

# МЕЃУНАРОДНА НАУЧНА КОНФЕРЕНЦИЈА

## РЕФОРМИ НА БЕЗБЕДНОСНИОТ СИСТЕМ КАКО ПРЕДУСЛОВ ЗА ЕВРО - АТЛАНТСКИ ИНТЕГРАЦИИ



### INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCE

### SECURITY SYSTEM REFORMS AS PRECONDITION FOR EURO-ATLANTIC INTEGRATIONS

**МЕЃУНАРОДНА НАУЧНА КОНФЕРЕНЦИЈА**

**РЕФОРМИ НА БЕЗБЕДНОСНИОТ СИСТЕМ КАКО  
ПРЕДУСЛОВ ЗА ЕВРО - АТЛАНТСКИ  
ИНТЕГРАЦИИ**

**04 - 06 Јуни 2018, Охрид**

**Том I**

**Скопје 2018**



**INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCE**

**SECURITY SYSTEM REFORMS AS PRECONDITION  
FOR EURO-ATLANTIC INTEGRATIONS**

**04 - 06 June 2018, Ohrid**

**Volume I**

**Skopje 2018**

**Издавачи:**

Универзитет „Св. Климент Охридски“  
Битола  
Факултет за безбедност – Скопје

**За издавачите:**

проф. д-р Сашо Коруновски, ректор на  
Универзитетот „Св. Климент  
Охридски“ – Битола  
проф. д-р Никола Дујовски, декан на  
Факултетот за безбедност – Скопје

**Уредник на изданието:**

Доц. д-р Марјан Ѓуровски

**Лектор на англиски јазик:**

Анче Белада  
Рози Гроздановска Велеска

**Компјутерска обработка:**

Оливера Трајанова Ѓорѓијовски  
Кемал Рушид

**Печати:**

Графопром - Битола

**Адреса на издавачите:**

Факултет за безбедност 1000 Скопје  
П. Факс 103  
тел: 022546211

Универзитет „Св. Климент Охридски“  
1ви Мај б.б. 7000 Битола,  
тел: 047223788

**Publishers:**

University “St. Kliment Ohridski”  
Bitola  
Faculty of Security- Skopje

**For the Publishers:**

Sašo Korunovski, Dr.Sc Rector of  
the University “St. Kliment  
Ohridski”- Bitola  
Nikola Dujovski, Dr.Sc Dean of  
the Faculty of Security- Skopje

**Editor in Chief:**

Marjan Gjurovski, PhD

**Lecturer in English:**

Ance Belada  
Rozi Grozdanovska Veleska

**Computer Processing:**

Olivera Trajanova Gjorgijovski  
Kemal Rushid

**Print:**

Grafoprom - Bitola

**Address of the Publishers:**

Faculty of Security 1000 Skopje  
P.O. Box 103  
tel: ++389(0)22546211

University “St. Kliment Ohridski”  
1 Maj b.b. 7000 Bitola  
tel: +++389(0) 47223788

## ПРОГРАМСКИ ОДБОР:

Проф. д-р Никола Дујовски, Декан на Факултетот за безбедност - Скопје, Република Македонија

Проф. д-р Клаус Физингер, Regional Director for Southeast Europe, Hanns Seidel Foundation

Богдан Мирчев, Hanns Seidel Stiftung Foundation

Проф. д-р Цане Мојаноски, Факултет за безбедност - Скопје

Проф. д-р Томе Батковски, Факултет за безбедност - Скопје

Проф. д-р Миодраг Лабовиќ, Факултет за безбедност - Скопје

Проф. д-р Злате Димовски, Факултет за безбедност - Скопје

Доц. д-р Богданчо Гогов, Факултет за безбедност - Скопје

Проф. д-р Ференц Банфи, Директор на CEPOL

Норберт Лајтнер, Претседател на Асоцијација на Европски Полициски Колеџ

Проф. д-р Георг Лохман, Guericke University of Magdeburg, Берлин

Проф. д-р Таро Цукимура, Doshisha University, Kyoto, Јапонија

Проф. д-р Марко Ломбарди, University Cattolica, Milano, Италија

Проф. д-р Винај Каура, Sardar Patel University of Police, Security and Criminal Justice, Rajasthan, Индија

Проф. д-р Галит Бен-Израел, Ben Gurion University of the Negev, Bar-Ilan University, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Израел

Проф. д-р Горан Бошковиќ, Декан на Академија за криминалистика и полициски студии, Србија,

Проф. д-р Торје Даниел-Костел, Rector of the Police Academy "Alexandru Ioan Cuza", Романија

Проф. д-р Неделчо Лазаров Стоичев, Ректор на Академија на Министерство за внатрешни работи, Бугарија

Проф. д-р Андреј Сотлар, Декан на Факултет за Кривична правда и безбедност, Словенија,

Проф. д-р Ивица Радовиќ, Декан на Факултет за безбедносни студии, Белградски универзитет, Србија,

Проф. д-р Неџат Корајлиќ, Декан на Факултет за криминалистика, криминологија и безбедносни студии, Универзитет на Сараево, Босна и Херцеговина

Проф. д-р Иван Тотх, Декан на Универзитетот за применети науки, VVG, Хрватска,

Проф. д-р Марта Зорко, Продекан на Факултетот за полициски науки Загреб, Хрватска

Проф. д-р Денис Калета, Претседател на совет, Institute for Corporate Security Studies ICS Љубљана, Словенија

Проф. д-р Јошко Вукосав, Декан на Висока полициска школа, Загреб, Хрватска,

Проф. д-р Миријана Франческо, Декан на Факултет за право и бизнис студии Лазар Вркатик, Универзитет УНИОН, Нови Сад, Србија,

