

6 Security Sector Reform in South East Europe – a Study in Norms Transfer

Philipp H. Fluri and Eden Cole

Introduction

This chapter examines the question of whether the security sector norms European and Transatlantic organizations sought to extend across South East Europe in the post-Cold War era not only affected, as desired, a substantive change in culture, but also their utility in terms of the literature on norms transfer and the value may be attributed to the methods used to assist those countries' transformation.

To achieve this end, the chapter discusses the 'norms' and 'norms transfer' literature. It proceeds to locate the utility of norms transfer within the context of the contemporary international system. The ideal and reality of security sector reform as a vehicle for 'norms transfer' is put in the context of the relevant norms and their effect on shaping behaviour. Views on whether security sector norms transfer to South East Europe has worked are then analysed.

The chapter argues that the pursuit of an invitation to join a Euro-Atlantic discourse on security sector governance and reform has by itself now become a norm; and that a successful norms transfer to South East Europe has occurred in the security field.

During the post-Cold War era, international organisations including the Organization for Security and Cooperation (OSCE), the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the European Union (EU) and EU-inspired and funded institutions such as the Stability Pact, variously sought to affect similar constructive changes in the area of security sector reform, principally in securing solid democratic control mechanisms over the state's coercive agencies. The OSCE pursued the aim for the sake of the pan-European security architecture; NATO did so as a means of facilitating NATO accession; the EU, similarly, as a means for enabling EU accession; and the Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe sought, in its very conception, to affect region-wide policies that would ultimately satisfy all of the international organisations' objectives for the good of the region after the final acts of the Wars of Yugoslav Dissolution.

In this instance, new entrants to international organisations have to convert to the norms and values of their Western counterparts. For a political union, defence alliance, or a security organization to be successful, member states do not only need to 'grow together' (which they inevitably will if there is a shared economic and/or security interest). If these organizations are to successfully function, an element of cultural 'conversion' to the shared values and norms level of the newly joining member states will necessarily come into play. Such arguments can be unpopular. They entail changes in patronage networks, bureaucracies, and other heretofore established vested interests: changes which, even with good management, may produce confrontations. As such, the norms transfer process cannot be measured as simply in terms of fulfilment of action plans though the action plan may be the most adequate means of specifying requirements and the conditions for implementation. The spirit and the letter differ.

From a normative perspective, the advocacy of norms in this chapter proceeds from an acceptance of the social constructivist agenda.¹ The contention that international relations are about widely shared ideas and theorisation about the role of norms and collective identities in world politics informs the discussion. Not only are identities and interests of actors socially constructed, but they must share the stage with a whole host of other ideational factors emanating from people of any society as cultural beings. Hence, the construction of social realities at the international level presupposes that shared ideas and values shape any given actors' beliefs and that their actions are thereby conditioned by those beliefs.² Norms transfer arises from the creation, dissemination and recognition of such behavioural ideas.

In terms of empirical data from which to draw conclusions, this chapter draws heavily on the results of a Stock-Taking and Self-Assessment project on security sector reform in South East Europe (SEE) undertaken during the last two and a half years. Though none of these research and documentation programmes sought to evaluate the success of the norms transfer to South

¹ See P. L. Berger and T. Luckmann, *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*, (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1967). For the constructivist agenda in international relations theory see Alexander E. Wendt, 'Anarchy is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics', *International Organization*, Vol. 46, No. 2, (Spring 1992) pp. 391-425.

² See John G. Ruggie, 'What Makes the World Hang Together? Neo-utilitarianism and the Social Constructivist Challenge', *International Organization*, Vol. 52, No. 4, Autumn 1998.

East Europe, instead seeking to describe the assimilation processes from within, the findings document very clearly such successes, or the absence thereof. The findings allow a more sophisticated diagnosis of security problematics to shape the next phase of security sector reform strategies.

The outcome of the stock-taking exercises indicate that an security sector reform norms transfer process is underway in SEE. Norms have been internalised, and the nature of the debate about security sector reform issues indicates the ideas' dissemination beyond the narrow confines of academia and security specialists.

Norms Transfer in Contemporary Social Science

In this section, the two-fold understanding of norms and norm transfer in a contemporary context, on which the chapter is based, is elaborated.

A norm can be defined as a standard of appropriate behaviour for actors with a given identity.³ The diffusion of international norms into domestic practices has been conceived as a socialisation process defined as 'the induction of new members (...) into the ways of behaviour that are preferred in a society'.⁴ It may be contended that socialisation such as this presupposes the existence of an 'International Society' which has a set of specific collective understandings about the appropriate behaviour of its members i.e. norms, even if differentiated across political, economic, and legal regimes. To become recognized members of International Society, states must accept and internalise these collective understandings.⁵

The norms transfer process itself can be characterised as a three stage process over time. Following Finnemore and Sikkink, Stage One of 'norm emergence': norm entrepreneurs with organisational platforms, motivated by altruism, empathy, ideas, and commitment seek to use persuasion, the only dominant mechanism open to them at the inception of a norm as an idea, to further diffuse the norm.⁶ Stage 2, the 'norm cascade', wherein the actors become states, international organisations, and networks; the motives legitimacy, reputation, and esteem; and the dominant mechanisms

³ Martha Finnemore and Kathryn Sikkink, 'International Norm Dynamics and Political Change', *International Organization*, 52, 4, Autumn 1998, p. 891.

⁴ Thomas Risse, 'International Norms and Domestic Change: Arguing and Communicative Behavior in the Human Rights Area', *Politics and Society*, Vol. 27, No. 4., December 1999, p. 529.

⁵ Risse, 'International', p. 529.

⁶ Finnemore and Sikkink, 'International', p. 895.

socialisation, institutionalisation, and demonstration. Stage 3, the ‘internalisation’ of norms, wherein the actors are lawyers, professionals, and bureaucrats; the motives conformity; and the dominant mechanisms habit and institutionalisation.⁷

Whilst a number of related conceptual issues still cause confusion and debate (principally distinguishing the applicability of norm(s) in individual or collective institutional contexts), this does not preclude a synthesis of the schools of thought. Nor does it preclude the utility of the norm debate when considering the epistemic exchange of ideas across borders, politics, social, communal and institutional boundaries. As Finnemore and Sikkink argued, ‘used carefully (...) norm language can help to steer scholars toward looking inside social institutions and considering the components of social institutions as well as the way these elements are renegotiated into new arrangements over time to create new patterns of politics’.⁸

In sum, international norms serve as a means of understanding the complex inter-relation and inter-action of contemporary politics at all levels. The explanatory value of international norms in the context of international relations derives from their position at the apex of a series of norms throughout the international system itself. Norms at the state and international levels are essentially defined by each other ‘in the modern world system “constitutive” norms of sovereignty define what counts as statehood, while regulative norms that either constrain or enable specify how sovereign states ought to conduct themselves (...) International norms influence behaviour by shaping state identities, by providing “inference warrants” from which governments officials can draw conclusions about whether a class of actions is required, forbidden, or allowed’.⁹

Such interlinking blurs state boundaries as anticipated political, economic, judicial, regulatory, and military behaviour becomes more predictable by virtue of deliberate (from willing partners) or induced (from partners outside a framework) forms of behaviour: at the same time, the establishment of norms proceeds from the commonality of interests across states which have ultimately led to the emergence of such norms. Such a contention presupposes a capacity for international norms to initiate action: they are thought of as sources of action in three ways ‘*constitutive* in the sense that they define what counts as a certain activity: they may be *constraining* in

⁷ Finnemore and Sikkink, ‘International’, p. 895.

