

Conflict Prevention and
Conflict Management
in the New Security Context:
The Case of the Former
Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

Anton Grizold
Marina Mitrevska
Anthony Wanis-St. John
Vlado Buchkovski
Iza Tršar

Ljubljana 2012

Anton Grizold, Marina Mitrevska, Anthony Wanis-St. John, Vlado Buchkovski, Iza Tršar
**Conflict Prevention and Conflict Management in the New Security
Context: The Case of the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia**

Publisher: Faculty of Social Sciences, Založba FDV
For Publisher: Hermina Krajnc
Ljubljana 2012

Reviewers: Prof. Petar Atanasov and Prof. Vlatko Cvrtila
Language editing: Nina Gorenc, Ph.D.
Cover design: Darinka Knapič
Book design: Alf Net d. o. o.

Copyright © Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Ljubljana, 2012.
All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

Print on demand.

CIP - Kataložni zapis o publikaciji
Narodna in univerzitetna knjižnica, Ljubljana

355.02(497.7)

CONFLICT prevention and conflict management in the new security
context : the case of the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia /
Anton Grizold ... [et al.]. - Ljubljana : Faculty of Social
Sciences, Založba FDV, 2012

ISBN 978-961-235-579-1
I. Grizold, Anton
260595968

Contents

List of Abbreviations	5
Preface	7
Introduction	9

CHAPTER I

The Changing Nature of Security	15
The Conceptualization of Security: Value, Activity, Policy, System.....	17
The Study of the Concept of Security	20
Personal and Human Security: a New Trend in Understanding the Concept of Security	24
National and State Security	25
International and Global or Universal Security.....	27
International Security System(s): 'the common responsibility' for World Peace and Security.....	28

CHAPTER 2

Post-Cold War Shift in Security Paradigm: Conflict Prevention, Conflict Management and Post-conflict Settlement	33
Crisis Management versus Conflict Prevention	35
The Emergence of Conflict Prevention	37
Conceptual Evolution of Conflict Prevention.....	38
The Post Cold War Panorama: Failures to Prevent.....	43
Preventive Deployment.....	47
Critiques of Conflict Prevention	49

CHAPTER 3

Socio-Economic, Political and Ethnic Premises In Macedonian Society Post Independence	53
Macedonian Road to Independence.....	54
Socio-Economic Premises of the Newly Founded State	56
Ethnic Premises of the Newly Founded State	56

CHAPTER 4

The Origins of Tensions between the Albanian and the Macedonian Communities in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	59
Escalating Conflict between the Macedonian Majority and the Albanian Minority ..	60
Preventive Pre-conflict Deployment of the United Nations	61
Pre-conflict Political Dynamism: from Action to Reaction.....	65
Sources of Frustration – from Identity to Economic Hardship	67
Interpreting the Outburst of the Conflict	68

CHAPTER 5

The Genesis of the Conflict: from Latent to Manifest Phase	73
---	-----------

CHAPTER 6

Endeavors of the Macedonian State to Resolve the Conflict	79
--	-----------

CHAPTER 7

Mediation by the European Union, Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization ..	91
The Role of European Union	91
The Role of the OSCE	93
NATO Endeavors	100

CHAPTER 8

The Ohrid Framework Agreement.....	103
Main Points and Implementation	103

CHAPTER 9

Lessons Learned	121
Macedonia in the (new) International Security Environment	124
Genesis of the Conflict Leading to the Outbreak of Hostilities (2001)	127
Outbreak of Hostilities and the Use of Force	132
Resolution of the Conflict (the Ohrid Framework Agreement)	137