Проф. д-р Весна Трајковска, Секретар на Програмски одбор

## ОРГАНИЗАЦИСКИ ОДБОР:

Доц. д-р Марјан Ѓуровски, Претседател,

Проф. д-р Жидас Даскаловски, член

Проф. д-р Марија Миленковска, член

Проф. д-р Марјан Арсовски, член

Проф. д-р Саше Герасимоски, член

Доц. д-р Раде Рајковчевски, член

Доц. д-р Ице Илијевски, член и секретар

## **PROGRAMME COMMITTEE:**

Dr.Sc. Nikola Dujovski, Dean of the Faculty of Security, Skopje, Republic of Macedonia, Chairman,  
Dr.Sc. Klaus Fiesinger, Regional Director for Southeast Europe, Hanns Seidel Foundation  
Bogdan Mirchev, Hanns Seidel Stiftung Foundation  
Dr.Sc. Cane Mojanoski, Faculty of Security, Skopje, Republic of Macedonia  
Dr.Sc. Tome Batkovski, Faculty of Security, Skopje, Republic of Macedonia  
Dr.Sc. Miodrag Labovic, Faculty of Security, Skopje, Republic of Macedonia  
Dr.Sc. Zlate Dimovski, Faculty of Security, Skopje, Republic of Macedonia  
Dr.Sc. Bogdanco Gogov, Faculty of Security, Skopje, Republic of Macedonia  
Dr.Sc. Ferenc Banfi, Director of CEPOL (European Union for Law Enforcement Training)  
Norbert Leitner, President of the Association of European Police Colleges  
Prof. (em.) Dr.Georg Lohmann, Guericke University of Magdeburg, Berlin  
Dr.Sc.Taro Tsukimura, Doshisha University, Kyoto, Japan  
Dr.Sc. Marco Lombardi, University Cattolica, Milano, Italy  
Dr.Sc.Vinay Kaura, Sardar Patel University of Police, Security and Criminal Justice, Rajasthan, India  
Dr.Sc. Galit Ben-Israel, Ben Gurion University of the Negev, Bar-Ilan University, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Izrael  
Dr.Sc. Goran Boskovic, Acting Dean of the Academy of Criminalistics and Police Studies, Serbia  
Dr.Sc. Torje Daniel - Costel, Rector of the Police Academy "Alexandru Ioan Cuza", Romania  
Dr.Sc. Nedelco Lazarov Stoichev, Rector of the Academy of the Ministry of Interior, Bulgaria  
Dr.Sc. Andrej Sotlar, Dean of the Faculty of Criminal Justice and Security, Slovenia  
Dr.Sc. Ivica Radovic, Dean of the Faculty of Security Studies, University of Belgrade, Serbia  
Dr.Sc. Nedzad Korajlic, Dean of the Faculty of Criminalistics, Criminology and Security

Studies, University of Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina  
Dr.Sc. Ivan Toth, Dean of the University of Applied Sciences, VVG, Croatia  
Dr.Sc. Marta Zorko, Vice-dean of Faculty of Political Science of Zagreb, Croatia  
Dr.Sc. Denis Caleta, President of the Council, Institute for Corporate Security Studies ICS Ljubljana, Slovenia  
Dr.Sc. Josko Vukosav, Dean of the High Police School, Zagreb, Croatia  
Dr.Sc. Mirjana Franceshko, Dean of Faculty of Law and Business Studies Lazar Vrkatic, University UNION, Novi Sad, Serbia  
Dr.Sc. Vesna Trajkovska, Secretary of Programme Committee

## **ORGANIZING COMMITTEE:**

Dr.Sc Marjan Gjurovski, Chairman  
Dr.Sc Zhidas Daskalovski  
Dr.Sc Marija Milenkovska  
Dr.Sc Marjan Arsovski  
Dr.Sc Sashe Gerasimoski  
Dr.Sc Rade Rajkovcevski  
Dr.Sc Ice Ilijevski, Secretary of Organizing Committee

## CONTENTS:

### PREFACE

### SECURITY SCIENCES

#### WHY IS IT NECESSARY TO HAVE A REFORM OF THE SECURITY SYSTEM OF THE REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA?.....3

TOME BATKOVSKI, DR.SC

#### RECONCEPTUALIZING SECURITY IN THE 21ST CENTURY .....15

SNEZANA NIKODINOVSKA - STEFANOVSKA, DR.SC

#### SECURITY INSTITUTIONS OF THE COMMON FOREIGN AND SECURITY POLICY OF THE EUROPEAN UNION.....22

NIKOLA DUJOVSKI, DR.SC

MARJAN ARSOVSKI, DR.SC

#### THE ROLE OF THE CORPORATE SECURITY WITHIN THE NATIONAL SECURITY REPRESENTED THROUGH THE SECURITY OF THE CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURES .....35

MARJAN GJUROVSKI, DR.SC

GJORGJI ALCESKI, DR.SC

#### THE CIVIL SECTOR AS A CONSTITUTIVE ELEMENT OF THE SECURITY SYSTEM OF THE REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA.....46

MARJAN NIKOLOVSKI, DR.SC

#### PARLIAMENTARY CONTROL OVER THE OPERATION OF THE ADMINISTRATION FOR SECURITY AND COUNTERINTELLIGENCE IN THE REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA.....54

