

INTRODUCTION BY THE EDITOR

Introduction A longing for peace can be observed on almost every occasion. Numerous international organisations, states and individuals invest great efforts in the peaceful settlement of disputes, but wars and the accompanying misfortunes nonetheless remain a part of human experience. Unfortunately, society will most likely not be able to settle disputes without combat and war for some time, and so this longing often remains unresolved.

Nevertheless, we should strive for peace, every day and everywhere. Individuals can do a great deal, but the most realistic and substantive efforts are connected with the international community and various organisations with legal remedies at their disposal. The most important among the latter are undoubtedly the UN, which is formally and legally responsible with regard to the UN Charter, and numerous regional organisations such as NATO, the EU, the OSCE and the African Union. These are the very organisations that carry out legal decisions – resolutions concerning individual regions. However, we must not forget that the efforts of individual organisations are actually the efforts of the Member States. Without them, more precisely without their resources, the various missions would not be possible. Even though this is not obligatory cooperation, nor a necessary readiness of all states, the expectations concerning some of them are different. They are, above all, associated with the availability of resources of individual states as well as with the perception of responsibility and commitment of each state to maintain international peace and security.

In the attainment of its independence and throughout its history, the Republic of Slovenia was very sensitive to different forms of violence. Due to traumatic experiences in the country's recent history, Slovenia understood what civil wars leave behind them. Ever since joining the UN in 1992, Slovenia has dramatically responded to conflicts and engagements which flared up after the end of the Cold War. Severe engagements in the neighbouring Croatia and later in Bosnia and Herzegovina presented

an additional security challenge and threat to the young state. Because the Republic of Slovenia was in the process of establishing a modern defence system, reforming its defence capabilities and forming the Slovenian Armed Forces, its endeavours for peace were limited to diplomatic activities. In 1997, an important step was taken. The first 21 members of the Slovenian Armed Forces were sent to the peace support operation SUNRISE, where they provided medical support in the ROLE 1 medical unit for the international forces in Albania. From that time on, the Slovenian flag has flown beside those of numerous other armies. The number of members deployed on various missions has grown continuously, and since the number of successful missions has multiplied, we can conclude that the Slovenian Armed Forces have gained a great deal of experience, which they then transferred to their own training and educational system, thus enabling quality growth in the field of participation in peacekeeping operations. While unfortunately not much is known about the latter, there seems to be no end to the praises of foreign commanders and members of foreign armies.

With regard to the path that Slovenian peacekeepers walked, we have, in the creation of this thematic issue of the Slovenian Armed Forces *Bulletin*, primarily focused on reference points for the development of a comprehensive strategy of Slovenia's participation in international operations and missions, and providing an in-depth and reasoned explanation for Slovenia's involvement in international organisations.

We will start with the article written by **Ljubica Jelušič, PhD**, Minister of Defence and arguably the most recognised expert in Slovenia in the field of research devoted to international operations. Her article should, therefore, be considered from two perspectives: (1) from a distinctively theoretical viewpoint, on the basis of which she analyses the terminology of international operations in the Slovenian environment and in a distinctively practical sense in which she intervenes in the field of operational strategy of the Slovenian defence system, and (2) from an empirical perspective, as she discusses the formation of the strategy of Slovenia's participation in international missions and operations. In the first part, she presents a new phrase which comprises all international community activities in providing peace and security – international missions and operations (MOM). We thus witness the birth of a term that will not be preceded by the abbreviation of any of the organisations most frequently involved – UN, NATO or EU, which is probably necessary in making decisions regarding Slovenia's active involvement in peacekeeping in the region and in the world. Besides terminology, the author also presents her view on Slovenia's strategy for participation in international operations and missions. With a comprehensive and thorough analysis of previously adopted and applicable fundamental documents used in making such decisions, she establishes the lack of comprehensive and, in particular, harmonised planning in relation to the questions of Slovenia's participation in international operations and missions. The author's cross-analysis offers several important and utterly realistic proposals, in addition to which the analysis indicates the steps to be taken towards the formation and adoption of a strategy of participation in international operations and missions. The first step has already been taken – a comprehensive discussion in which the opinions of theoreticians, practitioners

and politicians are confronted. Her article points to the future dynamics and guidelines for the aforementioned strategy.

