contact point embassy and destination we will continue to seek possibilities for enhancing and deepening the practical cooperation on the basis of these parameters. In this manner, we trust that our role as a contact point embassy will continue to be seen as a valuable function for both NATO and Serbia and Montenegro during the next meetings. Thank you very much.

Tomáš Klvaňa:

Thank you Mr. Ambassador, I would like to open the floor to questions to your discussion points. We welcome certainly both of them, I see two microphones here so please if you want to speak wait for a microphone, it will get to you very quickly and after that if you would identify yourself and perhaps the institution you speak for, it would be great help for us as we are taping this event and

it will be published in English and Serbian. As I said you may ask questions, you may contribute a discussion point but I would like to ask you to limit your point or questions to three minutes so that other people can also take their turn. The floor is yours. Who would like to ask the first question?

If there is no first person who would like to speak, perhaps the first person is going

to be me and I am going to take the advantage of that position I have and I would like to ask a question of the man sitting on my right and the man sitting on my left. It will be the same question. Jiří Schneider at the very beginning was speaking about a sort of change in psychology, a change in mentality that was very important for the Czechs to go through in order to embrace NATO. As you might also know from your own historical experience, NATO during communism was seen as an enemy organization by the communist government and although many people certainly did not believe that propaganda, there were some residues that influenced the thinking about NATO even in the 1990s as the Czech Republic was trying to get into that organization. That sort of equivalency between the former Warsaw Pact that we were forced to be part of during communism and NATO was very much a hot topic for discussion and policy makers and politicians faced an uphill struggle to explain to the people that these

two organizations are vastly different and they cannot be really compared. That a better point of comparison is a contrast between these organizations. And that if we join NATO we will not be passed around by the United States or Great Britain or other great and powerful nations within that organization and that our voice will be heard in that organization.

I would like to ask Saša Vondra who has experience from working within NATO: How that actually works within the structures, how is the voice of the Czech Republic, which is not a powerful nation and is not a rich nation, how is it actually heard within the organization, what sort of influence do the countries like the Czech Republic wield within the organization? And a similar question to Mr. Ambassador – How does Norway, what are Norway's experiences of pursuing their national interest within an organization of 16, 19, and now 26 nations?

Alexandr Vondra:

I think it is a function of how the government is willing to articulate its use, how much are they going to fight for them. It is one factor in the game. The second factor in the game is always the structure as well as the procedures within the organization itself. And here NATO is to remain as a consensus based organization, so it can reach a decision only if all the members of it are in agreement. So of course it gives you a relatively absolute power to veto if you do the vote quickly. So, relatively the weight is bigger than even in some decision-making of the European Union which has adopted in the past years in particular and we will adopt even more

with the approval of the European constitution, the so-called majority vote. So the consensus based process is evaporating because the European Union would require this, so there is a requirement of great effectivity, so one can imagine that you can lose your case in this majority vote. That is the difference number one, but I would say always it is much more about the determination of the government, the strength of the government because these both are international bodies and to articulate the views means that you have to be prepared to articulate and you need to sustain that kind of activity for a certain time, otherwise just to articulate this once does

not have so much sense in such organizations. And last but not least, that is the third major element, you know, just one voice does not mean so much, so in the international organization to win your

case you have to be able to find, let us say, allies in the other countries, so if you join forces with the others your chance to win your case is much better than if you are just fighting alone.

Tomáš Klvaňa:

Mr. Ambassador, what is Norway's experience in voicing their voice and pursuing their interest within NATO?

Hans Ola Urstad:

Well, we are one of the founding members of NATO, so we have of course long experience with this and if we go back to the former cold war, for instance, the Warsaw Pact and NATO standing against up each other, and I do not need to go deeper into that, all know what I am talking about. For instance Norway had this policy of reassurance of a special policy of restriction, of self-imposed restrictions, we were all the time one of two nations within NATO who were bordering directly on the Soviet Union, the other nation being Turkey of course. We have a 190 km border with Russia today, with the Soviet union then, and you know probably also these self-imposed restrictions were – no huge troop stations very close to the border, there were never border guards and so on, of course there were military people there but we were not having exercises very close to the Soviet or Warsaw Pact area and also no nuclear weapons were placed in this territory. This was accepted by NATO. This is just as an example that was some time ago but we

have always found it extremely useful to be in early on for instance developing the policies of NATO through the important meetings, through the communiqués that have been developed and I can tell you that there is a lot of hard work going into the phrasing, the wording of those things, long into the nights, and when the council finally meets then also it is only hammered out through long and hard negotiations very often.