ICE ILJEVSKI, DR.SC

ZLATE DIMOVSKI, DR.SC

KIRE BABANOSKI, DR.SC

#### CONTEMPORARY CHALLENGES TO CONFLICT RESOLUTION APPROACH TOWARDS MAINTAINING INTERNATIONAL SECURITY.....61

ANA FRITZHAND, DR.SC

MARJAN GJUROVSKI, DR.SC

#### COORDINATION AND REORGANIZATION OF SECURITY INSTITUTIONS .....71

OLIVER BAKRESKI, DR.SC

TANJA MILOŠEVSKA, DR.SC

LETA BARGIEVA, MA

#### MIGRATION: A SECURITY THREAT OR SECURITISATION PROCESS?.....79

IVICA SIMONOVSKI, DR.SC

ZEYNEP ECE UNSAL, DR.SC

<b>ROLE OF THE OFFICE OF THE HIGH REPRESENTATIVE (OHR) IN THE SECURITY SECTOR REFORMS (SSR) IN BOSNIA FOLLOWING THE DAYTON AGREEMENT – LESSONS LEARNED FROM THE ARMY AND POLICE REFORMS .....</b>	<b>90</b>
NIKOLA AMBARKOV	
<b>CHALLENGE OF THE MULTIPOLAR INTERNATIONAL ORDER FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF DONALD TRAMP.....</b>	<b>103</b>
SASAJKOVSKI SLAVEJKO, DR.SC MICANOVSKA LJUBICA	
<b>BUILDING INTERNATIONAL SECURITY IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE EUROPEAN UNION GLOBAL STRATEGY 2016 .....</b>	<b>111</b>
TATJANA GERGINOVA, DR.SC	
<b>THE ENLARGEMENT OF NATO AND COOPERATION BETWEEN NATO AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONS AND COUNTRIES.....</b>	<b>119</b>
ŽARKO ČULIBRK, DR.SC	
<b>STATUS AND CHALLENGES OF DEFENSE REFORMS IN BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA FOR NATO INTEGRATION .....</b>	<b>129</b>
ANDREJ ILIEV, DR.SC ZLATKO STOJOVSKI, MSc DRAGE PETRESKI, DR.SC	
<b>GPS NAVIGATION, A SEGMENT OF THE NEW DIMENSION OF WARFARE.....</b>	<b>144</b>
TONI MILESKI, DR.SC NIKOLCO SPASOV, DR.SC	
<b>SECURITY SYSTEM REFORMS IN THE WESTERN BALKANS: ENSURING HUMAN DIMENSION OF SECURITY.....</b>	<b>154</b>
ASTRID OROVCANEC, DR.SC	
<b>MODERN CHALLENGES AND THREATS TO THE SECURITY SYSTEM OF THE REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA.....</b>	<b>166</b>
MUHAMET RACAJ, DR.SC SASHO JANEV ZEKIRJA AZIRI	
<b>SECURITY AS PART OF DISASTER MANAGEMENT PLANNING .....</b>	<b>176</b>
MAJA TIMOVSKA, DR.SC METODIJA DOJCINOVSKI, DR.SC MENDE SOLUNCESKI, DR.SC	
<b>MANAGING IRREGULAR MIGRATION AT THE BORDERS OF THE REPUBLIC OF SERBIA: THE CASE STUDY OF THE AIRPORT “NIKOLA TESLA” IN BELGRADE...186</b>	
SLOBODAN ČOPIĆ, DR.SC SANJA ČOPIĆ, DR.SC	
<b>DATA AS THE STARTING POINT OF A SECURITY ASSESSMENT .....</b>	<b>197</b>
ZELJKO NINCIC, DR.SC	



<b>THE CORRELATION BETWEEN EXTERNAL THREAT AND INTERNAL WEAKNESSES - THE BASELINE FOR SECURITY REFORMS .....</b>	<b>207</b>
ADRIJANA KALACHOSKA, MSc MITE KJESAKOSKI	
<b>ROLE OF THE NON-STATE ACTORS IN REDUCING THE THREAT OF NUCLEAR WAR .....</b>	<b>222</b>
GOSPAVA STOJANOVIC, MSc NENAD PUTNIK, DR.SC	
<b>THE CONTEMPORARY TERRORIST THREAT AND THE RESPONSE OF THE SECURITY AND INTELLIGENCE AGENCIES – INTERNAL REFORMS, COORDINATION AND COOPERATION .....</b>	<b>231</b>
VASKO SHUTAROV, DR.SC	
<b>INTELLIGENCE DEPENDENCE ON THE POLITICAL REQUIREMENTS AS AN IMPERATIVE FOR ACHIEVING THE GOALS OF THE STATE (THE ROLE OF THE INTELLIGENCE SERVICE IN THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS) .....</b>	<b>241</b>
LJUPCHO STANKOVSKI	
<b>TYPES AND EXTENT OF DATA SIGNIFICANT TO MONITORING AND ASSESSING SECURITY THREATS TO CERTAIN PERSONS AND FACILITIES.....</b>	<b>249</b>
SLAVIŠA KRSTIĆ, DR.SC DANE SUBOŠIĆ, DR.SC	
<b>PUBLIC POLICY, TERRORIST THREATS AND RANDOM CHECKS.....</b>	<b>256</b>
FERID AZEMI	
<b>THE ROLE OF NGOS EDUCATION SECURITY CENTERS ON THE ROAD TO MEMBERSHIP OF THE EUROPEAN UNION .....</b>	<b>264</b>
ILJA ZIVOTIC	
<b>THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EXTERNAL THREATS AND INTERNAL WEAKNESSES – THE BASIS FOR SECURITY REFORMS .....</b>	<b>272</b>
MR. ORLANDO MARDNER	
<b>HYBRID COALITION AS A NEW FORM OF SECURITY ASSOCIATION.....</b>	<b>283</b>
DUSKO TOMIC, DR.SC ELDAR SALJIC, DR.SC STANKO BULAJIĆ, DR.SC	
<b>THE ROLE OF BORDER CONTROL IN THE SECURITY OF THE STATE BORDER...289</b>	
ŽELJKO Z. SPALEVIĆ, DR.SC ŽAKLINA SPALEVIĆ, DR.SC MILUTIN ATELJEVIĆ, DR.SC	
<b>STRATEGY FOR FIGHT AGAINST DRUG TRAFFICKING AND PROPOSED MEASURES FOR STRATEGIC ACTIONS IN THE AREA OF SECURITY .....</b>	<b>299</b>
LJUPCO TODOROVSKI, DR.SC ICE ILJEVSKI, DR.SC	

