

Nenad A. VASIĆ¹

CHANGES IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND THE ORDER OF THE EUROPEAN UNION

Abstract: The modern world has been going through great and far-reaching changes after the Cold War and the fall of Berlin Wall in 1989. In the first place, uni-multi-polarity was established in international relations, then since 2008, non-polarity and finally from 2014, there is a new global-expanded bipolarity. Changes in international relations also inevitably affect the order of the European Union. The issue of borders, enlargement, citizenship and receiving countries to full membership in the EU with open issues, governmental and inter-ethnic disputes had an impact on its old order and will affect the new order.

Key words: changes, international relations, European Union, uni-polarity, non-polarity, a new global-extended bipolarity, order.

Introductory remarks

Starting from the history of civilization and culture, the history of diplomacy and foreign policy in contemporary international relations, two important concepts that characterize and define much of humanity and the modern world besides *adjusting* and *interdependence*, are: first *changes*, and then *order*. From these two last-mentioned terms, which are contained in the very title of this scientific work, there can be sensed and in many ways understood the methods in our research approach. Changes in international relations and order of the European Union, which are our focus, cannot be only observed just theoretically, historically and by comparison, but also with a different aspect of political science in the corpus of social sciences.

¹ Nenad, A. Vasić, Ph.D., The Institute of Serbian Culture, Leposavić. This paper was written as a part of the project *Material and spiritual culture of Kosovo and Metohija* (Ev. No. 178028), funded by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of the Republic of Serbia.

In this research work, changes in international relations are recognized, understood and defined as a process in which different event actors cause with their actions certain reactions that have had consequences on other people and different nations, states, form of governments, international organizations and institutions. Changes or attempted changes always affect the former state as a possible breakup with it, in which people in power have found themselves in public services together with citizens in any country of the modern world. For this reason, besides changes in international relations, it is very important to review the issues of order both in countries and the world as a whole. And not only that! It is important to take into consideration any order in the history likewise contemporary international relations, even if it is an example of a study case of order within the European Union. This will be addressed in detail in the third part of this scientific work.

The order is recognized, understood and defined as an internal and external international legal constitutional system of government relations between the various political and diplomatic actors as subjects of international relations.

1. The dominant theory and the question of a new paradigm in the science of international relations

According to Kenneth Waltz, one of the most famous experts on international relations and foreign policy, in contemporary science about the international relations, the theories of international politics² are also important. Throughout the history of international relations there have been a lot of theories with which famous intellectuals (from philosophers and historians to various University professors) tried, sometimes with more success or less possibility and unsuccessfully, to explain people and events that they have been engaged to.

It is an undeniable fact that the foreign policy officials in government, everywhere in the world are in principle, the strategic by its approach (if not, should it be), and current by space and time of conducting. However, what is very complex to evaluate and understand correctly concerning both international political processes and relationships of relevant actors are: 1) issues of decision-making, and 2) behaviour of the authorities and the opposition on the most important issues in domestic and especially in foreign policy.

The Officials in the government have adopted various decisions, laws and sub-legal normative acts that inevitably have implications and consequences on the foreign policy position of some governments in international relations and diplomacy. However, of the most important significance are certainly the

² Kenneth N. Waltz, *Theory of International Politics*, Waveland Press, Inc. Long Grove, 2010.

dominant initiatives and activities of officials of the most powerful countries around the world that affect decisively, sometimes directly or from time to time, indirectly, on changes of position, interests and relations in the international system of the world.

In this regard, changes in contemporary international relations can be monitored, evaluated and professionally commented with three relevant scientific and theoretical paradigms.

1. *Declinism* – (global process of pre-dislocation factors of power from the West to the East part of humanity is understood and practically accepted as a necessity). Starting from the 80-ies of the twentieth century and with a historian, Paul Kennedy³, the question has been asked from the standpoint of the science about the international relations, theory and the history of diplomacy, is it really so? But a little more and more specifically on this, will be mentioned later on. On the other hand, according to journalist and author Fareed Zakaria today's world is – post American World.^{4, 5}

2. *Realism* – (factor of power as a central concept of all realistic theories of international relations), ranging from the classic - Hans Morgenthau⁵ to a defensive realism and offensive realism –of a theorist of international relations, John Mirshajmer⁶ including there the inevitable, already mentioned, Kenneth Waltz's neorealism⁷ and his theory of international politics.

3. *Liberalism* – (where is the factor of cooperation a central concept of all liberal theories of international relations) with the theory of historical sociology - the third time as a combination of realism and liberalism in international relations,

³ Paul Kennedy, *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers: Economic Change and Military Conflict from 1500 to 2000*, Random House, New York, 1987.