⁸ Finnemore and Sikkink, ‘International’, p. 891.

⁹ Gregory A. Raymond, ‘Problems and Prospects in the Study of International Norms’, *Mershon International Studies Review*, No. 41., (1997), pp. 214.

that they enjoin an actor from behaving in particular way, or they may be *enabling* by allowing specific actions'.¹⁰

Common forms of accepted practice enable the inter-relation of multiple actors, and a greater level of understanding manifested in greater speed of interaction at multiple levels transnationally. Norms delineate boundaries, serve as signposts, routine many facets of transnational relations (especially in commerce and finance), and can perform a tripwire function.¹¹

To expand: the norm standard determines, regulates, or conditions the actual or anticipated interactive behaviour between a multitude of actors on a given issue or issues; and the conglomeration of a set of norms across inter-related fields leads to a broader set of norms shaping and making more predictable and transparent in an international context the behavioural characteristics of international organizations and governments operating within a given set of international frameworks.

The shaping of internal aspects of polities to facilitate interaction with their external antagonists adds to the conception of a variegated international society, variegated across security, legislative, commercial, and social axes, constituting the international system rather than an atomised and solely security-focused set of units. Norms, in sum, provide a way of seeing, to paraphrase Raymond, that although the international system may lack a tangible central governing body to enjoin those with felt grievances from resorting to the 'self help' of coercive action in any given context, the more abstract forms of supposed anarchy within the international system should not be taken for an actual and all pervasive anomie of state or individual.¹²

Security Sector Reform as a Vehicle for Norms Transfer in South East Europe

In an environment of proliferated global governance, international norms in the security sector have substantive meaning – they can be used to affect and consolidate positive micro- and macro-societal change. But: why does security sector reform matter as a norm? how is it defined? and what elements of it benefit from the ideational suppositions of norms transfer and

¹⁰ John Rawls, 'Two Concepts of Rules', *Philosophical Review*, No. 64, January 1955 pp. 3-32 and Randall L. Schweller and David Preiss, 'A Tale of Two Realisms: Expanding the Institutions Debate', *Mershon International Studies Review*, No. 41, p. 3. in Raymond 'Some Problems', p. 214. Emphasis in original.

¹¹ Raymond, 'Problems', pp. 215-216.

¹² Raymond, 'Problems', p. 206.

international society? In the next section the idea of security sector reform will be briefly discussed. Thereafter, the evolution of security sector reform norms pertinent to South East Europe will be located in terms of international norm establishment outlined earlier. Then the projects which sought to initiate and assess ongoing internalisation of such norms are assessed.

Security Sector Reform

The security sector is defined here as ‘all state services and agencies that have the legitimate authority to use force, to order force or to threaten to use force’ and including the military, police, paramilitary units (like military police), border guards services and intelligence services’.¹³ Security sector reform is defined as the ‘structured, planned and assisted effort to adapt domestic Security Sector Governance (SSG) to the international norms as spelled in membership action plans and other association and membership facilitating documents’.¹⁴

The evolution of security sector reform is discussed elsewhere in this book, as is the available literature about the concept. However, it is possible to state that the concept became more entrenched in the late post Cold War era. Furthermore, it was relevant to South East Europe because of the similar aims of international organisations in Western Europe: transferring security sector governance norms required substantial security sector reform.¹⁵

Relevant Security Sector Reform Norms to South East Europe

The concept of security sector reform in the context of NATO, EU and OSCE are well covered in two separate chapters of this book¹⁶ and in

¹³ See ‘Glossary’ in Hans Born, Philipp H. Fluri and Simon Lunn (eds.), ‘Oversight and Guidance: The Relevance of Parliamentary Oversight for the Security Sector and its Reform; A Collection of Articles on Foundational Aspects of Parliamentary Oversight of the Security Sector’, *DCAF Document*, No. 4, (Geneva: Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces, 2003 forthcoming).

¹⁴ ‘Glossary’ in Born, Fluri and Lunn (eds.), ‘Oversight’, (forthcoming).

¹⁵ For further information on security sector reform see also Hans Born, Marina Caparini, Philipp Fluri (eds.), *Security Sector Reform and Democracy in Transitional Societies*, (Baden-Baden: Nomos, 2002)

¹⁶ See in this volume Chapter 7 Marina Caparini, ‘Security Sector Reform and NATO and EU Enlargement’ and Chapter 8 Victor-Yves Ghébali, ‘Revisiting the OSCE Code of Conduct on Politico-Military Aspects of Security (1994)’.

another forthcoming publication.¹⁷ Herein, the relevant norms are elaborated in brief for discussion purposes herein.

The centrality of democratic control of armed forces as critical security sector reform goal for transition countries was underscored in the articulation of NATO, EU and OSCE security sector reform norms. For NATO, participation in Partnership for Peace (PfP) programmes remains dependent on adherence to the shared values of the Alliance including ‘the protection and promotion of fundamental freedoms and human rights and safeguarding of freedom, justice, and peace through democracy’.¹⁸ The NATO Study on Enlargement specifically stated the interrelation of civilian politics and armed forces and the need to shape reforms in applicant states to Western norms and practices. Support of democratic reforms ‘including civilian and democratic control over the military’ contributed to ‘enhanced stability and security for all countries in the Euro-Atlantic area’.¹⁹

The ‘EU’ security sector reform norm specified similar bases, with the elaboration of the 1993 ‘Copenhagen criteria’ offering the prospect of EU membership to Central and Eastern European nations²⁰ with the ‘stability of institutions guaranteeing democracy, rule of law, human rights and respect for and protection of minorities’²¹ being specified. The European Parliament’s endorsement of the Copenhagen criteria in its ‘Agenda 2000’ resolution provided further guidelines for EU accession, stressing the need to

¹⁷ Wilhelm Germann and Timothy Edmunds (eds.), *Towards Security Sector Reform in Post Cold War Europe—A Framework for Assessment*, (Baden-Baden: NOMOS forthcoming). See particularly Victor Yves Ghébali, ‘The Normative Contribution of the OSCE to the Democratic Control of Armed Forces: The Added-Value of the OSCE Code of Conduct on Politico-Military Aspects of Security’.