**THE REFUGEE CRISES ON THE BALKANS – PARADOXES AND EXPERIENCES OF  
REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA VS. THE CHALLENGES OF NATIONAL STATES.....307**

IVANKA D. VASILEVSKA, DR.SC

IVAN IVANOV, M SCI

**IMPORTANCE OF THE REGIONAL ORGANIZATION IN THE SECURITY OF THE  
STATES AND THE CASE OF TURKEY IN THE INTERWAR PERIOD .....318**

VOLKAN TATAR, DR.SC

INST. SERDA GÜZEL

**ANALYSIS OF THE ACCOUNTABILITY OF THE INTELLIGENCE AGENCIES IN THE  
US WHEN THEY SPY ON US CITIZENS (MECHANISMS, BODIES AND PROCEDURES),  
A MODEL TO BE FOLLOWED BY THE REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA?.....326**

ZORAN TODOROV, MSC

# CONTEMPORARY CHALLENGES TO CONFLICT RESOLUTION APPROACH TOWARDS MAINTAINING INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

*Ana Fritzhand, Dr.Sc*

*Faculty of Philosophy – Skopje, Republic of Masedonia*

*e-mail: anaf@fzf.ukim.edu.mk*

*Marjan Gjurovski, Dr.Sc*

*Faculty of Security - Skopje, Republic of Masedonia*

*e-mail: mar.gjurovski@gmail.com*

## Abstract

The world is rapidly transforming and continuously facing changes in every aspect of people's existence. Each new change, whether local or global, introduces a new challenge to deal with. Unfortunately, some current changes are not positive at all. Such are the threats towards the international security and stability. Therefore, many people would argue that the world we all live in is a dangerous place and they would not be far from the truth. Each day, through the media we witness new conflicts, terrorist attacks, killings, and suffering. We also witness a new security concern for the states in the form of transnational terrorism. Extremist groups can reach every corner of the globe in just a few days. Some of them remain focused on local or national political dynamics, but others seek to affect global change. Another particularly important challenge for the Balkans and Europe in recent years is the migration crisis. Macedonia is one of those countries that was and still is on the main route for migrants from Syria, Pakistan, Afghanistan, etc. This opens new issues towards how we maintain safety and stability, nationally and internationally. More particular, what conflict resolution approaches should be used in dealing with terrorists, for example? Or, what changes should be made in the security system of our country, in order to be tuned in with the Euro-Atlantic standards and thus become more effective and reliable in dealing with the new forms of security challenges the whole Europe is facing? Relevant literature highlights negotiation, mediation, and dialogue as most important conflict resolution strategies. Therefore, in the following pages we will review the possibilities and limitations of the mentioned strategies in dealing with new international security challenges.

**Keywords:** *conflict resolution, international security, negotiation, mediation, dialogue*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

During this last decade intensive and rapid changes related to increased instability and insecurity occurred in many parts of the world. Starting from the Arab Spring which erupted into deadly conflicts in some Arab countries, through militarized clashes in Ukraine, as well as worsened relations between China and Japan, the ongoing crises in North Korea, the ominous consequences from the American withdrawal from Afghanistan and ongoing terrorist attacks in Europe, altogether contributed to the growth

of feelings of unsafety and insecurity among people worldwide. Although some authors would argue that conflicts are universal features of human societies (e.g. Ramsbotham, Woodhouse, Miall, 2016), still today international security is facing serious challenges which lead to the impression that there is no safe country in the world. According to Ramsbotham, Woodhouse, Miall (2016), conflict resolution theory tries to respond to such a challenging context by highlighting the contemporary cosmopolitan conflict resolution approach that focuses on “...adequate hybrid local-global responses to tackle the new reality – the hybrid mix of local, regional and global conflicts...called transnational conflict” (p. 5).

In theory, conflict resolution is usually defined as a complex set of approaches and techniques for resolution of conflicts by a third party. It is tightly related to the process of peacekeeping. A new form of practice of the international conflict resolution, called *interactive problem solving*, is based on social-psychological principles. These principles form a particular framework for analyses of international conflicts in particular, i.e. of international relations in general terms (Kelman, 1997). When it comes to conflict resolution and the study of constructive responses to the problems caused by violent ethnic conflicts, many authors make a distinction between the conflict management and the conflict resolution approaches. Sometimes, these two approaches are defined as incompatible with each other. For example, Cohen and Arnone (1988), distinguish between *conflict management* and *conflict resolution*, by defining the first one as typically short-ranged in which governments must engage and the later as the long-term processes, which must include the involvement of entire societies and the replacement of adversarial relations with cooperative ones.

However, it seems that the assumption of a basic incompatibility between conflict management and conflict resolution is not justified because it is generally unhelpful in promoting conflict resolution. Therefore, some authors (e.g. Ryan, 1990) suggest how the two approaches can be combined, by introducing the concept of peacekeeping, peacemaking, and peacebuilding. According to Ramsbotham, Woodhouse & Miall (2005), appropriate conflict resolution strategies as today's answers to the international terrorism, are one of the most serious tests of the principles and the approaches used in the general philosophy of conflict resolution. Judging from the position of cosmopolitan conflict resolution in 21<sup>st</sup> century, terrorism is defined as a complex, multifaceted global-local phenomenon. These authors state that conflict resolution approaches towards international terrorism should include two things. First, they have to cover all levels (from local to global). Second, they have to obtain appropriate answer based on relevant security strategies in order to rebut terrorism and to be applied in a wider political frame which consists of three strategies: preventive (in order to accept that there is a potential base for bursting deadly conflicts and terrorism), persuasive (in order to persuade relevant political groups) and coordinative (in order to combine all mentioned efforts under the umbrella of contingency and complementarity principles).