⁴ One of the most important and influential thinkers of the modern world, it is certainly Farid Zakaria. According to him, the United States remains the undisputed on political and military level and the only superpower. In other dimensions, among which he mentions about: industrial, financial, educational, social and cultural, there is a redistribution of power. This does not mean that the present world in most of humanity is anti-American. However, the present world is according to Zachary, "a post American World: it is defined and managed from different places, and it involves many nations." Farid Zakaria, *Postamerički svet*, Heliks, Smederevo, 2009, p. 4. About the American declinism see also: Dragan R. Simić, Dragan M. Živojinović, *Od Sputnjika do Lenova: šest talasa američkog deklinizma posle drugog svetskog rata*, in: *Godišnjak 2010*, Faculty of Political Sciences, Belgrade, 2010, pp. 269-293.

⁵ The central concept in classical realist theory of international relations, Hans J. Morgenthau's power. See about: Hans J. Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*, Knopf, New York, in 1948.

⁶ John J. Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, Norton, New York, 2001.

⁷ Žaklina Novičić, *Kenneth Waltz i neorealizam*, in: Priredio i uredio Dejan Jović, *Realizam*, Politička kultura, Zagreb, 2013, pp. 264-287.

starting with Professor Raymond Aaron⁸ and his student Stanley Hoffman,⁹ and finally to his students Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye, and their learning and the famous phrase “complex interdependence.”¹⁰

Taking into account everything that we have dealt with in this part of the scientific work and scientifically and theoretically analyzed, it is also important to clarify the following question: Is there a new paradigm in contemporary international relations? Our unambiguous answer is, yes.

That new, dominant paradigm in contemporary international relations is a *realistic theory* which dominates in most practical (sectoral) policies related to foreign affairs of the officials in the governments in the international system of the world.

2. Changes and the orders in the history of international relations

There is no doubt that the history of diplomacy¹¹ is of particular importance for the science of international relations. Throughout the history of international relations, the power of some individual stakeholders sometimes grew or declined. When in the focus are the most powerful countries in the world, and officials of government, in our particular case, the United States, it is extremely competent and professionally done by Dragan Simić and Dragan Živojinović, especially in 2011. “Studying different waves of American declinism since World War II until present day, as well as taking into consideration our arguments about the uncertainties of declinistic learning,

⁸ Remon Aron, *Mir i rat među nacijama*, Izdavačka Knjižarnica Zorana Stojanovića, Sremski Karlovci-Novu Sad, 2001; Srđan Slović, *Aronova teorija međunarodnih odnosa i aktuelno kosovsko pitanje*, Institut za srpsku kulturu, Priština-Leposavić, 2009, pp. 15-270.

⁹ Stanley Hoffmann, *World Disorders: Troubled Peace in the Post-Cold War Era*, Rowman & Littlefield, Lanham Maryland-Oxford, 1998.

¹⁰ Robert O. Keohane, Joseph S. Nye, *Power and Interdependence*, Longman, New York-San Francisco-Boston, 2001, p. 20. Besides the complex interdependence, Dragan Živojinović from the Faculty of Political Sciences in Belgrade successfully worked on the phenomenon, issue and various points of view regarding globalization. In his famous scholarly work on globalization, Živojinović analyzed and commented on the relationship between globalization and interdependence in international relations, as they were conceptually determined and realized by Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye in joint scientific work. See: Robert O. Keohane, Joseph S. Nye, Jr., *Globalization, What's New, What's Not, and So What?* In: *Foreign Policy*, Washington, DC, No. 118/Spring 2000, pp. 104-119. How Živojinović considers, while keeping the focus of their scientific work, “globalization is a sort of subtype of interdependence ...”. Dragan M. Živojinović, *Globalizacija u međunarodnim odnosima – pojam, dimenzije, istorijat, protivrečnosti*, in: editor, Dragan Đukanović, *Savremeni međunarodni izazovi: globalna i regionalna perspektiva*, Institute of International Politics and Economics, Belgrade, 2008, p. 388.

¹¹ David Đ. Dašić, *Istorija diplomatije*, Altera, Belgrade, 2012.

our conclusion is that the decline of American power today can be certainly discussed, but not as a final state of things, that is to say, as the end of American dominance in world affairs.”¹²

From the very beginning of rulers and states, the phenomenon of ascending and descending of personal or collective power was the topic and the subject of numerous analyses, expert reviews and articles. That and such relationship has been particularly intensified since the Middle Ages up to the present day. For this reason, for each state as a subject of international relations was, is and will be important:

1. the size of the population
2. territory,
3. natural resources,
4. economy,
5. military power,
6. culture, and
7. information technologies.