¹⁸ Partnership For Peace Framework Document. 10 January 1994. <http://www.nato.int/docu/basicxt/b940110b.htm>.

¹⁹ Chapter 1, Purposes of Enlargement, NATO Study on Enlargement. September 1995. <http://www.nato.int/docu/basicxt/enl-9502.htm>.

²⁰ Lea Biason, ‘A Collection of International Norms and Criteria: A Reference Tool’ in Germann and Edmunds, *Towards*.

²¹ Copenhagen European Council – 21-22 June 1993, ‘Presidency Conclusions, Relations with the Countries of Central and Eastern Europe’ available at http://www.europa.eu.int/enlargement/ec/cop_en.htm These conditions also figure in the Treaty of Amsterdam which enshrines the principles of liberty, democracy, respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, and the rule of law as a constitutional principle common to all Member States (new article 6(1)). The Intergovernmental Conference has amended Article O (new Article 49) so that membership was conditional upon respect of Art. 6(1). See Briefing No. 20 ‘Democracy and respect for human rights in the enlargement process of the European Union’ available at http://www.europarl.eu.int/enlargement/briefings/20a2_en.htm

establish: ‘the legal accountability of police, military and secret services (...) and acceptance of the principle of conscientious objection to military service.’²²

The OSCE Code of Conduct on Politico-Military Aspects of Security²³ became the benchmark for democratic control of the security sector, representing the culmination of an emergent consensus on sources of security and objectives originally elaborated in the 1990 Charter of Paris.²⁴ The most critical elements of Section VII elaborated the conditions, not least transparency, for which the instruments of democratic oversight and governance have been developed.²⁵

The presumption of democratic modes of government and representation in each document were underpinned by the admission of many South East Europe states to the Council of Europe during the 1990s, facilitating the transfer of norms of parliamentary democracy, indivisibility and universality of human rights, rule of law, and common cultural heritage enriched by diversity. All countries of the region are eligible for membership and involvement in the Council’s collective effort to bring about ‘democratic security’, but each of them must demonstrate willingness to join and prove its capability to comply with membership requirements.²⁶ The binding of human rights and admission to collective security and politico-military alliances created a consistent yardstick for judging the successful internalization of norms by countries.

The inter-related aims of security sector reform transfer articulated by these institutions was underscored by the formation of the Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe which underpinned the need for the diffusion of norms at a regional level whilst serving as a vehicle for engendering such transmission. As stipulated by the June 10, 1999 Cologne document, more

²² Agenda 2000, §9. In the resolution Agenda 2000, the European Parliament stated that ‘all applicant countries which do at present meet the criterion of a stable democratic order, respect for human rights and the protection of minorities laid down at Copenhagen, have the right to open the reinforced accession and negotiating process at the same time’. <http://www.europarl.eu.int/>

²³ Code of Conduct of Politico-Military Aspects of Security in Budapest Document. CSCE Summit. Budapest. 5-6 December 1994. §20. <http://www.osce.org/docs/english/1990-1999/summits/buda94e.htm>.

²⁴ Charter of Paris: A New Era of Democracy, Peace and Unity, CSCE Summit, 19-21 November 1990 <http://www.osce.org/docs/english/1990-1999/summits/paris90e.htm>

²⁵ See, for example, Born, Fluri and Lunn (eds.), ‘Oversight’, (forthcoming).

²⁶ To complete the accession process – SiM and BiH are still in – Council (Parliamentary Assembly and Council of Ministers) must assess each candidate’s qualifications ‘on its own merits’.

than 40 partner countries and organizations undertook to support the region in their efforts to foster peace, democracy, respect for human rights and economic prosperity in order to achieve stability in the whole region.²⁷ By seeking to engender a sense of regional ownership by applying participative strategies: representatives of South East European countries were, for the first time, on an equal footing with those of international organizations and financial institutions in advising on the future of their region and in setting priorities concerning the content of all three working areas.²⁸ The Stability Pact's mandate was thus the first long-term and comprehensive strategy of the international community to replace previous crisis-intervention instruments by a long-term comprehensive conflict prevention and peace-and prosperity-building instrument.

Furthermore, to accommodate Albania, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, FYR Macedonia and Serbia & Montenegro²⁹ through a similar and related multilateral body, the EU set up a new generation of Stabilisation and Association Agreements – signed Croatia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (henceforth: Macedonia) in 2001, negotiations with Albania started in 2002 – with the intention to increase economic, political, social co-operation between EU and said countries through CARDS (Community Assistance for Reconstruction, Democratisation and Stabilisation).³⁰ The Stability Pact is thus complementary to SAP and accession process and covers South East European candidate countries, Western Balkans, and the Republic of Moldova.

Thus, the vehicles for security sector reform norm creation, diffusion and internalisation were built during the late 1990s at the regional level, a platform for the extension of politico-economic, collective security, and human rights norms being proffered by Western institutions.

Security Sector Reform Norm Transfer to South East Europe

The adoption of these norms in South East Europe during the post-Cold War period and their successful internalisation at the macro-level can be argued for; moreover, the emergence of security sector reform norms follows Finnemore and Sikkink's identification of norm influence as a three stage

²⁷ See http://www.stabilitypact.org/stabilitypactcgi/catalog/cat_descr.cgi?prod_id=409

²⁸ *Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe*, 2003, p.2.

²⁹ Romania and Bulgaria were admitted to full negotiations on membership at Helsinki 1999 summit.

³⁰ An amount of EUR 4.65 billion is allocated for period 2002-2006 to support reforms.

process.³¹ The near contemporaneous emergence of OSCE and the then EU security sector reform/democratic control norm at the Copenhagen Council and in the Charter of Paris declaration reflects Stage One of ‘norm emergence’: norm entrepreneurs with organisational platforms, motivated by altruism, empathy, ideas, and commitment seek to use persuasion, the only dominant mechanism open to them at the inception of a norm as an idea, to further diffuse the norm.

Stage 2, the ‘norm cascade’, wherein the actors become states, international organisations, and networks; the motives legitimacy, reputation, and esteem; and the dominant mechanisms socialisation, institutionalisation, and demonstration, was variously reflected in the genesis and spread of PfP membership, NATO accession frameworks, the OSCE refinement of a politico-military norm, and participation of transitional states in the networks, some on each platform.

Stage 3, the ‘internalisation’ of norms, wherein the actors are lawyers, professionals, and bureaucrats; the motives conformity; and the dominant mechanisms habit and institutionalisation; all are reflected in the new NATO members, the imminent extension of the EU in 2004 and prospective extension in 2007, the role of the Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe, and the widespread acceptance of a democratic control norm throughout the OSCE. The interest in first and second generation security sector reform suggests the need for refinement of the security sector reform norm to build on the achievements so far.³²

However, *prima facie* inductive elements of these arguments can be substantiated by an examination of the projects which sought to promote the creation, cascade and internalisation of these norms, to which the study now turns.