Klemen Grošelj, PhD, has upgraded basic theoretical premises with an overview of the transformation of contemporary peacekeeping operations. In his article, the author distinguishes between the terms “evolutionality” and “transformativity” of peacekeeping operations in both content and meaning. While it can be established that the first defines the expected development in which the future of peacekeeping operations can be predicted with great certainty, the second term draws attention to the structural changes of operations, whose roots reach back to their conceptual changes. Out of a once “interest-and-value-neutral” activity they have transformed into a largely “interest-and-value-driven” activity in the international community. As a consequence, a mass of operation typologies appeared which are proper to either the individual actors in the international community or to the professional and theoretical presumptions of individual experts. Nonetheless, the actual reason for their appearance must be sought primarily in the political and operational question of what peacekeeping operations are to become. The element of interest they introduce into the structure of individual countries and groups of countries is becoming their increasingly recognisable feature. The author therefore rightfully addresses the obvious abuse of the term “peacekeeping operation” in attempting to legitimise or establish the legality of today’s numerous military interventions. We must keep in mind that all interventions are not peacekeeping operations; however, all peacekeeping operations are interventions.

In contrast to the previous article, **Erwin Schmidl, PhD**, has concentrated on a more evolutionary view of the development of peacekeeping operations. In his article, he reaches back to the end of the 19th century to present and critically evaluate the contemporary typologies of peacekeeping operations while also introducing certain peacekeeping operations into these typologies. In his contribution, he remains faithful to the fact that in defining and categorising peacekeeping operations one must proceed from the fundamentals of the UN, taking them as the foundation of the legality and legitimacy of such endeavours of the international community and individual states. This broad overview, which concludes with the clear – and today, perhaps, indispensable – participation of regional organisations, among which are both NATO and the EU, in the implementation of UN peacekeeping efforts, does not yet represent a definitive categorisation of peacekeeping operations. Peacekeeping operations have been and will most likely remain the most important foreign policy tool and at the same time the most effective tool in international crisis management, for which reason each peacekeeping operation should be evaluated according to its current position in international relations, while its effectiveness should be understood through the provisions of the mandate and not through the expectations of either warring factions or the civil population.

Milan Jazbec, PhD, has focused on a discussion of the development of foreign policy within the framework of understanding international operations and missions,

to which he applies empirical findings from Slovenian practice. Despite the defence and military element of contemporary international operations and missions, which is becoming more accentuated, the latter remain an element and a lever of an individual's state foreign policy, where a great many other national systems are also present. Moreover, if it is possible to relatively easily determine institutionalised national systems on the basis of legal documents, it is likewise possible to identify non-institutionalised participating national systems, such as nongovernmental organisations, humanitarian organisations, the economic sector and highly specialised individuals and associations that help individuals and groups with a narrow spectrum of problems in the process of post-conflict reconstruction. What is Slovenia's position on this issue? The author emphasises several facts on the basis of which numerous opportunities for further and perhaps more in-depth cooperation of Slovenia's foreign policy in planning international operations and missions can be found. Here, it is not appropriate to search for comparable solutions and models, for the differences between nations are too great. We would have to introduce a completely unique model for the resolution of this issue and, above all, set ourselves ambitious, yet realistic goals for the future.