## **2. SOCIAL-PSYCHOLOGICAL DIMENSIONS OF INTERNATIONAL CONFLICTS**

There are several propositions about the nature of international conflicts coming from the social-psychological perspective. One proposition is that international conflicts are processes driven from collective needs and fears. The other propositions claimed that these conflicts are intersocietal processes, multifaceted processes of mutual influence, and

interactive processes with an escalatory, self-perpetuating dynamics (Kelman, 1997). In sum, the shared feature of the international conflicts is that they are *processes* which affect international relations. When discussing the first proposition regarding the needs and fears, it should be underlined that unfulfilled basic human needs (such are those for physical safety, food and shelter, health, identity, security, autonomy, sense of justice and many more), are among the most influential causal factors in any kind of conflict (international, inter-ethnic, inter-racial, etc.). This is particularly highlighted in the theory of basic human needs (Staub, 2003). In the situation of direct violence between individuals or nations, the needs for security and identity are becoming most important. When people live in structural violence where the economic needs or the needs for freedom of speech and self-determination are not met, the path to violence is clearly open.

The fear of denial of the basic needs (especially the perceived threat to *identity* and *security*) is closely related to eruption of intergroup conflicts. When protracted conflicts between identity groups are present, those fears could become existential in their nature, thus turning the conflict into a struggle over group survival. As theory and practice show, the causes of conflict usually combine both objective and subjective factors which are interconnected. However, when subjective factors linked to collective basic needs and existential fears take on the lead, they have a significant impact on the escalation and perpetuation of the conflict. The latter is true, because such needs and fears create resistance to change even when all parties in the conflict are well aware that it is in their best interest to end it. Moreover, collective needs and fears are often linked to individual needs and fears, so in the international conflicts they can be relatively easily manipulated by the leaders, causing high levels of rage and violence (Kelman, 1997). Therefore, as Christie puts out (as cited in Murdzeva - Shkaric, 2007), the resolution of a conflicts can be achieved only by satisfying the basic human needs (or at least those for identity, security, well-being, and self-determination), diminishing fear and reaching social justice.

International conflict, as an intersocietal phenomenon, pervades the whole society, both when violence is explicit, or muted. Therefore, when analyzing conflicts, we need to account not only for its strategic, military, and diplomatic dimensions, but also for its economic, psychological, cultural, and social-structural dimensions. All these dimensions interact with each other and define both intrasocietal and intersocietal processes that drive the conflict. Since each party involved in the conflict protects its own positions and interests, the conflict arises when those interests clash. Therefore, the parties engage in mutual influence targeted towards advancing their interests and blocking the opposite ones. However, the conflict is a process in which all parties change over time and react in relation to each other. When the conflict is highly intensive, the interaction is becoming more tensed and violent, by reinforcing and deepening the conflict. Such interaction is driven by certain norms and principles that lead to creation of an escalating, self-perpetuating dynamic (Kelman, 1997).

Since international conflicts are complex processes, approaches that are used for resolving or transcending of these conflicts have to be systematic and holistic. As Galtung explains (as cited in Murdzeva - Shkaric, 2007), a conflict, which can be symmetric or asymmetric, is a triangle consisted of attitude, contradiction, and behavior. These three components are constantly changing and influencing one another, because conflict is a dynamic process. Thus, resolving a conflict must include simultaneous interventions in all three components. This includes de-escalation of the conflict behavior, changing of the attitudes, and transformation of the relationships, personalities and interests of all sides in the conflict. Relating this model to the forms of structural, cultural, and direct violence

brings to the conclusion that changing conflict behavior will end direct violence, removing structural contradictions and injustices will resolve structural violence, while changing attitudes will help ending cultural violence (Ramsbotham, Woodhouse, Miall, 2016). Main tools for conceiving of these outcomes are the dialogue, negotiation, and mediation.

### **3. TRANSNATIONAL TERRORISM AS A MOST SERIOUS THREAT TO INTERNATIONAL SECURITY**

Today's terrorism is transnational in cause, operation, and effect. Its essential features ensure its importance within international relations because it represents a whole new security concern for the states: the risk of attack does not just come from other states (war) but from mobile criminal groups that move between nations and are dispersed globally (transnational terrorism). According to the Global Terrorism Index (2016), the dynamics of global terrorism is rapidly changing and those fluctuations are very complex. The modern terrorist activity has a fluid nature which can be recognized in the continued intensification of terrorism in some countries. Referring to data reported in GTI 2016, there is strong evidence that terrorism is a highly concentrated form of violence. It is mostly committed in certain countries by a small number of groups. Among the analyzed countries, there are five which are suffering the highest impact from terrorism. Those are: Iraq, Afghanistan, Nigeria, Pakistan, and Syria, accounted for 72% of all deaths from terrorism in 2015. The same Report highlights that ISIL, Boko Haram, the Taliban, and al-Qa'ida were responsible for 74% of all those deaths.

Transnational terrorism has diverted the attention of global institutions from supporting basic developmental issues. Economic and social issues have been combined with the counter-terrorist activities. The consequences of terrorism operating transnationally are that states have been presented with a number of decision points about when and how to intervene. The first set of decisions governments must make, is where to intervene. Western nations have been tempted to intervene internationally in order to prevent the emergence of terrorist groups or minimize the efficacy. Relevant evidence indicates that the most common actions as a response to terrorism are the military ones. It also reveals that those types of actions are not effective enough to resolve terroristic behaviors. By contrast, many times they end up with negative contra-effects by provoking even more destructive and violent actions from terrorists. One probable reason for this is the nature of terrorism itself since it represents a mosaic of different types of behaviors (Kendall Hope, 2014). Therefore, if counter-terrorist strategy is to be effective with long-term benefits for all parties, the conflict resolution approaches aimed towards resolving complex terroristic behavior should be considered as well. By acting simultaneously on different levels and domains, it is essential for regions and countries that face a long history of deadly conflicts.