Post Scriptum/Epilogue	143
-------------------------------------	------------

A Word on the Authors	144
References	145
Index	152

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ARM – Army of the Republic of Macedonia
CSCE – Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe
DPA – Democratic Party of the Albanians
DKPO - UN Department of Peacekeeping Operations
DUI – Democratic Union for Integration
EU – European Union
FYRM – Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
KFOR – NATO Kosovo Force
KLA – Kosovo Liberation Army
LAPMB – Liberation Army for Preševo, Medveđa and Bujanovac
LDP – Liberal Democratic Party
MINURCA – United Nations Mission in the Central African Republic
NATO – North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NLA – National Liberation Army
OFA – Ohrid Framework Agreement
OSCE – Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe
PDP – Party for Democratic Prosperity
RM – Republic of Macedonia
SDSM – Social Democratic Alliance of Macedonia
SDUM – Social Democratic Union of Macedonia
UN – United Nations
UNAMIR – United Nations Assistance Mission to Rwanda
UNMIK – United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo
UNPREDEP – United Nations Preventive Deployment
UNSC – United Nations Security Council
UNSG – United Nation Secretary General
VMRO-DPNE – *Vnatrešna makedonska revolucionerna organizacija - Demokrat-ska partija za makedonsko nacionalno edinstvo*; Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organization - Democratic Party for Macedonian National Unity

Preface

The present book seeks to be a unique synthetic analysis, combining the theoretical foundations of the changed contemporary security paradigm, the resulting notions of conflict prevention, preventive diplomacy and preventive deployment. These conceptual themes are examined by analyzing the Macedonian conflict in depth.

The aim of this complex book is to provide answers to the question of what was happening in all stages of the conflict in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYRM), by thoroughly analyzing the events that took place before and in particular during the year 2001. It further intends to emphasize the significance of the signed Ohrid Framework Agreement for the European future of the FYRM.

We probed for the answers by applying different theoretical and practical methodological approaches, and through the analysis of empirical data combined with theory and our field experience.

Through discussions and interviews with representatives of international organizations, international experts and the Macedonian and Albanian politicians, a new perspective that analyzes the year 2001 through a prism of scientific facts is offered not only to the academia, but also to a wide range of practitioners devoted to constructive conflict resolution. Scientific lessons in theory and practice of conflict resolution have thus been ascertained, contributing to the definition of the conflict resolution model, and to the enhancement of stability, not only in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, but in the wider region as well.

The complexity of the issue called for broad participation of several authors, making the topic of conflict resolution per se a matter of international importance. This work could not be realized without full engagement of Macedonian, Slovenian and American authors, all experts in their

respective fields. Our work is enriched also by thoughtful reviews of Petar Atanasov, professor at the Institute for Sociological and Politico-Legal Research in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Vlatko Cvrtila, professor and the former dean of the Faculty of Political Sciences in Zagreb, Croatia.

Due to the complexity of the book, which presented a challenge to the authors and will in parts be challenging also to the readers, the authors will be grateful for any suggestions and comments, which we will keep in mind in a possible future edition.

Our acknowledgment and sincere thanks go to the sponsors, Triglav d. o. o., represented by Mr. Iztok Šekoranja and ADP Adria d. o. o., represented by Mr. Miha Dvojmoč, who have allocated resources that helped publish the English version of the present book, previously published in Albanian and Macedonian.

The authors,
Ljubljana, Slovenia, 2012

Introduction

Conflict prevention is a broad concept encompassing numerous strategies and policies that seek to prevent the emergence, escalation or re-emergence of violent conflict. Scholars and practitioners speak of several approaches to prevention, including diplomatic, military and structural (which refers to initiatives addressing root causes of conflict, including poor governance, social exclusion, poverty and income inequality among others). The Macedonian case illustrates several approaches to prevention, including preventive diplomacy, preventive military deployments and, once the peace process has been entrenched, structural adjustments designed to deter the re-emergence of violence.

We start by asking whether or not Macedonia, or the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, faced a real crisis in 2001 imposed on it with the primary goal of disintegration of the state itself?¹

The international community played a particularly significant role in the resolution of the conflict in 2001. It had an active part in the resolution of the conflict in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and, hence, influenced the dynamics of the conflict. In that sense, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the European Union and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, on the one side, and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia on the other side of this conflict, learned a very beneficial and edifying lesson. From the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia's example of relatively successful prevention, a general lesson

1 Authors will be using the names of the Republic of Macedonia (RM) and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYRM) as based on historic developments in the name formation and name alterations.

emerged both for the international and for the domestic actors: conflict prevention cannot be represented as a formula that would cure the problems on the surface, and yet leave profound political (ethno-political mobilization, corruption, crime), economic (underdevelopment, unemployment, lack of investments, illegal trade), social (poverty, low living standard) and security (illegal possession and trade of weapons, illegal trafficking in humans) reasons for the conflicts. The dissection of the conditions in Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia before and after the conflict in 2001 is an evident example for this.