Has Security Sector Reform Norms Transfer to South East Europe Occurred?

An invitation to reform the security sector has as its objective an improvement of the security institutions and security-providing services by means of changing the very culture of security. What is at stake is a shift from the culture of state security to a culture of cooperative security

³¹ Finnemore and Sikkink, ‘International’, p. 895.

³² Timothy Edmunds, ‘Security Sector Reform: Concepts and Implementation’, in Germann and Edmunds, *Towards*.

embedded in the Euro-Atlantic system.

This again implies not only a process of insightful adaptation to Euro-Atlantic security sector reform standards, norms and procedures. It also implies a process of un-learning of the past. security sector reform norms are manifested in five concepts.

Firstly, accountability – the construction of transparent lines of responsibility for each individual regardless of their position in government – will need to replace the expectation of collective responsibility. Secondly, parliamentary and public democratic oversight of the security budgets and personnel will need to replace the expectation that state security comes before individual security, and that budgets be therefore best kept secret, and security-providing services best kept out of reach of parliamentary and public control. Thirdly, civil-military relations with a strong accent on civilian political leadership structures within the Ministries of Defence and the successful integration of the general staff within these ministries will have to replace the expectation that the military form a state within the state. Fourthly, civil society organizations will develop independent security sector governance competence and expertise and replace the para-state or para-party organizations destined to disseminate enthusiasm and friendship, or their opposite. And finally, collective cooperative security as provided by an alliance of sovereign states will replace the expectation of a rigid system of artificially homogenized and integrated states and their military, or Social-Darwinist battles of nation against nation. The concept of human security will replace the concept of security for one's nation.

To this end, between 2000 and 2003, various stock-taking exercises on the status of security sector reform were organized in cooperation with both governmental and non-governmental experts from South East Europe to assess the knowledge and transmission of security sector reform norms. The method to be used and developed as necessary was (and remains) national self assessment.

The concept reflects the interaction between the previously described first and second stages of norm diffusion: norm entrepreneurs with organisational platforms may seek to use persuasion to further diffuse the norms. But to ensure that the second stage 'cascade' occurs wherein the actors are states, international organisations and networks, a gap must be filled by other 'organisational platforms' which seek to promote or, as it were, create a critical mass to ensure the norms cascade, and that the concepts are understood, mobilised and owned at a national level, so that they may be internalised thereafter.

The South East Europe Defence and Security Sector Governance and Reform Self Assessment Process (2000-2003) was planned and implemented as an assisted and supervised self-assessment process in six South East European states (made possible by a mandate from the Swiss Ministry of Foreign Affairs on behalf of Stability Pact Table III): Albania, Bulgaria, Croatia, Macedonia, Moldova, Romania. The findings were made available to the NATO SEESTUDY Group in January 2003 and the Stability Pact at its annual meeting in Cavtat/Croatia in June 2003.³³

The method of the programme was stock-taking and self-assessment of the security sector against western security sector reform standards. The aim: to create a process in which nationals inside and outside the security sector felt a sense of *ownership* of reform, debate and analysis. The creation of well-informed and confident experts allowed for outside input to reform to go beyond institutions, the potential for acceleration being self evident.

Policy makers in the target countries assessed the stages of reform so far attained, prioritized the immediate requirements on the basis of taking stock of their situation and, working with external experts, defined both the feasibility and implementation of consequent reform activities. From March to July 2002, the Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces (DCAF) convened workshops in every participating country to assess and constructively criticise each set of findings and make recommendations for further action. The participants included policy-makers, non-governmental experts, and government representatives. In most cases, the Defence and Foreign Ministers participated (in Macedonia, the President did so), senior policy makers, and the military, ambassadors of Western states and international organizations, and non-governmental organizations and the media. The objective of the workshops was to identify clearly the present state of defence and security sector reform, success and lessons learned, and the areas where external expertise is required and how it can be best provided.

³³ Findings published in Philipp Fluri and Jan Trapans (eds.), *Defence and Security Sector Governance and Reform in South East Europe: A Self-Assessment Study Volume I; Albania, Bulgaria, Croatia*, (Belgrade/Geneva: CCMR for DCAF, 2003); Philipp Fluri and Jan Trapans (eds.), *Defence and Security Sector Governance and Reform in South East Europe: A Self-Assessment Study Volume II; FYR of Macedonia, Moldova, Romania*, (Belgrade/Geneva: CCMR for DCAF, 2003); Timothy Donais and Philipp Fluri (eds.), *Defence and Security Sector Governance and Reform in South East Europe. Volume III*, forthcoming. The study does not comment on Serbia and Montenegro where Security Sector Reform is nascent, or Bosnia and Herzegovina which was not part of the project.

As a follow-up for the workshops, the special studies written by local non-governmental experts, with support from governmental civilian and military staff, concluded the programme. The aim was similar – to identify the local understanding of the ideas and effectiveness of the norms and procedures as manifested in eleven critical areas: Democratic Oversight and Control over Defence; The Parliament; Transparency and Accountability; Democratic Oversight and Control over Intelligence, Police and Border Guards; Civilians and the Military in Defence Planning; Good Governance in Security and Defence Reform; Reform of the Civil Service, Parliamentary Staff and the Military; Civil Society; Crisis Management; Peace-Keeping and Regional Security; and International Requirements and Influence.

The written assessments allowed the progress made on adapting, from the perspective of national actors, the security sector reform norms advocated by Western international organisations across each area relevant to the internalisation of such norms. After all, as argued at the beginning of this chapter, the perception of norms transfer by those who aspire to them is the best guide to their national and the international community as to whether the form or substance of such transfer has been adopted. While Volume III of the Stock-Taking exercise in SEE will deal with the implications of the findings and the recommendations for international actors, they are dealt with thematically below in order to locate the threefold process of security sector reform norms transfer as manifested in each instance.

Democratic Politics and Reforms

All six countries under self-scrutiny had addressed the task of downsizing and reforming the Armed Forces with enthusiasm and success. As might have been imagined, the reform and downsizing of the army created discontent. The demobilised officers had to face the difficulties of integrating themselves into civilian life at a time when all countries were going through painful economic transition. In Albania during the 1997 crisis, military officers demobilised during the reform process joined and played an important role in the rebellion that was sparked by the financial crisis caused by the collapse of pyramid schemes.³⁴ But in none of the countries assessed have armed or other security forces have shown any praetorian tendencies,

³⁴ Aldo Bumçi, 'Security Sector Reform in Albania', in Trapans & Fluri, *Defence*, Vol. 1., pp. 23-43; see also Besnik Mustafaj, *Albanian Human Development Report 1998*, (UNSECO 1998), pp. 78.

which is in line with their tradition,³⁵ and quite remarkable given the massive budget and personnel cuts were being implemented.