According to an expert on international relations and Americanologist, Dragan Simić, who successfully, among other things, have studied systematically and multidisciplinary the issues and discussions about the order, the term or phrase “world order’ is at the center of this debate.”¹³ Changes and issues about the orders in contemporary science of international relations and diplomatic history can be clearly identified and followed by three major events.

- A. Westphalian peace and international order of sovereign states.
- B. Summit at Yalta and the division of spheres of interest on the European continent in the world after World War II.
- C. Summit in Malta and the end of the international order – the Cold War.

We will briefly mention and look at the basic characteristics of the three mentioned, major transformations in the history of modern and contemporary international relations. That, all the more so because it is their correct observance and professional understanding that is important for assessment and accurate evaluation of the current situation but also as the way of contemplating the foreign policies of the relevant actors in the international system of the world.

¹² Dragan R. Simić, Dragan M. Živojinović, *Da li je opadanje neminovno? – nekoliko argumenata protiv*, in: Srpska politička misao, Institute for Political Studies, Belgrade, No. 2/2011, p. 186.

¹³ Dragan R. Simić, *Rasprava o poretku*, Zavod za udžbenike, Belgrade, 2012, p. 12.

*A. The Peace of Westphalia and international
order of sovereign states*

Peace of Westphalia¹⁴ was negotiated and signed on 24 October 1648, after a thirty-year war between the Emperor Ferdinand III, the German princes, representatives of the Netherlands, France and Sweden.

It was based on three important principles:

- (1) *rex est imperator in regno suo* – (king is an emperor on his national territory), the sovereign cannot be a subject to a higher authority including the Christian church, and every king is independent and equal in rights to any king,
- (2) *cujus regio, ejus religio* – (the ruler determines which religion will be present on the national territory where he is sovereign) up to that moment, from the outside no one has the right to intervene in someone else's sovereign territory of the state even if he has the right to intervene for religious reasons and
- (3) *stratera virtutis* – (balance of power), whose goal is the prevention of the establishment of hegemony on the European continent that would dominate all other rulers and peoples in their own countries.

The Peace of Westphalia established a new international Westphalian order¹⁵ and the Westphalian diplomacy, which was based on so-called principle of balance of power, and which had in its essence the balance of power and the balance of fear. "In the West, the only examples of functioning the balance of power can be found in the city-states of ancient Greece and in Renaissance Italy, as in the European state system created after the Peace of Westphalia in 1648. The main feature of the system was that the real situation – the existence of numerous states of approximately equal powers – understood as the principle that will govern the world order.

In intellectual terms, the idea of balance of power reflected the belief of all the leading political thinkers of the Enlightenment era."¹⁶ The beginning of the twentieth century, relations between the officials of the state of the world of that time, brought a new constellation of international uncertainty and diplomatic vastness. That was affected, first by two Balkan Wars then World War I, but also the 5th October 1917, when it was brutally overthrown tsarism of the Romanov dynasty in Russia, where revolutionary communists – the Bolsheviks, came to power led by Vladimir Lenin. Later on was formed the USSR led by the dictator

¹⁴ Leo Gross, *The Peace of Westphalia, 1648-1948*, in: *The American Journal of International Law*, Washington DC, Vol. 42, No. 1/1948, p. 20.

¹⁵ Charles W. Kegley, Gregory A. Raymond, *Exorcising the Ghost of Westphalia - Building World Order in the New Millennium*, Prentice Hall, New Jersey, 2002.

¹⁶ Henri Kisindžer, *Diplomatija*, Verzal press, Beograd, Vol. 1/1999, p. 8.

and tyrant Joseph Visarionovic Stalin, after the death of Lenin. In international, organizational, institutional and diplomatic sense, though, the first half of the twentieth century will be marked by, among other things, the formation of the previously mentioned international organization known as - the League of Nations. One of the most important proposals for the establishment of the League of Nations was given by a famous philosopher from the period of German classical idealism, Immanuel Kant and his ideas and proposals of the world community of nations in the function and purpose of eternal peace.¹⁷

It is believed that a specific proposal to then-president Woodrow Wilson for the formation of the League of Nations, and which he accepted, came from the then British Foreign Secretary Edward Grey.