Despite the praise of the international community and individual states and their representatives participating in international missions with members of the Slovenian Armed Forces and other personnel, the achievements of Slovenian men and women should not be limited only to the existence of an independent Republic of Slovenia. Together with our colleagues, military historians from the Austrian military academy (Landesverteidigungsakademie) in Vienna, we have looked back into the past and seen that the commitment of Slovenian soldiers to peace and peacekeeping tasks already existed in early 1897, when the Austro-Hungarian monarchy committed to actively maintaining the truce between the Greeks and the Turks on the island of Crete. Even though the Austro-Hungarian Empire had a comprehensive military apparatus at the time, it was the 2nd Battalion of the 87th Infantry Regiment from Celje, which was considered Slovenian since the majority of the soldiers in the Battalion were Slovenes, that was chosen for the peacekeeping task on Crete. More than the choice itself, it is the reason for the choice that is interesting – the Austro-Hungarian military elite trusted this unit because of its excellence, flexibility and versatile model behaviour. The choice turned out to be a good one. And so Slovenian soldiers became a part of the international community in resolving military conflicts. Thus it is entirely understandable that this first updated issue of the Slovenian Armed Forces *Bulletin* is dedicated to the achievements of Slovenian men and women in their endeavours for peace, which are well grounded in history.

The collection of articles in the second part of the *Bulletin* highlights the already mentioned mission of the 2nd Battalion of the 87th Infantry Regiment from Celje. The aim of presenting their achievements as authentically and credibly as possible led to the cooperation of historians from Austria, Greece and Slovenia. The respected Greek military historian, **Efpraxia Paschalidou, PhD**, highlighted the Candian War,

the role of Greece and Turkey, and the reasons which led to violence on Crete. The topic is treated from the Greek point of view, presenting the Greek understanding of the conflict on the island, so it must be understood in the context of the cohesion of the Greek community in continental Greece and the Greek ethnic community on Crete, or better in the pressure exerted by the Cretans on the Greek government and the king when organising help. It is interesting that the author stresses the religious ties that united both communities much more than their ethnic or cultural resemblance. In fact, it was religion which enabled a clear demarcation and distinction of the two communities.

Irmgard Pangerl, MSc, focused particularly on the role of the Austro-Hungarian naval forces in the establishment of the naval blockade. The conflict on the island had to be isolated. Both countries, Greece and Turkey, strongly supported the two ethnic groups on Crete with weapons, ammunition, soldiers or volunteers, and food. Fifteen Austro-Hungarian military ships of various sizes and classes contributed to the naval capabilities of the great European powers – Germany, Russia, Great Britain, Italy and France – with the Austro-Hungarian capabilities being focused on monitoring the northern part of the island. The area of responsibility included approximately 100 kilometres of the coast. The task of the coalition forces was to monitor ship movements and capture all unauthorised military materiel. The success of the blockade was manifested in significantly reduced smuggling. For this reason, the Austro-Hungarian authorities decided to withdraw their fleet at the end of October 1897, while France, Great Britain, Italy and Russia remained present. The process of dismantling the naval blockade of the island did not end until December 1898. Independent administration of the island was provided for, led by Greek Crown Prince George. At the time of his resignation in 1905, the idea of uniting Crete with Greece emerged once again. By signing the London Agreement on 30 May 1913, Crete was formally united with Greece. However, the issue of the remaining Turkish population on the island remained unresolved.

Vladimir Prebilič, PhD, has endeavoured to reconstruct the events before, during and after the mission in Crete with the help of newspaper sources. By using secondary sources of Austrian historians, he was also able to complete the process of objectivity of media reporting at that time in relation to the events linked to the 2nd Battalion of the 87th Infantry Regiment from Celje. The decision on participation of the Austro-Hungarian land forces was reached by the military leaders and confirmed by the emperor himself. Like today, the decision to intervene under extremely unstable conditions and risk the lives of soldiers was extremely difficult. It was particularly important to choose an appropriate unit for the otherwise non-military activity of confronting the warring factions and cooperating closely with the coalition partners. Special attention was paid to the commander, Colonel Anton Guzek. The inhabitants of the island confirmed the excellent work of the soldiers and their consistency, impartiality and respect for the local population, paying them special compliments. Worth mentioning is the commitment of the soldiers to perform various humanitarian tasks. Although such tasks would be defined differently today, we can say that the

Slovenes who at that time operated in the structures of the Austro-Hungarian Armed Forces took on their otherwise non-military and therefore special role in a very professional way, and did this with no additional training.