The Macedonian conflict ended with a political solution. The citizens (primarily the ethnic Macedonians) were not prepared for such a solution and reacted vigorously to the Ohrid Framework Agreement. The most significant changes refer to the use of the so called 'Badinter rule' during voting procedures in the Parliament, decentralization of power, the use of the Albanian language as the second official language in the state and the justified and equitable representation of ethnic communities in the state administration. The international community also demonstrated it was able to intervene resolutely *before* an outburst of a civil war, especially by investing money and diplomacy.

Many of the public opinion polls and the analyses in this book have shown that the Ohrid Framework Agreement, as an agreement on paper, is not sufficient. True mutual respect is necessary in order for the communities to live together, regardless of the differences that confront or separate them. Deeds must follow words; and this is the difficulty. The conflict has deepened the distrust and impatience between ethnic Macedonians and ethnic Albanians. The first steps towards the 'deeds' are painful, unpleasant, difficult, burdened with many hesitations and obstructions. One of the possible consequences of the 'political earthquake' is the strengthening of the national self-feeling of ethnic Albanians, and as a reaction to that, the emerging of the need of the ethnic Macedonians to strengthen their own national identity. That will not be painless for the future of the country.

The concept of Macedonia as a nation-state (national state of the Macedonian people) has been abandoned with the Ohrid Framework Agreement.

The full implementation of the Ohrid Framework Agreement as political capital with a specific political and legal weight has opened horizons for building a happier future for all citizens of the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. The road to the EU passes through the Ohrid Framework Agreement and it should be clear to everyone that only with equal opportunities in society, with the same privileges and responsibilities,

the citizens of the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia will cross the threshold of the big European family. The sooner the multiethnic reality is understood, the faster the citizens will get out of the ethnic framework. The differences need to bring the citizens of the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia closer to each other and make them see that the future lies in the recognition of the mutual distinctions of authentic and civilization values. It is necessary to create an enduring positive climate in the state for accepting the advantages of the Ohrid Framework Agreement by all citizens of the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, for affirmation of unity and tolerance and the unconditional endeavors for the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to join NATO and the European Union.

The subject of interest presented in this book is systematized in nine parts. The first part frames the changing nature of security paradigm, emphasizing the contemporary, post-Cold War concepts and approaches to security, which have significantly increased over the last two decades both as a field of research and as a field of practice. This increase generates sound debates for appropriate analysis of conflict phases and appropriate prevention mechanisms and instruments that can be implemented in and throughout the phases of a certain conflict.

The second part addresses, through a theoretical and methodological framework, the changes of the security paradigm from crisis management to conflict prevention. At the level of a modern state, security is ensured through the national security politics and structures, thus obtaining several new characteristics in the current cultural and civilizational situation.

The third and the fourth parts thoroughly analyze the conflict in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia from its root causes, stemming from the Macedonian independence in 1991, to the manifest clashes in 2001; the conflict prevention and security measures taken by the state; the mediation of the international community; and the endeavors to find a pacific resolution, resulting in the signing of the Ohrid Framework Agreement in 2001 and the change of the Macedonian Constitution. These two parts include the analysis of the socio-economic, political and ethnic specifics in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, and the ensuing tensions between the ethnic Albanian and the ethnic Macedonian communities in the country.

In view of the historical circumstances surrounding the establishment of the independent state, the first Constitution of the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia did not provide consistent answers to inter-ethnic issues in Macedonia. In the years to come, these inconsistencies have increasingly become a stumbling stone in the development of democracy and multiethnic society. The problems could be anticipated even during the

developing process of the Constitution, and particularly through the fact that the members of the Parliament of Albanian ethnic origin boycotted the voting because they thought the Constitution did not guarantee the collective rights of the ethnic Albanian community. More precisely, this led to the creation of all the preconditions for the escalation of dynamics, the action and reaction, monitored through the framework of the concept for societal security dilemma. Namely, the proclamation of the first Constitution of the independent Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia only by the ethnic Macedonians, without the support of the ethnic Albanians, has been a motive for reaction.