Although there is a large body of research on terrorism, studies about the role of conflict resolution approaches towards countering terrorism are still scarce. There are various reasons. Namely, there is an intensive debate whether such approaches should be considered at all in dealing with terrorists. Often, many believe that this is not the right way to fight terrorism since negotiating with terrorists is a sign of weakness. Furthermore, it will strengthen their positions and it will only provide false legitimacy to their actions. Nevertheless, experienced negotiators provide evidence against such notions, explaining it is usually the case when the situation is evaluated incorrectly and / or the negotiation process is conducted unprofessionally. According to Weiss (2003), in crisis or during

conflicts more communication is essential to resolve these conditions successfully. Conducting proper negotiation means being focused on reaching the best possible solution to the conflict, without undermining one's own positions. Furthermore, it is considered that the scope of terroristic actions is too wide; identifying and reaching leaders within radical groups has been determined impossible to negotiate with.

When considering appropriate conflict resolution approaches towards countering terrorism, the psychology of individuals who become involved in terrorism needs to be taken into account as well. Relevant literature indicates that there is a longstanding interest among behavioral scientists to describe and explain what is mutual to all those individuals and their behavior (Borum, 2011). According to Victoroff (2005), there is a significant body of evidence which suggests that the genesis of the terrorist mindset is contributed by modifiable social and psychological factors. Understanding the causes, motivations, and determinants of terrorist behavior poses an enormous challenge, but it is also an inextricable part of every counter-terrorism strategy. Thus, pursuing this knowledge is vital to countering violent extremism's threat to global security.

Transnational terrorism is a complex international issue which needs to be addressed by fully understanding of the nature and scope of the need of the global world to counter terrorism. Different professional and social groups have a definite role to play in the counter international terrorism. Diplomacy also plays a crucial role in developing this international approach. In order to implement the policies against terrorism, the state needs well-articulated mechanisms and procedures. International security across borders of countries needs to be upgraded so as to promote international security and reduce movement of terrorists across counties thus reducing the impact of terrorism worldwide.

However, if a counter-terrorist strategy is to be effective and with long-term benefits, more should be added into it. Specifically, conflict resolution approaches aimed towards resolving complex and fluid terroristic behavior have to be considered as part of wider intervention. However, not all authors agree on the later. A key objection raised by those who are against engaging in negotiations with terrorists is that it legitimizes terrorist groups, their goals, and their means. A dialogue with them would serve only to incite more violence and weaken the democracy. Furthermore, it is that the complex transnational structure of some terrorist organizations brings confusions and suspicion about who the officials should start a negotiation with. Faced with a multifaceted, horizontal organization such as a terrorist, the dilemma is how officials should engage in the negotiation process. Nevertheless, the truth is that conflict resolution approaches can lead to a better understanding and peace, even with terrorists. It is viewed as an alternative approach to the question of legitimacy and complexity in engaging with terrorism. Drawing from research in peace and conflict studies, it becomes obvious that there are strategies which may, in fact, be conducive to a nonviolent resolution of conflicts, involving terrorist violence. In that sense, legitimation of terrorist groups through talks can transform a conflict away from violence and complexity and it may open up new possibilities for engagement (Toros, 2008).

#### 4. COSMOPOLITAN CONFLICT RESOLUTION: A NEW WAY OF ADDRESSING TRANSNATIONAL TERRORISM

The effects of globalization in the 21<sup>st</sup> century forced societies to open their borders, accept new ideas and new ways of communication, different cultural values, belief systems and ways of living, etc. However, this also resulted in local conflicts to be manifested globally and vice-versa, so their effects are felt much further away than the place they in which originally appear. Therefore, conflicts are not only experienced on an intrastate or interstate level, but also globally, which makes them transnational. According to Ramsbotham, Woodhouse, and Miall (2016), transnational conflict is a hybrid mixture of local, regional, and global conflicts. This requires new doctrines of intervention, but also a new understanding of peace and security. Here, cosmopolitan conflict resolution probably has most to offer.

Cosmopolitan conflict resolution is both reactive and proactive. Its activity is viewed in promotion of the global agenda based on certain values, as well as in its overarching strategy to stimulate further transformation. Authors use this term to highlight the need for an approach that promotes constructive ways of dealing with conflicts on all levels (from local to global), all in the best interest of humanity. In its essence, cosmopolitan conflict transformation is devoted to prevention, alleviation, and termination of the damaging aspects of transnational conflict thus protecting those who suffer the most from such a conflict (Ramsbotham, Woodhouse, & Miall, 2016). As it was mentioned at the beginning of this paper, the most serious threat to the international security today is transnational terrorism. Therefore, the question of whether the cosmopolitan conflict resolution approach could provide a new and more effective strategy for dealing with terrorism occurs naturally. Some people doubt this, saying that conflict resolution has nothing to offer in the area of deadly security threats from fanatical ideologies. Thankfully, this is far from the truth.

In terms of addressing terrorism, the cosmopolitan conflict resolution approach gives a framework consisted of four dimensions: *prevention*, *persuasion*, *denial*, and *coordination*. *Prevention* implies to reduce proneness to terrorism which is in the core of a conflict resolution antiterrorism strategy. This further means to address what drives international terrorism globally, and what the regional systems and the issue of state legitimacy and capacity are. *Persuasion*, as the second dimension, provides three main elements of its strategy: to challenge ideologies of terror; to persuade conflict parties to use non-terrorist means; and to reduce the appeal of terrorism within wider actual or potential support constituencies (Ramsbotham, Woodhouse, & Miall, 2016; p.340). The third dimension – *denial* – is focused on reducing vulnerability and defeating hardliners. *Promotion of international cooperation and legitimacy* is the last, fourth dimension in the suggested framework. It includes coordination of regional and local incentives in widest coalition of possible international actors. Application of the principles of contingency, complementarity and comparative advantage is also part of this dimension. In the same time, it is very important to ensure that terrorist action is sanctioned internationally and that it complies with the international law.