If we consider the substantial number of activities of Slovenian men and women for the advancement of peace in different regions and the world, we can confidently point to their all-round success. However, to be more specific, I will make use of several findings offered by the authors of the articles in the second part of the *Bulletin of the Slovenian Armed Forces*. Since the Republic of Austria is among the most experienced countries in the field of cooperating in peacekeeping operations, **Erwin Schmidl, PhD**, illuminates the experience of the Austrian Armed Forces in his article. Austria, with its posture of armed neutrality, participated in numerous peacekeeping operations. The author presents the rich Austrian experience that the country began gaining through the cooperation of the Austrian Armed Forces in the peacekeeping operation in Congo in 1960. In accordance with the principle of rotation, only 50 members participated in the mission until 1963. Although the Austrian unit experienced considerable difficulties (immediately after their arrival the members were kidnapped by insurgents), towards the end of the UN mission in Congo Austria decided that same year to cooperate in the peacekeeping mission in Cyprus. This mission was followed by Austrian cooperation in the UNTSO operation in 1967. The appointment of Kurt Waldheim as UN Secretary-General in 1972 further increased the cooperation and presence of Austria. After the Yom Kippur War, a battalion of the Austrian Armed Forces participated in the UNEF II operation in 1972 with its own area of responsibility. The Austrian soldiers were also part of the UNDOF peacekeeping operation in the Golan Heights. The first victims appeared among the Austrian peacemakers; however, this did not bring considerable changes to the countries' endeavours for peace. Approximately 1000 soldiers participated in UN peacekeeping operations each year, two thirds being members of reserve components. The cooperation of Austria in the Western Balkans is particularly important because the Austrian Armed Forces were an integral part of all operations in the former Yugoslavia. This, however, led to a constant increase in the number of deployed soldiers. Cooperation in international peacekeeping operations became an inevitable and distinctive part of Austrian foreign policy.

Major General Alojz Šteiner and **Brigadier Alan Geder** present the transformational shift of international military operations and missions (MVOM) to the level of the Republic of Slovenia, with special emphasis on the cooperation of the Slovenian Armed Forces. In considering Slovenia's involvement, the authors point especially to the entry of the Republic of Slovenia into NATO and the EU. In the authors' opinion, this fact is the milestone which directly led to the increase in military contributions after 2005, when the number of participants increased by 40 percent in comparison to 2004. As a result, the expectations of the international community and individual Member States increased as well. Moreover, task performance has also undergone significant changes. Tasks are becoming increasingly more demanding, both in the operational sense and in the level of risk. According to the authors,

lessons learned from the cooperation of the Slovenian Armed Forces in international missions can be divided into three periods: the first, from 1997 to 2002, characterised by the inclusion of small and simple modules, to the platoon level; the second, from 2002 to 2006, characterised by a gradual and persistent increase in the number of Slovenian men and women participating in missions and by evident quality improvement; and the third period, from 2006 onwards, characterised by integration into the challenges of comprehensive conduct of operations and into multinational structures at the battalion group level. One such case is cooperation with a battle group in Kosovo in 2007, where the battle group Sokol assumed its area of responsibility and directly entered the chain of command and control of the KFOR mission. This classification raises the issue of dispersion or concentration of the national contribution and sustainability of the cooperating forces. Such indicators are made quite relative by the fact that an average of 66 percent of the national contribution in international military operations was deployed in the Western Balkans. We can therefore claim that despite the absence of a strategic document to clearly define the national priorities, the Slovenian MoD already has existing guidelines for cooperation in international military operations and missions.