12

In the fifth part, the emphasis is put on the genesis of the conflict in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, and the sixth part outlines the activities of the latter's government to resolve the disputes between the ethnic Macedonian majority and the ethnic Albanian minority. In 2001 the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia faced activities of armed extremist groups on a part of its territory. Such activities threatened the territorial integrity and sovereignty of the state, the life and security of the citizens and their rights, as well as the regional peace and security. Suppression of the extremists, establishing peace and security and the rule of law on the territory as a whole, were not only the issues of paramount concern for the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, but also for the neighboring countries and the international community as such. To deal with this problem, a unique approach concerning the manner and methods with which the conflict was handled, was pursued by all state political actors in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

The seventh part focuses on the role played by the international community in the resolution of the conflict in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. In this context, an analysis is provided of the role of the European Union, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, as well as of their reactions and mediation with their proper mechanisms and instruments in the management of the conflict in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

The emphasis in the eighth part is put on the basic principles underlying the Ohrid Framework Agreement. It includes an analysis of the Ohrid Framework Agreement, which, as a political act of internal nature, has changed the course of history of the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia after the critical year of 2001. In that context, the three basic segments, namely, the expanded use of minority ethnic communities, the justified and equitable representation of the representatives of minorities, and the local self-government (decentralization) are thoroughly discussed.

This work is a contribution to the debate on defining the events that happened in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia in 2001. Probably decades will have to pass before we can build a comprehensive picture of those events. In the meantime, what is of particular importance are the lessons learned about approaches, methods, political will of the main domestic and international actors in resolving an intra-state conflict against the background of the present international security environment.

The Changing Nature of Security

The security environment has been permanently changing, passing from a primordial state with a relatively small number of threats to a complex one, in which the threats are more and more complex and diffuse. The *value* of security has also been changing throughout the history; nevertheless, it has remained high on the 'priority list' of human societies since ever. From historical point of view, security presents a fundamental value that has to be preserved one way or another (Lippman in Wolfers 1952, 484–485); its provision is institutionalized through the appearance of a sovereign state and the system of sovereign states at an international or global level.

Security is the opposite of insecurity or threat. The latter is the result of the operation of various sources of threat arising in nature, in a society or in the relations among societies. The sources of threat differ as to the reason, contents, level, place, etc., but security remains the primary structural element of the social system since all members of society are affected. Any social system tends to organize its individual spheres so that they operate interdependently and that they are structured in such a way as to comply with the need for security in society at large.

Even nowadays, at the present level of complex social developments, security persists to be the inherent element of existence and actions of an individual, a society or state and the international system. In these intertwined social networks the present-day understanding of the notion of security has thus become necessarily holistic, including every aspect of human and societal existence, as well as all levels of relations and forms encompassed in the broad social organization of the international community.

The underlying principle of international system is the natural inclination of human beings and states alike, to protect and defend themselves by means of force, unless they are extraneously coerced into behaving differently (Bidwai 1999, 109). In a threatening environment of various vulnerabilities, individuals and states strive to ensure the state of security or the state of balanced mutual existence, which manifest themselves in the broad or the narrow sense (e.g. an individual in relation to the other individual or the state or a state in relation to other states and the international system).²

Security, therefore, refers to an individual, society/state and the international system as a whole. Although fulfilling security needs of each autonomous entity undoubtedly forms an inseparable part of the whole, there is, importantly, no harmony between them. Stemming from this notion, the contemporary security paradigm is contextualized separately and traditionally studied in the form of three basic conceptual frameworks, namely those of (i) individual security,³ (ii) national security⁴ and (iii) international security.

Given the fact that sovereign states, as well as individuals, do not exist in vacuum, but form a part of the international or global society, the relational dilemma erupts; a dilemma of national security in relations between individual states. The question of security of a nation state and its citizens is all the more important considering the anarchic state the international community dwells in.

2 Vulnerability represents the identifying of the foreign events jeopardizing the system's existence or the infrastructure and which represents the initiating elements within specialized risk analysis, taking into account the probability to create new hazard elements and negative effects of the disaster propagation. When talking about vulnerabilities, we associate the economic-social processes with the numerous hypostases of the state and non-state actors (Neag 2009). These vulnerabilities create favorable terms for any kind of threats (economic, political, ideological cultural environmental) aiming at the survival of the state.