And as you so correctly said, building alliances in this cooperation can be very important after all, there are 26 nations there today and we have to agree somehow, it is a consensus building and a consensus based organization.

I remember simply one occasion I believe when my nation, my country had to take what we call “a footnote” on one of the main communiqués which was kind of a tough decision to make, normally any nation would try to avoid that and try to find a way to join the consensus in the end.

Question:

My name is Ilja Džordžević and I am from the Atlantic Council of Serbia and Montenegro. I have maybe all the speakers could answer this question because we all know that since the end of the cold war and until now we have evolution of NATO, I mean from the military organization to political organization which is now the case, so what can we expect in the next five years. Will NATO

be, will take all roles from the United Nations or will have some joined future with NATO and United Nations, because the United Nations were accepted in the whole world and NATO is not and the main goal of both organizations is to promote these Euro-Atlantic values, so can you tell me what will happen in next five years? Maybe all speakers could answer this question. Thank you.

Tomáš Klvaňa:

So the question was what is going to happen in next five years and let me start with Jiří Schneider who has not spoken for a while and I suspect that there will be

some disagreement with your statement that in the past NATO was a military alliance and now it is more political. But I will leave it up to our guests.

Jiří Schneider:

Thank you. I would also disagree on that characterization of NATO that it used to be only a military organization and now it is becoming more and more political. I think it has been always political-military organization and as Saša Vondra described the decision-making mechanism, the secrets of the consensus building in the organizations which is based on consensus are clearly showing us that this has always been a political organization. There is a danger that its military arm which has been a real asset because NATO was indeed the only organization capable of managing operations with the presence of not just one nation but more of them. That this capability is going to be

abandoned, not used simply because of the political character of the organization which is too complicated for decision. So there is a danger that in five years there is going to be another organization for security and cooperation in Europe apart from NATO and this is definitely something which I think all member states would not like to see to happen because we do not want to have another organization which is already at place. We would like to keep the edification of NATO present. Now you have mentioned the relation to United Nations, there was never intention of NATO member states to become, to supersede the United Nations. On the contrary, I think NATO is one of the most capable, regional organizations

which can provide an arm to enforce something which is globally covered by the umbrella of United Nations. There are items in the Charter of the United Nations which pointed to this direction, you know, what the African Union is doing in Africa, and... so NATO was always and is still a regional organization and it is a kind of a paradox to me to see that on paper the European Union is having bigger geographical ambitions with its security

policy, further geographical ambitions than NATO which is really focused on the broadened Euro-Atlantic region. European security strategy counts on the range of 6.000 km of possible peace keeping or peace enforcing operations done by European operations, so there is a slightly disagreement on this. So my fear is that NATO might lose its edge and its edge is the ability to perform operations which are politically mediated.

Hans Ola Urstad:

Well, NATO will not become United Nations in my opinion, I speak in my own opinion now, but we have the also another important conversation in between we can say the sense, the way we see it, they have different purposes, different means available for the actions and I think that NATO will certainly continue to, in many ways, in many fields, be dependant, in fact perhaps as it goes to larger organization, even more on UN policies and decisions and in the sense that we are seeing an impasse now for NATO now and the peace making, peace keeping missions and

we have these from our Norwegian side always it has been very important that they are based on the UN requests, so being the world wide organization that it is, having been one of the pillars of our foreign policy, has been that all the time since it was established and..., but certainly as NATO develops and grows into a larger organization obviously more and more interests will be involved and it might be harder to keep all the requests together within such a very large organization but of course that is the challenge we have to face in the future.

Alexandr Vondra:

Perhaps to add something to your UN comment. The United Nations is certainly organization which can contribute to the legitimacy or legality of certain action. But it is not the only one as for legitimacy or legality but can seriously contribute that. But the fact is that it is limited. There are in fact there were only two authorizations by the United Nations to the major wars since the establishment of the United

Nations in 1945 – the Korean War and the first Gulf War. So, I would say that NATO cannot be substituted here as at least the organization which is bringing together Europeans and Americans and just to make NATO a political discussion club, I would not see that as an effective and rightful approach because then there would have to be developed alternative to NATO and what is the alternative to

NATO? It is just another alliance of the states like we have seen in Iraq so I would state NATO as the military political organization as we know it and of course that it is going to react to the various new challenges of the recent world. And with the United Nations I would not expect any miracles, so if the reform of the United Nations Security Council would be improved one day or one year and you know it is a long road to go, we will not have more effectivity having 10 permanent members instead of five. We would just have more difficulties in

getting the consensus among those permanent members. So there are certain ideas how to reform the UN in a way that would be a kind of more formalized caucus of democratic countries. Probably it is not a bad way forward but still I would see serious obstacles in the formulating such terms in the United Nations and they are facing even serious disagreements among the democratic nations. Maybe those who are interested can remember those debates between Americans and French five years ago.