In all countries under scrutiny, defence and security sector reform together with the introduction of democratic institutions have produced some convincing results – most of all in the Defence Ministries – but are far from having been accomplished.³⁶ The inclination of the military to intervene in politics is only one side of civil-military relations. The other side of the coin is the tendency of civilians to use the military, and it is in this field that problems have been seen. Thus institution-building in Albania was done in such a way as to allow the political forces in power to control the institutions by bringing in their own people and carrying out massive purges. The military institutions have not escaped from this approach.³⁷ Macedonia had no experience of independent statehood so even the limited practice and skills gained under communism were of some significance in 1991 and for quite some time thereafter.³⁸ However, in Moldova the transformation of

³⁵ As Bumçi argues vis-à-vis Albania, it is remarkable in that ‘during the democratic experiment of the last decade the army has clearly not shown any praetorian tendencies, which is in line with its tradition. And this is not the case because of the proper establishment and functioning of democratic institutions. On the contrary, the Albanian democratic experiment has been far from successful. Albania has not yet passed the test of free and fair elections. The conduct of all the parliamentary elections, except those of 1992, has been challenged by the losing party and has been below democratically-established standards. Contested election results have been accompanied by institution-building which has lacked legitimacy and consensus and has been politicised. Due to the polarised political atmosphere and the ongoing political struggle and insufficient economic resources, the Albanian state could very well be characterised as a weak state. However despite all this, the military has not been a factor in Albanian politics. Nor has the military used the exploding situation in Kosova to demand greater support and a greater say in government.’ In Bumçi, ‘Security’, p. 25.

³⁶ Velizar Shalamanov, ‘Security Sector Reform in Bulgaria’, in Philipp H. Fluri & Velizar Shalamanov, *Does Security Sector Reform Work?*, (Sofia, 2003) pp. 173-191. There is a common perception in Croatia that the admission into the MAP is the confirmation of Croatia’s maturity in fulfilling the criteria and standards of behaviour of the Euro-Atlantic structures – NATO and the EU, which are not only military but also civil. See Mladen Staničić, ‘Security Sector Reform in Croatia’, in Fluri and Trapans, *Defence*, Vol. I, pp. 333 – 347.

³⁷ ‘Thus after the coming to power of a left-wing coalition, 1,500 officers of different ranks were purged from the armed forces, among them around 400 officers who had received education and training in the West in 1992-96. We need to qualify the way the political forces have used the military by comparing it with the other two security institutions – the police and intelligence service. See Bumçi, ‘Security’, p. 25.

³⁸ Biljana Vankovska, ‘Security Sector Reform in Macedonia’, in Fluri and Trapans, *Defence*, Vol. II, pp. 13-35.

civil-military relations has received much less attention than larger issues of democratisation, economic and social reform.³⁹ Romania belongs with Bulgaria to the group of most advanced states (in terms of Security Sector Reform); like the latter it has been concerned with immediate regional security challenges in the Balkans and in South Eastern Europe: the ‘NATO agenda’ is a very important part, but only one part, of the ‘security sector agenda’⁴⁰.

Thus, while security sector reform norms have cascaded in this segment, their full internalisation remains an ongoing process region-wide. On current lines, they can come closer to full internalisation as the passage of time allows institutions and awareness to develop further. Internalisation remains an ongoing process, but the bases are increasingly stable.

The Constitutional and Legal Framework

All six countries under scrutiny have succeeded in putting in place constitutional provisions and subsequent legal acts laying down explicitly or implicitly the legal framework that regulates civil-military relations and responsibilities in the security sector. In Albania it is important to note that although the opposition boycotted the referendum on the new constitution and has not voted on a number of laws related to the democratic control of the army and documents on defence strategy, this fact is not considered a ‘lack of consensus between the political forces on civil-military relations’.⁴¹

In the Bulgarian Constitution of 1991 responsibility for security matters was distributed among the Parliament, President, Government, Judiciary, armed forces and citizens. There is no definition of the security sector as such. The communist-era character of the armed forces was seriously changed by subsequent laws on Defence and the Armed Forces (1995), on the Ministry of the Interior (1991), on the establishment of state companies to replace Transport troops, Construction troops and Telecommunications troops, as well as Decrees of the President and Government to establish a National Intelligence Service (1990), a National Protection Service (1992), a State Agency for Civil Protection (2001), registration in court of new defence companies separate from the ministries of defence and the interior (1990s), the privatisation of defence companies that were in the Ministry of

³⁹ Nicolae Chirtoaca, ‘Security Sector Reform in Moldova’, in Fluri and Trapans, *Defence*, Vol. II., p. 165.

⁴⁰ Liviu Muresan, ‘Security Sector Reform in Romania’, p. 304.

⁴¹ Bumçi ‘Security’ in Fluri & Trapans, *Defence*, Vol. I, p. 26.

the Economy (Industry), the restructuring of many commissions and committees on the military-industrial complex and mobilisation readiness, arms trade control and others.⁴²

Provisions of the National Security Concept (NSC) to establish a System for National Security and to have laws on all different elements of this system (elements of the security sector) have not been fully implemented yet. In Croatia the Parliament enjoys a range of competences in the field of national security, which, as a concept, does not differ greatly from the perception of national defence. In accordance with article 80 of the Constitution, the Croatian Parliament decides on war and peace, which is the main component of defence, but also adopts the Strategy of National Security and the Strategy of Defence.

In Macedonia the constitutional arrangement of the separation of powers has not been clearly defined. Since 1991 Macedonia has been 'wavering between its constitutional concept of parliamentary democracy and strong elements of a presidential system'.⁴³ The new Law on Defence adopted during the crisis was expected to eliminate the ambiguities in the relationship President-Government-Minister of Defence-General Staff. It did not help overcome the problems in practice and soon the respective legal provisions were disputed before the Constitutional Court. Over the years of Moldova's existence as an independent country a legal division of authority between the state institutions responsible for national security has been gradually established. Efforts to ensure "transparency" and raise public awareness concerning national defence planning and military budget approval have been made.

Hence, the prerequisite security sector reform norms, a comprehensive legislative framework defining the relation of coercive state agencies with the government, executive, parliament, and public has begun to cascade. An exception is Macedonia. However the mitigating circumstances and level of international involvement there are such that there is reason to believe a sustained international engagement on this problematic issue can generate the sufficient framework necessary as events continue to stabilise. Given the conflicts in region during the break-up of the Yugoslav Federation, the introduction, cascading, and, most importantly, understanding of these issues

⁴² Shalamanov, 'Civil Military and Inter-Agency Cooperation in the Security Sector in Bulgaria', in Fluri & Shalamanov, *Does?*, p. 83. In the past, the armed forces had covered all security/defence-related services up to the Central Committee of the BCP and its Politburo *in extenso*. See Shalamanov, *ibid*, pp. 83-84.