Janja Vuga and **Lieutenant Colonel Bojan Gregorič** focused their research and analytical work on the question of civil-military cooperation in peacekeeping operations and missions. For a clear presentation of this complex cooperation, the authors used a study on the 15th and 16th Slovenian contingents in Kosovo. They point to the particularities of the Slovenian model of conducting CIMIC activities, which particularly exposes the civilian functional experts. The authors also refer to NATO doctrines and policies, which also represent the fundamental basis in Slovenia. The so-called “pilot project” of performing CIMIC activities in cooperation with civilian functional experts revealed certain deficiencies relating to financing, organisation, preparation prior to departure, subordination and work clothing. The initial problems can be understood and accepted, although it would be worth considering certain proposals for improvement offered by the authors, who consider preparation prior to departure for a mission particularly important in order to clearly define the relations in the CIMIC group and the wider context – in the contingents of the Slovenian Armed Forces in missions. By the inclusion of civilian functional experts we witness the contact of two very different concepts of operation: civil and military. This is a special case of cooperation, requiring increased flexibility of both the soldiers and the civilian functional experts. Only mutual understanding, respect and cooperation will ensure the achievement of mission objectives. Should this not be the case, the result will be just the contrary, having no added value.

We have many challenges ahead of us in the area of international military operations and missions. Numerous lessons learned have to be better incorporated into the everyday operation of the entire national defence system and many more could be presented to the partners. There can never be too much cooperation in the areas of education and training. We also have to consider Slovenia’s priorities in the integration of sources in crisis areas. It is not so much about the perhaps too rash or even

uncontrolled decision-making regarding cooperation in current and future international operations and missions, but about being prepared to assume more responsible command tasks in missions on the basis of experience, which, however, is only possible through the cooperation of larger contingents of the Slovenian Armed Forces. Assuming such responsibility will enable the future growth of Slovenian peacekeeping endeavours and upgrading of the lessons already learned. Even closer cooperation among the ministries will be required to achieve synergy in the formation, management and conduct of crisis response operations. In this case it will be possible to achieve more with fewer resources. If we also manage to put into effect many other advantages that we possess as a country and as individual members of the national defence system, such as knowledge of the language, tradition, culture and religion, as well as the respect we enjoy in the region, this will be added value for all. The international community will be able to achieve the objectives defined by mandates, reconciliation of warring factions in the region, stable economic development and in particular long-term peace. This is undoubtedly what everyone desires. However, as expressed in the dedication, it is necessary to work hard in order to achieve such results. There are no shortcuts or easier and faster ways, because peace cannot be bought, enforced or imported. There is also no general rule as to how to achieve peace, since every conflict is special and must be treated as such. Therefore, the strength and size of an individual country, its diplomacy and the national security system play no part in achieving peace. What is required is knowledge in the area of conflict management, empathy and thus understanding the specifics of conflicts, particularly their roots, wise and reserved behaviour to settle tensions, and justice and impartiality in dealing with the warring factions. Not everyone possesses these qualities. However, we can claim that they may be found in the work the Republic of Slovenia and its representatives, especially the members of the Slovenian Armed Forces, have done so far. We can ascertain that the Republic of Slovenia was, is and will most likely continue to be an important partner, and in certain regions, for example in South Eastern Europe, an indispensable one, in the management and resolution of conflicts.

Finally, I would like to thank my colleagues on the editorial board, who constantly supported and monitored the creation of this issue of the *Bulletin of the Slovenian Armed Forces*. I would also like to thank the proofreaders, translators and other technical personnel for contributing to this technically and otherwise improved issue. Thanks to all the authors, especially the Commander-in-Chief of the Defence Forces of the Republic of Slovenia, Prof. Danilo Türk, PhD, for his thoughts and the Minister of Defence, Prof. Ljubica Jelušič, PhD, for her views on the strategy of development and further cooperation of the Republic of Slovenia in international operations and missions. In the service in peace, we wish for peace ourselves.