Question:

Good evening, I am also from the Atlantic Council. I have a short question for Mr. Jiří Schneider. Once upon a time, Václav Havel has promised that KGB modelled secret intelligence service in the Czech

Republic would be cancelled. As we all know, all the ex-communist countries have the same issue. So how did your country resolve that question? Thank you.

Jiří Schneider:

Thank you for an invitation to another seminar. I try to hint to this field as well because we should not be focused only on military, we should address the whole security sector and this is important element of that. This is important element for building the trust among civilians and those who are in service, be it military service or security service, police or whatever. And that was the sensitive point, the point of hot political debates in our country and you might have different opinions whether that was a successful transformation or an unsuccessful transformation. It depends on point of

view. But one thing is certain – we have done – I would say among the post-communist countries – unprecedented and most excessive changes in this field. Some say that was detrimental to the effectiveness of the security services but I was definitely contributing and beneficial to the better understanding and public support for these roles of the state. So there are lessons learnt, we have inherited different branches of these sectors and one branch of the security intelligence service was established actually as a new service, almost as a new service. Some other branches tried to bet on the continuity, so we have different

models even in our country and I think that would be an excellent topic for a debate with our experts somewhere here or in Prague. I think we have gathered some experience and we were pioneering some approaches among the

transformation countries. We have seen that some countries adopted after some hesitation some major schemes adapted earlier in 1990s, so thank you for that question, I think that is a very important element of security transformation.

Question:

First of all thank you very much for the presentations which I think have been very useful. Let me thank Mr. Schneider for raising one very important issue which in my opinion has been neglected for many times and this is the economic aspect of Euro-Atlantic integration. You mentioned very well. Your membership to NATO resulted in the recognition of the transformation of your country. I think this is very important for this country to emphasize the economic aspect. Because the membership in such organization and you have mentioned it many times, brings stability in the country. And of course the stability of the country attracts investment and that is a very important issue for this country, because we are lacking investments. This is also a question for Mr. Živulovič who was talking about some the problems – we have to adjust, the army, we have to pay this and that, but nobody has mentioned how big, e.g. in your case, how many investments you have actually had offered more after joining NATO,

how much money actually your country “made” and my question in this context is – if you have any knowledge of this – did you notice the rise of economic investments after the joining the “Partnership for peace”, not after joining NATO which you have obviously mentioned I think it is very important for us in this stage because it can be used as an element for the public outrage – this economic aspect. And I want to ask one question for Mr. Vondra – I do not know if it is politically correct to say that the future of cooperation in the security center of all countries can be determined by two elements. First that we share common values and the other thing is that today we do not have much enemy – to summarize what you said – the weapons of mass destruction, the international terrorism and the radical Islam and this is something that we are facing. We do not have an actual enemy, there are elements that endanger our values and we have to be united and defend those values.

Jiří Schneider:

I am not aware of the calculations or the impact of the “Partnership for peace” on our economy investments and these things. I think what is important to be

said, in our experience in 1994, it was even before we applied for the European Union membership, it was before it was possible to put an application, so it was a very

important confirmation that we are on the path to Europe and those days I remember it was very appreciated that even before our becoming candidates of the European Union which was seen as a tough job, we

were able to make some steps in the direction of integration. So it definitely played a role, but I am unable to calculate that.

Tomáš Klvaňa:

Of course it is going to be for the Serbs and Montenegro people to decide whether you want to join NATO or not but perhaps it might be even more important let me speculate for you to join NATO than the EU that for us because of what happened in this region in past 10 years maybe Mr.

Živulović may have some ideas on the topic importance of joining NATO versus the importance of joining the European Union for attracting foreign direct investment to Serbia and Montenegro. Would you like to take on this topic?

Vladan Živulović:

Let us say – for economical reason we need to be in the European Union, for security reasons we have to be in NATO because we do not have any other solution, so the European Union is a first step, NATO is the second step. But it must not be our goal to be the members. For the security reasons first we have to reorganize our defence system in a way that it is in other countries to join NATO but not be the member of NATO but to set the standards, it is very important.