⁴³ Vankovska, 'Security', p. 32.

is reason for optimism that the norm will continue to be influential.

The Competencies of the President

All six countries have succeeded in addressing the temptation to create a strong presidency – but with inconclusive results for some. The new Albanian constitution has reduced the powers of the President, who no longer enjoys law-making authority, and has few appointment competencies. The main competencies of the Bulgarian president are his constitutional position as Supreme Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces and his Chairmanship of the Consultative Council of National. The main problem of the Croatian executive is still the non-transparent allocation of powers between the Office of the President and the government, i.e. the Prime Minister. The new Law on Defence promulgated in March 2002 enumerates the duties of the Head of State, based upon his constitutional role. This Law recognises the President of the Republic as the Commander-in-Chief but seems to give the President too many specific duties which should fall to the government, the Parliament, or be located within the system of defence itself.

In Macedonia talk about defence and military reforms intensified in the crisis period of 2001. The peacetime ambiguity over competencies between the executive powers (President-Government-Defence Ministry and the Interior Ministry) and the disagreements that followed the formation of a government of National Unity upon the insistence of the international community, resulted in a disorganized command over the security forces. In Moldova there is a clear division of powers and responsibilities between different branches of central state powers. The President is assisted in his duties by the Supreme Council for Security, which functions as a consultative body with its activity regulated by presidential decree.

Thus the transparent separation and differentiation of powers between President and Parliament to create clear lines of responsibility and accountability over the security sector are increasingly well established. Macedonia's difficult transition being the most recent, the attempt to delineate responsibility suggests the norm is now being internalised region wide; but further improvements can be made.

Republican Guards and Irregular Forces

Albania still keeps a Republican Guard. The President of Albania, on the proposal of the Prime Minister, appoints and dismisses the Commander of

the Republican Guard. A number of contradictions are embodied in the organization of the Republican Guard such as its dependence on the Ministry of Public Order while at the same time it is composed of conscript soldiers, which is a defining element of the armed forces. Thus the Republican Guard is a hybrid structure in terms of composition that to a certain extent contradicts the Constitution with respect to the chain of command for the armed forces on the one hand, and the police on the other.

Some of the six countries sport security organizations which are only partly under governmental control. During the 2001 conflict, special paramilitary units appeared in Macedonia. The military, the police, and the Interior Ministry activated special units, boldly named “Wolves”, “Tigers”, “Lions” and the like. They were supposedly to be engaged as special reaction forces, as the army had the “Tigers”. The best known, if disreputable, unit was the “Lions”, activated in mid-2001 by Interior Minister Boskovski. While recent events have contained the units, their networks’ gradual elimination remains to be decisively proven.

In this case, at least two anomalies challenge the security sector reform norm with varying degrees of latent threat: such hybrid forces allow for the executive to autonomously use force outside military or police frameworks. Whilst the recent history of both countries may account for the units’ continued presence, the absence of similar formations in the other countries assessed suggests a greater diffusion of the norm in the countries assessed. The full internalisation of the norm regionally would require further efforts by internal and external actors.

Parliamentary Oversight, the Authority of the Parliament and the Defence (Security) Committee

All six countries – to varying degrees – recognize the important oversight role of the parliaments. The Albanian parliament, whose role has been enhanced in the new constitution, represents the main and most important institution concerning democratic control. The parliament is the key institution that performs not only democratic control functions but also aims at ensuring transparency and accountability. Ad hoc committees are created to examine specific and complex legislative acts as well as to prepare specific legislative proposals.

The Bulgarian Parliament has with the National Security Concept, Military Doctrine, Interior and Defence Ministry laws as well as ratification of agreements with NATO, with the main NATO countries and those on regional cooperation established a real environment for security sector

reform. However, a National Security Law still needs to be formulated.

The Croatian Parliament is authorized to ‘supervise the work of the Government of the Republic of Croatia and other holders of public authority responsible to the Croatian Parliament, in conformity with the Constitution and Law’.⁴⁴ This illustrates that the Croatian Parliament has significant authority in the field of national security. For Moldova’s parliament the most important role in the field of national security and defence can be considered the establishment at the beginning of 1990s of the constitutional and legal framework, including civilian control of an armed forces created from scratch, which is still functioning up to now.

Herein are several datasets indicating the cascading and latterly internalisation of the democratic control of the security sector law. The establishment of democratic control frameworks can be improved, but the concepts have been made real in legislative frameworks.

Parliamentary Oversight of the Intelligence Service

All six countries acknowledge a parliamentary responsibility for the intelligence services, though legislation may be not even a matter of discussion yet. This is an important area where the security sector reform norm has not been transparently internalized: the reticence on the issue suggests that the cascading of the norm has also not truly occurred.

The International Environment

All six country teams acknowledged and welcomed the agenda-setting role of the international community. Albania was among the first countries to join the North Atlantic Cooperation Council (NACC) in June 1992, and PfP in February 1994. These steps were important in bringing Albania closer to the Alliance. The PfP programme based on the defence Planning and Review Process (PARP) has contributed to the restructuring and of the Albanian military establishment and capabilities in conformity with NATO standards. Bulgaria has profited from British, German, French, Italian and Greek consultants in the Bulgarian Defence Ministry, the US Military Liaison Team (MLT), plus PfP coordinating and foreign military financing (FMF) coordinating officers, attached to the US embassy.

The Croatian team acknowledged that international assistance, including conditionality and even some kind of pressure, would facilitate the

⁴⁴ Vlatko Cvirtila, ‘The Parliament and the Security Sector’, in Trapans & Fluri, *Defence*, Vol. 1, p. 361.

accomplishment of reforms in various sectors, including the security sector. Macedonia, as a result of a difficult post-Kosovo security situation, has hosted a number of international missions with different mandates for peace building and democracy promotion. They have all had an impact on security sector reform and security conditions in the country. Macedonia has not managed to build a consensus on national interests and national security strategy. International organizations were seen to ‘arrive with different and often contradictory advice concerning bilateral, multilateral or international arrangements’.⁴⁵ In Moldova external influence and the existence of an outside ‘agency of change’ is seen as a realistic solution for an otherwise lagging reform process.

In Romania, Western assistance was essential in building democratic institutions, particularly a democratic civil-military pattern. But this can not yet be the end of the process, a coherent programme on assistance to foster the institutions, to help civil society to grow and aid development of the mechanisms of civilian control must continue. Otherwise, the institutions will remain fragile and could fail due to political or economic failure. Among the numerous opportunities, the PfP is said to have been a good training school for making the Romanian Armed Forces (RAF) compatible with NATO forces. Bilateral military assistance programmes also played an important role in making the RAF more professional, in setting up a multi-year defence planning system and reorienting the armed forces towards regional security requirements. However, the systematic approach and inclusion of intelligence, police forces and defence industry in the assistance programmes came rather late and many things still need to be done in this respect.