A review of the relevant literature reveals five generations of conflict resolution approaches. Cosmopolitan conflict resolution is listed in the latest generation that emerged in 2005. It is focused on developing new tools and approaches appropriate for the rapidly changing world and the impact of global information communications technology. The frequent use of the internet by many different parties opens global space for achieving



negative goals (such as organizing a terrorist attack or spreading hatred and fear) but also for achieving positive goals (such as the interventions targeted towards prevention of conflicts, education of young generations, and increasing awareness of the importance of a dialogue and the implementation of non-violent problem-solving strategies). There is also a focus on human solidarity in this fifth generation as well as the efforts to ensure that conflict resolution is going to be truly international. The latter implies that the central goal of “transforming potential violence into non-violent change” (Ramsbotham, Woodhouse, & Miall, 2016; p. 503) has to be shared cross-culturally in order to be cosmopolitan. Finally, the awareness of shared *humanity* that lies in the essence of cosmopolitan conflict resolution needs to be recognized and ultimately respected, because it is the deepest identity of all – individuals, ethnic groups, nations, states, religions, and cultures – and the core characteristic that defines the human species.

## 5. STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF THE CONFLICT RESOLUTION APPROACH TOWARDS INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

It was already mentioned at the beginning that terrorism is probably the most serious threat to the international security these days. Regarding the possibility of applying negotiation, mediation, and dialogue in countering terrorism, some authors believe that it will be just a waste of energy, since it will be a reward for them, and not punishment for their behavior. However, the conflict resolution approach offers an innovative path toward understanding terrorism by engaging with terrorism as a form of violence that is part of a broader conflict. Terrorism thus becomes a strategy used in conflicts by actors who believe it is the best strategy to adopt at a given time. Thus, from a conflict resolution perspective, terrorism cannot be understood outside of the conflict of which it is part and can only be analyzed by scholars and engaged with by policymakers within this broader context (Toros, 2016).

Nevertheless, the conflict resolution approach is not omnipotent, so one has to know its full potentials and limits before applying any conflict resolution approach or strategy. Analysis of potentials and limits of conflict resolution strategies towards international terrorism presented in the relevant literature highlights several main conclusions. For example, in some cases, negotiation, mediation, and dialogue with terrorists are viewed as a weakness and many prefer to use military approaches. Some terrorist groups are structured in such a way that makes the negotiators or mediators to contact with them physically and transmit messages to them. The lack of open channels for communication increases isolation and mistrust and often makes the conflict resolution approach appear unsuccessful. Rigidity and stubborn mentality of religious extremists often makes it difficult for policymakers to resolve the conflicts with them peacefully and hence, they are compelled to use coercive counterterrorism measures (Amin, 2017). Regarding *conflict prevention*, Toros (2016) points out that one must not overestimate the potential for this approach in conflicts marked by terrorist violence, which may be particularly resistant to conflict prevention. In some cases, maintaining the group intact can become the ultimate goal of the group (Crenshaw, 2005, Weinberg and Davis, 1989, Wilkinson, 2001; as cited in Toros, 2016). Still, the analysis also provides theoretical arguments and empirical evidence that conflict prevention can have an impact on the rationale for groups engaging in violence, on their relationship with their constituency, and on halting a potential escalation of violence. It also highlights the important link between

conflict prevention and counterterrorism and how the latter has to be thought of as part of a broader response that understands terrorism as part of a broader conflict.

*Peacemaking* also has its potential and limits when applied to conflicts marked by terrorist violence. It is well known that violence can have a profound impact on negotiations. Armed groups have in the past miscalculated their capacity to impact on negotiations by pursuing strategies of violence to increase their leverage (for example, IRA). There is usually an inherent asymmetry in conflicts marked by terrorist violence, which makes it difficult for the state leaders and officials to accept that they are unable to defeat a small group of what they often consider to be criminals and terrorists. Another challenge for peacemaking is that in the contexts of terrorist violence lies the potential need for secrecy at the start of the negotiation process. As practice shows, many cases of negotiations between states and non-state armed groups began in secret. *Negotiations*, as one aspect of peacemaking, could often fail, as was the case in many conflicts involving terrorist violence such as the conflict opposing the Colombian government and the FARC or in the Basque conflict. However, understanding terrorism as a strategy used within a broader conflict opens the question of whether ending terrorism necessarily means a resolution of the conflict (Toros, 2016).

The *dialogue*, as another aspect of peacemaking, also differs in its role according to the type of the conflict, its duration and outcome. Although dialogue can be very effective in resolving conflicts nonviolently, it is also true that in some cases sustained effects other than precondition for the application of other policy tools are not registered. Hence, the dialogue is important as a diplomatic tool, but the necessary conditions for an integrative approach to succeed are seldom present in deep-rooted conflicts such is the one in Ukraine, or as were those in Georgia, Libya and Iran, for example (Rieker & Thune, 2017). The achieved stability could also easily be undermined, so there is a need of a long-term and systematic approach to conflict resolution in these cases. On the other side, a less formal dialogue process undertaken by non-diplomats (like in Afghanistan, or Sudan) was justified despite the massive costs of the war and the fairly modest achievements. According to Rieker and Thune (2017), some analyses of dialogue potentials and limits indicate that behavior and positions tend to change as a result of changing international and domestic circumstances and not exclusively because of the dialogue. It is also shown that diplomatic dialogues does not necessarily transform values and identities of the actors which is especially obvious in deep-rooted conflicts, but could affect both the timing of events and the nature of the measures that are adopted. Furthermore, if enforcement mechanisms are lacking, any negotiated agreement could be fragile. This applies also on the agreements based on the dialogue. The character of the dialogue differs depending on whether the negotiation is facilitated by a neutral third party or not. It also depends on the level of secrecy and confidentiality. Practicing the top-down approach usually makes a genuine dialogue more difficult to be established. Finally, practice shows that dialogue is more effective in preventing conflicts than in resolving them.