On the other side, for economical reasons if we are a member of the European Union we have to accept all the legal issues, laws, rules how to participate in the European Union economy so that must be the aim and the idea and the goal of Serbia and Montenegro. And last is to be the member of these two organizations – NATO - to secure the economy and the member of EU – to develop our economy. That is how I think what we have to do and I think that

we are on a good road because I think that we did very successful reform, we started with very successful reforms in the defence sector, I cannot speak on behalf of the other sectors because we are focused on the defence sector and I think that we are on a good road and I think we should succeed in preparing all. Mr. Ambassador mentioned the strategies, so our parliament accepted the strategy of defence which is the basic return we needed and we never cared before about history. Now we have to finish the White Book and the Military Doctrine immediately I think that they are prepared in our defence sector then we have to change our military roles and then to work on standards. In the meantime we are working on the reforms of the general staff in the way as NATO countries are organized, from G1 to G7 etc. I cannot speak about the economic sector because I am not an expert for these issues. Thank you.

Hans Ola Urstad:

I think that the membership for instance in “Partnership for peace” can also play an important role economically. Obviously, in one country it is judged according to a lot of factors and indicators. One indicator would certainly be - for instance in our country we have the guarantee institute for export credits and so on. They are not just looking at one

particular factor, one particular issue, in order to establish their opinion about the creditworthiness of export countries. And therefore I think such a move into “Partnership for peace” membership could have side affects certainly that would be very important also in the economic sector.

Question:

I would like to say just a few words. When you go down the street in, on both sides of the street you can see these destructed buildings. This is actually how people learn maybe about the NATO and I am quoting a politician here who says that if according to 12-24 Kosovo is a part of Serbia and Montenegro, than part of the country is under NATO occupation. So I can say NATO starts from minus, not even zero, in terms of explaining itself and that is why I would like to thank all of you as members of a country which is a member of NATO to come here and to give a very clear message that we want Serbia and Montenegro in NATO, first in “Partnership for peace” and then in NATO. It is not because NATO desperately needs Serbia and Montenegro force for security reasons or whatever, it is because for all of us it is very important that this part of Europe will not be excluded from any structure, either NATO or European Union. So the message is clear as you said from the beginning Mr. Schneider – that we all support the membership to PFP, yes, from the eastern

part of Turkey to the very corner of Iceland and this is why we want Serbia and Montenegro in this structure. And the one thing is as long as we open our arms, we want you to do some certain things which we think are necessary not for us but for you as well. And I will follow what my friend said, as one of American politicians said, you cannot talk about social security without the security of course, security will bring prosperity and membership and all other things. Yes, there are similarities but there are differences between Europe countries and this country. And in that sense I would like to recommend the efforts of the NATO contact point embassy as well as the Euro-Atlantic Council for their efforts to explain to the people because in this country, there is a belief that we all try to destroy this and it is not true – we do not want to - we want partnership and partnership is on an equal partnership and every initiative like yours, be it the small or this big, large one, is the same message – we want partnership.

Question:

I have a question for Mr. Živulović. You have mentioned some percentage about the support for NATO and the PFP – Serbia and Montenegro joining the NATO and PFP, you said that there is over 65% of Serbian and Montenegro inhabitants for the PFP partnership and about 35% for joining NATO. I believe there is a higher

percentage of the support among young people, you mentioned that you want to work especially among young people with this public diplomacy or your efforts. But I would like to ask what about the older people, people above 30, what would attract them to the idea of NATO or PFP membership.

Živulović:

Let us say I think what can attract them, older people than 30 years old, is economy again. To be honest, Serbia and Montenegro is in huge economic problem, we are very close to let say budget bankruptcy, economy is not working, the factories are closed, the salaries are very low. So a lot of distinguished participants and others mentioned the economy and what are the benefits of joining “Partnership for peace”. We have information that when Poland joined “Partnership for peace”, the foreign investments increased over 300%, so that is the information we are using when trying to explain to the people when we are going around Serbian and Montenegro cities. That could be one of the explanations why and how to attract this older generation.

I think that is the only, people have a difficult life here so we have to give them some chances and of course, we have to explain and maybe I mentioned that before, for against this integrations, which kind of organizations, in our defence strategy which is accepted, the two main threats are the organized crime and terrorism. We cannot protect economy if we do not destroy the organized crime which is here very present, you can read it

in newspapers, every day you can see in the newspapers that somebody was killed on the street, etc.