3 Individual security is conceptualized upon the fact that an individual is most directly cognizant of her or his individual needs, including the need for security. The fulfillment of this particular individual need presents the basis for a qualitative existence and individual development. Individual security is, also, always relational, as it depends on the intentions and actions of other members of a modern society, who can either empower security or threaten it.

4 National security on the other hand focuses on the efforts of a modern nation state to ensure security to all members of a given society, namely citizens, and protect them from both external and internal threats. Individual security can be ensured by the institutionalization of national security, but empirically, the relation between the individual and the national level is far from automatic.

The three entities, in a constant state of flux, in reality cannot be categorized. Several layers intertwine and two potential relationships are formed. The first relationship occurs when a state provides the general conditions for the individual security of its citizens, while the anarchic international environment simultaneously threatens the state and its national security. The second potential relationship arises in the framework of the international security order in which states are guaranteed their respective national security in relation to other states, while other citizens, states or even national institutions, which fail to provide the appropriate legal and political structure essential for the individual security of the citizens, continue to threaten their citizens. Whether or not the concept of non-interfering in the so called 'internal affairs' of a state can be surpassed, and if yes, in which cases it can be done – represents an ongoing debate. Recently, some new ideas and concepts, which may one day develop into politically and morally, if not even legally binding norms, emerged (e.g. the norm of conflict prevention, the question of humanitarian intervention, nowadays upgraded into the doctrine 'Responsibility to Protect' etc.). If this, for some people utopian spirit of the *legal* equality among world citizens prevails, one day famine in a far-distant country may be politically, morally and legally as worrying for citizens of a certain country as, for example, the unemployment among youngsters in their own country.

The Conceptualization of Security: Value, Activity, Policy, System

We can perceive the 'content of security' in at least four different, but inseparably connected terms: as a *value*, *activity*, *policy* and *system*.

(i) **Security as a value.** Values are philosophical-ethical category, which defines the ideational perspectives of individuals, states and other social actors, and, consequently, their work. These may, according to Baldwin (1997) include physical safety, economic welfare, autonomy, psychological well-being, and so on. Security is one of the oldest values of humanity, because without it all other aspects of human life are impossible. Having said that, it is obvious that security is not the only thing individuals, states, and other social actors value; and the pursuit of security necessitates the sacrifice of the other values. It is, according to Baldwin (1997), therefore necessary to ask how important security is, relative to other values.

Hence, the need for having certain degree of security is an incentive for biological and societal development of humans (Grizold 1999, 23–24), which resulted in the formation of a state. According to Hobbes, when he describes a hypothetical state of nature, he actually explains why this is in fact a state of war; such an aggressive environment can be, according to him, overcome only if individuals give up their rights to an all-powerful sovereign (Hobbes in Wisken, 2010). Consequently, the value of security can be ‘enjoyed’ in a form of a state.

Security, according to Wolfers, is a ‘value of which a nation can have more or less’ and which it can aspire to have in a greater or lesser measure. The states vary widely in the value they place on security, and some states may be so dissatisfied with the status quo that they are more interested in acquiring new values than in securing the values they have. The higher the value ranks on the ‘value list’ of the state (or better, of its political elite), the more intensive the endeavour for its protection would be. Since modern states rank the value of security highly, they organize the means of its protection in an appropriate way; Lippman (in Wolfers, 1952) thus argues that the nation is secure when it does not need to sacrifice its core values, or to put it differently, when it is in a position to preserve itself as a nation (state), if challenged by an imminent threat. Consequently, if security is perceived as a value, it means that certain efforts and resources will be devoted to its protection.

(ii) **Security as an activity and a system.** In the light of the previously determined content of security, it has to be noted that security is not simply a matter of the absence of threat or of a controllable and low level of sources of threat in nature or society. It should also be understood as an *activity* and a *system* through which the exercise of the basic functions of society can be ensured.