Thus international actors have assisted in providing expert skills and other assistance to enable the cascading and internalisation of security sector reform norms. Yet, their broad remit for security sector reform-related action is unfinished as elements of the grander issues of security sector reform beyond the security sector itself remain fragile in comparison to the relatively greater societal stability of the West. Systematic, long term engagement is still needed to make the societal internalisation of the security sector reform norm irrevocable.

⁴⁵ Biljana Vankovska, interview with members of OSCE mission in Macedonia, December 2002, cited in Vankovska, ‘Security’, p. 31.

Transparency and Accountability

All six countries have managed to put in place accountability and transparency-building mechanisms. Development of a transparency culture in the Bulgarian security sector started with the public debate on the Military Doctrine, Defence Reform Plan 2004 and Membership Action Plan 2004, a White Paper on Defence and Annual Reports on National Security, Defence and Armed Forces, hosted on the websites of the defence and interior ministries. Involvement of non-governmental organizations (NGOs), the academic sector and business, as well as of foreign partners led to impressive results. In Croatia the constitutional and statutory framework for political accountability is in place but the substance available does not match the legal rights.

In this arena, the norm has cascaded and been internalised across the region. The wherewithal of creating and publicising the tenets and perception of politico-military strategic needs enables the dissemination of the posture and policies advocated for the security sector by the government across society. Electronic means have been exploited, increasing the transparency of security sector reform norm adoption to foreigners.

Peacekeeping, Crisis Management and Regional Security

All six countries have been made efforts to create peacekeeping and crisis management capabilities. The Albanian Armed Forces have participated in the SFOR mission in Bosnia as part of the German-led contingent and deployed since 1996. Under an agreement between the Albanian and German Defence Ministries, the latter provides logistical support for the Albanian contingent participating in the IFOR mission and afterwards in the SFOR mission. Concerning the participation of the Albanian armed forces outside South East Europe, this first occurred in 2002 when a special commando unit of 30 soldiers of the Albanian armed forces was dispatched to Afghanistan for six months to serve with the Turkish unit in the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF). The Albanian armed forces contributed to the establishment of the South East Europe Brigade (SEEBRIG) under the auspices of the South East Europe Defence Ministerial (SEDM) in 1999.

SEEBRIG was established in accordance with the Multinational Peace Force South East Europe (MPFSEE) Agreement, which was signed in Skopje on 26 September 1998. The participant states are Albania, Bulgaria, Greece, Italy, Macedonia, Romania and Turkey, while the US and Slovenia

take part with observer status. Bulgaria's National Security Concept, Military Doctrine and many decisions of the Parliament and Government, stipulate security through cooperation and integration, which is expressed in regional cooperation in South East Europe (SEEDM, SEEGROUP, Stability Pact, 2+2 cooperation) and the Black Sea area (BLACKSEAFOR) as well as through the progress in NATO and EU integration. The active role of Bulgaria as a temporary member of the Security Council of the UN and upcoming chairmanship of the OSCE is an important dimension of this aspect of security sector reform. Currently Bulgaria participates in SFOR, KFOR, and ISAF with not only military units, but police contingents (KFOR) as well.

It can be argued that Romania does not have a coherent and integrated strategy and a national crisis management system that would take into consideration the characteristics, dimensions and complex consequences of such risks, which are mainly non-military, multidirectional and unpredictable. The Romanian Constitution recognises only a limited number of exceptional situations whose proclamation belongs strictly to the competence of the President. It follows that no other authority has the prerogative of declaring a state of crisis or of civil emergency. The experience gained in the Romanian participation in peace support operations is being put to good use in all military units, taking into consideration that so far more than 8,000 Romanian military personnel have participated in different theatres. This experience has permitted the adaptation of training programmes to the real operational conditions and to equip forces according to real needs.

As with the Baltic States, the internalisation of the security sector reform norm of contributing to collective security as a security provider, no matter the size of the contribution, has occurred across the region. Whilst Macedonia is a *prima facie* exception as a result of its domestic situation, it acknowledges the principle of contributing to a regional contingent.

Capacity-Building and the Role of Education in the Security Sector

All six countries have stepped up their training and instruction efforts, especially in the military field, and have profited from offers made by the international community. Given the important role military and civilian, governmental and non-governmental expertise plays in security sector reform, all six country teams criticized the insufficiencies of their own training and instruction capacities (especially for civilians and non-governmental experts), and/or the ignorance of applicable methods.

Thus, whilst the norm may arguably have cascaded in so far as a region-wide series of experts acknowledged the deficiency of expertise and improvements to knowledge capacities, the local identification of the demand provides an opportunity for Western engagement to tailor appropriate solutions that may ensure systematic internalization.

Society and the Military

In all six countries, efforts to overcome negative imagery of military and society interaction have been made and led to some success. This does, however, not imply that the information and media policy in all countries has come to full fruition, nor that civilians and non-governmental experts participate massively in security sector reform.

The new Defence Strategy, approved recently by the Albanian Parliament, acknowledges for the first time in an official document the need for the participation of civil society and public opinion in the discussion and drafting of new defence and security policies: ‘The role of public opinion, the media and civil society in drafting, discussing, and implementing the strategy on national defence and security policies, is necessary.’⁴⁶ In Bulgaria, a coalition of NGOs, media specialists and academics actively participate in the monitoring and even preparation of security sector reform. In Croatia there are encouraging signs but more from the part of media than from the part of civil society, especially NGOs, and not so much from the defence establishment which still labours under post-war traumata.

Thus the cascading of the norm of expert civilian knowledge and scrutiny of the security sector has proceeded unevenly. Some institutional resistance to such measures remains in place in the region. Yet the progress made, particularly in Albania, Bulgaria, and to a lesser degree in Croatia suggest the internalisation process is underway.

The Media, Civil Society – and Business

The most advanced countries in security sector reform terms are also often the ones with the most competently engaged civil societies and media. The Bulgarian Defence Ministry has been very active in out-sourcing activities which belong into the defence economy sphere; a lot of experience has already been gained in NGO-Defence Ministry cooperation in the area of organising public discussion and debate on defence policy, defence reform

⁴⁶ As argued by Henri Cili, ‘Security and Defence - Two Unfamiliar Issues for Media and Civil Society’, in Fluri & Trapans, *Defence*, Vol. 1., p. 124.

and modernisation as well as the practical participation of NGOs in resettlement of demobilised soldiers and in information campaigns. The role of unions of retired military, veterans, alumni associations and youth organizations are very prominent.

Irrespective of the fact that there is a limited tradition of NGOs and civil society in general in Croatia, citizens' civil engagement for solving both individual and community problems has not been a common practice among the vast majority of citizens in Croatia. Most citizens still consider the government/state responsible for solving their problems, including in the military area, making no distinction between defence and security.