Again if we are fighting against these two main threats, terrorism and organized crime, we should protect our economy and have a better space for developing of the economy. With the organized crime I am not sure if we can succeed so we have to destroy them.

That is why these guys and these organized groups are against the integration. Why? Because if we are going in the system, e.g. in the “Partnership for peace”, then as you know we have in PFP 2000 programs, we should sign the contract with all neighbouring countries to work together, to control the borders where they carry out all the smuggling – the people, the drugs, alcohol, the cigarettes. Can you imagine how these guys who are working in this business, smuggling drugs for example, are so happy, if we are going to the “Partnership for peace” and have a normal relations with neighbouring countries? Of course they do not want that. So they will find us as stupid parties and poor people to say: no, we do not need anybody, no system. They do not want any system. So that is the reason again, I think that all we need

education, very hard work to explain what we should have of joining this project “Partnership for peace”. That is the only

way I do not see the other way. Thank you.

Jiří Schneider:

I think it is a very delicate thing to measure the effects. But I remember in 1996, 1997, these two or three years after our entering this “Partnership for peace” program, I remember that there was immediate effect on those, it was a tiny minority at these days, but those in the military involved in the program who worked neck to neck with their partner soldiers from NATO countries. It improved their self-confidence, their self-esteem, before that they felt marginalized, even humiliated in the country of Švejk – you know that it is not a problem to feel humiliated being a soldier. And suddenly they felt as proud soldiers with experience from missions which were done with the - in their eyes - best soldiers in the world, the soldiers from the NATO countries to

whom they have real respect. This had a multiplication effect in the society and it was important element in the psychic of the society. It is difficult to measure that. It is really difficult. What we are now facing is that after five years of being in NATO there is a kind of tiredness. Some are already tired, there are no new challenges for them, the initial enthusiasm is over. But that is our problem. But the initial stages of the program, especially for those who were in the program, were important and especially the coverage by the media – they spoke to these people and they sent the message. Obviously, the message was not always positive but it was overwhelmingly positive. Mr. Klvaňa, the chair of this panel, is a journalist, so maybe he can add something to that.

Tomáš Klvaňa:

I know that Mr. Vondra wants to speak, so the floor is his.

Alexandr Vondra:

First of all, I am convinced that we do not share just the common values, but also the common threats. The most alarming threat is a combination of radical Islamism and

international terrorism and I believe that people in Prague and Belgrade can understand this more than many others in Europe. But back to this issue – I think that

PFP cannot be measured by millions of Euros or US dollars investments. PFP is just a small step. Its purpose is to bring a country closer to NATO and it is up to an individual country how it decides to exploit this program. PFP gives you a certain frame, it is a kind of road map. Then both NATO and EU memberships gives you more. They will offer you also certain status or image. Slovakia can serve as a perfect example Let's take Bratislava. It is much smaller as for people, much less attractive in comparing with Belgrade. Belgrade is a metropolis, Bratislava is a small capital with a strong competition of Vienna. Nobody was coming there in the middle of the 1990s, when Meciar hold the power. That time everybody saw Bratislava as a strange city in a strange country. There were no foreign investments, city was empty during the day and dark at the night, with a lot of criminality. And then suddenly they got rid of Meciar and have joined NATO and EU. Today they have 19% flat tax and,

they are undertaking serious reforms on social security, pensions, etc. Slovaks are considered to be darlings of Western Europe, they are called Tatra's Tigers. Foreign investment inflows from everywhere, just look at their numbers. Therefore I believe there is a relative easy way for you to follow the Slovak model. Your starting conditions could be even better with strategic location of your country and your capital, with qualified people at home and influential diaspora in abroad. You just need to answer few small questions. Where are those four generals required by tribunal in Haag? Why you cannot get rid of them? I think if you put on balance – those four generals with the future prosperity of your beautiful city – a balance sheet is clear and speaks strongly in favour of giving up them into Haag. So do it – rather sooner. Then I do not have any doubts about your future in a community of developed countries of Europe.

Collection of papers from the workshop

„Cooperation for New Partnership“

Held on 25th November 2004 in Belgrade

The workshop was supported by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs
of the Czech Republic.

Published by:
Jagello 2000 – Czech Euro-Atlantic Council
Výstavní 8
709 00 Ostrava 9
Czech Republic
tel./fax: +420 597 479 208
<http://www.jagello.org>
e-mail: jagello@jagello.org

1st edition, December 2004

© Jagello 2000, 2004

ISBN 80-239-5289-7