With the development of humankind, activities aimed at achieving security (*security activities*) have been gradually disunited from other activities of a society (e. g. food production, cultural activities etc.). Certain people (groups) within the society have obtained special tasks for securing the society (and the values the society cherished). Security as an activity acquires meaning in the moment when an individual reacts to a certain irritant from the environment, and becomes cognizant of imminent threat, pain or fear. Hence, we may conclude that the activities aimed at preserving security activity appeared at the beginning of culture (in the widest meaning of the word) – in the period when a man, with the use of primitive tools, tried to adapt to specific conditions in his environment (Grizold 1997, 7).

The securing and execution of these functions represents a wider, positive aspect of security, which goes well beyond the mere absence of threat (negative understanding of security).⁵ In this respect, the mankind started organizing the security activities and establishing first (primitive) forms of *security systems*, aimed at ensuring security in its broadest sense for all members of the society. With an increasing complexity of life and establishment of a modern state, simple primordial security systems began developing into more complex security systems, and in the final stage, into the *national security systems*, according to which any social system also provides for the realization of its security functions. The basic principle of national security system derives from structural links between security and human needs which have existed throughout human history, right up to the present. In spite of the global dimension of contemporary security, its national (state) dimension still remains the key constant. At a national level, modern states ensure the security of their citizens through the operation of their national security systems. The basic elements of the national security system are the operational activities of the society to ensure its security.

In modern states, one of the core elements of state policies is security policy.⁶ **Security as a policy (objective)** in its broader sense relates to any

5 Joseph S. Nye (ibid., 5) differentiates between security as a primarily negative goal, i.e. absence of threat to the existence of the state, and security as a positive aim, i.e. higher level of security, beyond mere survival.

6 The other two national security elements of modern states are **security structure** and **security self-organization of civil society**. *Security structure* is aimed at ensuring security at the society level and is specific to each individual state. However, most states have two elements of their security structure in common: defense and internal security. The basic functions of defense are (i) deterrence of a potential aggressor, (ii) defense of territory in case of aggression, (iii) protection of the population and material goods, and amelioration of the consequences following an act of aggression, organization of non-armed revolt against an aggressor and (iv) to ensure the functioning of political and other social subsystems in times of war. In order to carry out the above functions, defense as an element of the security system has two basic ingredients: armed forces and civil defense. On the other hand, the basic functions of internal security are formed around two basic premises, namely the maintenance of law and order and the protection of the whole social infrastructure. The structural elements, which perform these basic functions, are the police, intelligence service, customs, and other agencies of control. In addition to institutionalized security provisions at the state level, modern states also have provisions to ensure security at the individual or community level (*security self-organization of the civil society*). These include spontaneous self-protection (self-defense) activities of individuals, and various forms and levels of self-organization of social groups (interest groups, local communities) (Grizold 1992, 68–70).

advance preparations against threats deriving from nature, society, and relations among societies. In its narrow sense, security entails a network of measures, activities, and operations aimed at establishing a national security system. The aim of security policy in this sense is to design mechanisms and instruments by means of which the internal and external security of a society can be ensured; it means an operationalization of the political, organizational, technical, and other principles of security policy in its broader sense. Efficient national security policy for a modern state represents the synthesis of all policies developed by the state to regulate and govern lives, actions and providing conditions to ensure the prosperity of its citizens and all members of the society.

The Study of the Concept of Security

In the context of solving national, regional and international or global problems, the study of security related topics is based upon ideas and findings of various historical sources. The most relevant broad categories that greatly determined the development of the contemporary approaches to the studying of security issues encompass; (i) classical political philosophy, (ii) Christian political thought and (iii) modern political thought (Grizold, 2001).

All three basic approaches to the study of security at the level of the nation state and the international community as a whole have profoundly influenced subsequent contemporary thought on security problems. Among the most essential authors, ideas and approaches after the end of the Second World War, the following should be emphasized.

One of the most important ideas is Herz's (1950, 157–80) notion of the "security dilemma". Wolfers (1962) laid the foundations for the study of the multilayered concept of security in the contemporary world, Jervis (1976) introduced an interesting idea on security regimes, switching the researches' focus from the state to system-level analysis, Krell (1979) developed a comprehensive criticism of military conceptions of security, drawing on peace studies perspective; Bull (1978) also sought for more attention to be paid to the common interests of all states, and Krause and Nye (1975, 329) warned that economists and political theorists did not pay due consideration to the comprehensive foundations of national security, which play an instrumental role in emphasizing other social values.