Civil society in Romania is relatively vibrant but still lacks resources. A section of the Romanian media has been privatised and is relatively independent. Even though Romania's constitution guarantees access to information, governmental officials can hamper direct contact with ministerial officials. Many state institutions were reported not to apply Law 544/2001 regarding free access to public information, even though the law was introduced in December 2001.

Thus, if the norms have cascaded in the region and are being internalised but to differing degrees. The promotion of civil society and the media is another area where the norms have cascaded and have resulted in action but not the wholesale internalisation of the desired norm. Yet, the trajectories herein remain towards positive efforts towards further construction of appropriate practices and networks, rather than negative and un- or even de-constructive.

Conclusion

Faced with European states which had endured Communist rule based on the use of military and intelligence services as arbitrary instrument of social control, the capacity to change the security sector to accompany democratic aspirations and concomitant institution re-building was of great importance: not least as the acrimony resulting from 'police state' actions by such organizations had alienated the civilian population. Similarly, the transition process of old (pre-1991) and new (post-1991) states which had endured civil instability and state repression, often due to Cold War proxy wars and power politics, with the same end results of disillusion and social discontent, meant that the formation of a stable security sector was at a premium for the consolidation of democratic processes worldwide.

Furthermore, in the vacuum accompanying regime change, the degree of

organization and coercive means in state security agencies relative to other institutions made them an obvious ally or creator of criminal organizations against the residual regulatory capacity of the state. Given the capacity of transnational criminal networks to interact and market goods and services in a globalised era, such alliances could result in international isolation and civilian persecution within a polity either by design or by default.

Hence, the critical problematic became the modulation of civil-military and civil-security agency relations through the creation and consolidation of institutions which guaranteed the transparency and existence of necessary instruments for the normative management of the state's coercive means.

The programmes detailed in South East Europe vis-à-vis security sector reform indicate a practical reality both to the theoretical norms and the transfer process outlined and the hypothesised outcome of their three stage emergence. As stated in the section on 'Security Sector Reform Norms Transfer to South East Europe', the very act of NATO and imminent NATO and EU accession of several countries in Central and South Eastern Europe itself inductively suggests the articulated norms were transferred to the satisfaction of their creators; at the very least, in form if not substance, beyond the former boundary of the defunct Iron Curtain. As per the section considering 'Has Security Sector Reform Norms Transfer to South East Europe Occurred?', in South East Europe the process of promoting self analysis of the critical elements of security sector reform norm transfer, with varying but similar results, has allowed the cascading and internalisation of security sector reform norms. Degrees of internalisation vary across space and time as inter-related factors such as population, economic means, governmental traditions, education and societal structures are broached. It is critical that external agencies catalyse the gap between norm entrepreneurs' arts of persuasion and the norms cascade wherein the principle actors are states and international organisations through the mobilisation of (primarily methodological) strategies and appropriate instruments. The disconnect between ideal and reality, between spirit and letter, can be addressed in this way. Self assessment served as such a method.

The very process of engagement and norm transfer between parties is of course mutually reinforcing in this context. Analysis and constructive criticism allows the formulation of strategies to internalise ever more substantively the full breadth of security sector reform norms across society: the very place where they are meant to matter. Furthermore, the conditionality of aid represents (and notably has represented) an expectation that a mutually accepted and valid norm can be implemented and integrated

into a polity's decision-making and institutional structures, heralding the fullest possible interaction with international society. In this way security sector reform norm transfer it is a facet of the global governance agenda and realities. Transparency in aims and means allow greater international organization participation, an accelerant to change. The internalisation process is ongoing and ever-varying as formal accession to various institutions progresses, on the basis of NATO and EU accession so far, incrementally, the specific dynamic between international organisations' and a particular states' relations altering as time progresses. But the trajectories are set towards a substantive aspiration to security sector reform region-wide.

The discourse on security sector reform itself, even the very existence or entering into an international discourse on security sector reform, indicates that a security sector reform norm exists in an epistemic sense. The applicability of security sector reform as a conceptual norm is relatively recent, but derives its strength from its internal consistency with other norms such as civil society, transparency in political decision-making, and accountability. Authors who deplore the absence of a clear definition of security sector reform and clear norms for its implementation fail to acknowledge its nature. To embark on security sector reform is the norm, thus to join an open-ended yet structured discourse in cooperation with the very organizations and one intends to join. The distinction between 'first' and 'second' generation reform steps⁴⁷ is thus – though striking – ultimately misleading. It departs from the expectation of an uni-linear development along given lines. In fact, the reference system ('good practice') is itself on the move, and is itself simultaneously an abstract statistical field.

If Security Sector Reform is a transfer of norms, then, it is not to be mistaken for a rigid system of rules aimed at homogenizing a nation's values in order to better integrate and control it. Rather than imposing strict, pre-fabricated standards, the international community seeks to suggest agenda items, or rather: the agenda, for reforms. Security sector reform as such is a norm then, to which individual states are invited to subscribe. How they are going to meet the requirements of the norm is largely left to themselves, as long as they stay within the statistical field of good practice. The decision to embark on security sector reform, in cooperation with the Euro-Atlantic

⁴⁷ For the distinction between and advocacy of 'first' and 'second' generation reforms see Timothy Edmunds, Anthony Forster, and Andrew Cottey, 'The Second Generation Problematic: Rethinking Democracy and Civil-Military Relations in Central and Eastern Europe', *Armed Forces and Society*, Vol. 29, No. 1, Fall 2002, pp. 31-56.

community and with an objective to ultimately join at least some of its institutions and organizations, is itself the acceptance of a norm.

Apart from the long list of different objectives which all governments claim to have in the implementation of reforms, they also have another thing in common: the absence of a well-defined assessment and reporting process on the implementation of the security sector reform programmes. Scholars and practitioners addressing the issue of success and failure of reforms and adequacy of reform plans thus often have to rely on their own observations, interviews with officials they may know, and vague feelings in the population on whether things went 'right', or 'wrong'.

The security sector is and will remain a politically sensitive area. This, however, is not to imply that only the organs directly dealing with the security sector and its reforms, the executive, ought to be involved in its oversight. In mature democracies there is not only a separation of powers in implementation and oversight functions, but the civil society itself takes enlightened interest in security sector oversight and reform matters, for the security sector is no longer a state within the state, providing for itself and those illegitimately in power, but serves the human security interests of each and every citizen who considers it its own. The security sector and those in charge of it therefore have an interest to provide transparency.

All authors participating in the South East Europe Defence and Security Sector Governance and Reform Self Assessment Process discussed in this chapter suggested that security sector reform is well under way in their home countries, though the final status of implementation remains on many accounts unclear. This may be explained by the scarcity of information available, but also by the sheer size of the task and its complexity. It is in the nature of security that only in crises does the level of progress in security sector reform become fully revealed.