As Toros (2016) points out, *peacebuilding* usually undertakes disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration of armed combatants as one of its first policies. Yet, the actors involved in terrorist violence are not reintegrated into the society, because the focus of this policy is placed more on disengagement from terrorism. This has potentially dangerous repercussions for the resolution of the conflict and the overall levels of violence in post-agreement societies. Also, the asymmetrical power relations in the conflict may lead to the conclusion that compromise is not necessary to end the conflict with terrorists. Nevertheless, it is precisely the asymmetrical nature of conflicts marked by terrorist

violence which may make peacebuilding and reconciliation in particular more difficult. One of the biggest concern related to peacebuilding as carried out by international organizations is that a one-size-fits-all model is imposed on regions throughout the world with little concern for local specificities or for the social costs of widespread reforms. Peacebuilding can therefore be a source of renewed conflict if it follows a top-down model. Thus, conflicts marked by terrorist violence must be understood as conflicts when peacebuilding is undertaken but states and other actors have to account for the extreme asymmetrical nature of the conflict and its impact on peacebuilding strategies (Toros, 2016, p. 15).

## 6. CONCLUSION

As announced at the beginning, the present paper is focused on a brief analysis of the contemporary challenges of the conflict resolution approach, i.e. its strengths and weaknesses in maintaining international security. International conflicts as an intersocietal phenomenon pervade the whole society, both when violence is explicit, or muted. Thus, conflict resolution approaches can lead to a better understanding and peace. The latter is true even when dealing with terrorism. Although many would say that negotiations legitimize terrorist groups, their goals, and their means and serve only to incite more violence and weaken the democracy, conflict resolution approaches offer an innovative path toward understanding terrorism by engaging with terrorism as a form of violence that is part of a broader conflict. Terrorism thus becomes a strategy used in conflicts by actors who believe it is the best strategy to adopt at a given time. In this sense, several effective political strategies are possible. One of them is inclusiveness of people and issues. This strategy is important because it has the potential to reduce the frustration from unmet basic human needs which is a high motivator for people to support terrorists and terrorism and / or to resort to violence.

Persuasion aimed towards reducing the motivation of the conflicting parties to resort to violence and minimizing support for terrorists should also be applied as a potential strategy. This process includes challenging ideologies of terrorism, persuading the conflict parties to use non-violent and non-coercive tactics and reducing the existence of terrorism. Demonstrating greater humanity and efficacy of non-terrorist alternatives and persuading the parties that non-violent measures can best meet their strategic goals can go a long way in dealing effectively with terrorists and their support groups. Reducing vulnerability and defeating hardliners can as well be used to respond to terrorism. Coordination and maximization of the international efforts is also required to respond effectively to terrorism. Here, diplomacy also plays a crucial role in developing this international approach. Last, but not least, the nature of terrorism itself needs to be accounted for, since it represents a mosaic of different types of behaviors. Thus, knowing the psychology of terrorism and of terrorists is another very important part of every effective counter-terrorist strategy.

Finally, in order to make structural changes it is necessary to transform the conflict into another reality, i.e. to transcend. Transformation introduces systemic changes and it is a process which leads to greater equity and equality in the social system as a whole. When transforming deep rooted conflicts, it is necessary to apply the strategy “operate locally, think globally” by working on local solutions that will make a change in the global social structure as well. Here, the psychological plan requires dealing with hatred and traumas in order to move from a vengeance culture - an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth – towards a

culture of reconciliation. In this sense, building a culture of peace is the model for transforming social structures into peaceful places in the world.

### **BIBLIOGRAPHY:**

- Amin, S.J. (2017). Adopting a Conflict Resolution Perspective towards Terrorism – Possibilities and Limitations. *International Journal for Excogitation Education and Research*, Vol. 1, No.2, p. 48 - 54
- Borum, R. (2011). Understanding Terrorist Psychology. In: Silke, A. (Ed.). *The Psychology of Counter-terrorism*. p. 19 - 33. UK: Routledge.
- Cohen, S.P. & Arnone, H.C. (1988). Conflict Resolution as the Alternative to Terrorism. *Journal of Social Issues*, 44(2), p. 175 – 189
- Global Terrorism Index. (2016). *Measuring and Understanding the Impact of Terrorism*. Institute for Economics and Peace
- Kelman, H.C. (1997). Social-Psychological Dimensions of International Conflict. In: Zartman, W.I. & Rasmussen, L.J. (Eds.). *Peacemaking in International Conflict. Methods and Techniques*, p. 191 - 238 United States Institute of Peace Press, Washington D.C
- Kendall Hope, M. (2014). *Transcending the Cycles of Violence*. Pax Pugna Publ. North Carolina
- Murdzeva - Shkaric, O. (2007). *Nonviolent transformation of conflicts*. Skopje: Faculty of Philosophy
- Ramsbotham, O., Woodhouse, T., & Miall, H. (2016). *Contemporary Conflict Resolution: The Prevention, Management and Transformation of Deadly Conflicts*. Polity Press
- Rieker, P. & Thune, H. (2017). *Dialogue and Conflict Resolution. Potential and Limits*. Routledge, NY
- Ryan, S. (1990). Conflict management and conflict resolution. *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 2(1), p. 54 - 71. Published online: 21 Dec 2007
- Staub, E. (2003). *The Psychology of Good and Evil. Why Children, Adults and Groups Help and Harm Others*. Cambridge University Press
- Toros, H. (2008). 'We Don't Negotiate with Terrorists!' Legitimacy and Complexity in Terrorist Conflicts. *Security Dialogue*, 39(4), p. 407 - 426
- Toros, H. (2016). *Terrorism, Counterterrorism, and Conflict Resolution: Building Bridges*. Center for Excellence Defense Against Terrorism. NATO
- Victoroff, J. (2005). The Mind of the Terrorist: A Review and Critique of Psychological Approaches. *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 49(1), p. 3 - 42
- Weiss, J. (February, 2003). "Why Has Negotiation Gotten a Bad Name?" retrieved from <http://www.mediate.com/articles/weissj.cfm>