The formation of the League of Nations was anticipated by Paris Peace Conference on 25th January 1919 and was established on 28th June in the same year by the Secretariat of the League of Nations. The charter of the League of Nations, at the beginning, was officially signed by 44 representatives of countries and 31 representatives of countries that supported the Triple Entente in the First World War. However, already mentioned the League of Nations held its first meeting on January 10, 1920 in London, and the Secretariat has acted and during World War II war, up to 1946, when it was dissolved. All rights and property was handed over to the newly formed international organization - the United Nations in New York on the East River, which has begun its existence since 24th October 1945. As you can see, between the two world wars in the twentieth century emerged a new and powerful country - the United States. "After the disaster represented by the First World War, Europe has never fully regained its leading role on the world stage. As the main actor, appeared the United States, but Woodrow Wilson soon made clear that his country refuses to behave in accordance with European rules."¹⁸ Large, global (Western) economic crisis of capitalism, which lasted from 1929 to 1933, left huge consequences, especially in Europe, but also in most of humanity of the modern world. Earlier, in 1924, will appear a book by Adolf Hitler - *Mein Kampf*,¹⁹ which will partly affect the later condition of mankind in terms of keeping the internal and foreign policy officials of states and their diplomacy. In Europe, the first country whose representatives would be against the League of Nations, even though they were full-fledged members, was the latter being Nazi Germany, which by this act liquidated

¹⁷ In addition to Eternal peace, the philosopher Kant wrote: "The Republican Constitution, with its light origin from the pure source of the legal concept includes in itself the hope that will lead to the desired consequence - to an eternal peace." Imanuel Kant, *Večni mir*, Valjevska štamparija, Beograd - Valjevo, 1995, p. 40.

¹⁸ Kisindžer, *Diplomatija*, op. cit., p. 9.

¹⁹ Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, Zentralverlag der NSDUP, München, 1940.

Versailles international order and their diplomacy. "The Lausanne Conference in 1932 suspended, as a matter of fact, German reparations. Next year, in 1933, in January Nazis took full power over Germany, and on October 19, of the same year, Germany, as Japan earlier, came out of the League of Nations."²⁰ Nazi Germany led by the Führer Adolf Hitler and Fascist Italy with Benito Mussolini led to the commencement of World War II.

B. Summit at Yalta and the division of spheres of interest in the European continent and in the world after World War II

With the beginning of World War II, there was formed the anti-Hitler coalition with the leaders of three of the most powerful states, the USA, the United Kingdom (Great Britain with Northern Ireland) and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics with their leaders. "Big Three anti-Hitler coalition - Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin started, even during World War II diplomacy at the top."²¹ Otherwise, diplomacy of anti-Hitler coalition, ended with Churchill Fulton's speech. "The dissolution of this specific diplomacy at the top during the World War II, did not significantly affect the results achieved by this diplomacy on conferences in three, especially the ones from Yalta and Potsdam."²²

The Summit in Yalta, where were Sir Winston Leonard Spencer Churchill, Prime Minister of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, thirty-second President of the United States and Visarionovich Joseph Stalin, President of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, was held from 4th to 11th February 1945, in Crimea. (Picture 1)

From the history of international relations and diplomacy, it is known that the above-mentioned, the Yalta summit between the three major leaders in the contemporary world, agreed to a division of spheres of interest in the European continent and in the world, but also the formation of the United Nations after the end of the World War II on May 9, 1945.

*C. The Summit on Malta and the end of the international order
– of the cold war*

Changes after the World War II led to the profiled structuring and formation of modern diplomacy. Soon there was a division of mankind in the western

²⁰ Branimir M. Janković, *Poreklo i razvitak diplomatije*, u: *Diplomatija – Zbornik radova*, IP Vaša knjiga doo, Beograd, 2006, p. 44.

²¹ M. Janković, *Poreklo i razvitak diplomatije*, op. cit., p. 47.

²² Ibid.

world, (which are represented by officials of the United States as a single bloc (with strategic allies formed on April 4, 1949, NATO) and the eastern bloc of the world of mankind, which was led by the officials of the USSR, who formed (as a counterpoint to NATO), the Warsaw Pact, which began its existence on 15 May 1955. Such their bilateral and multilateral relations created the bipolar international order and antagonistic diplomacy.

There was a period called the Cold War, which also caused the formation of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM), which is essentially anti-block in terms of classifying nations and countries. "After twenty-five years of its action, Non-Aligned Movement had built its political strategy in order to achieve the program established at the founding conference in Belgrade in 1961. Non-Aligned Movement focused its activity on the maintenance of the three-year summits of their countries and the governments and, in particular, in the framework of the United Nations as a kind of a political bloc in the world organization. Practice has shown that the non-aligned countries have built specific forms of traditional diplomacy and multilateral diplomacy, which they call the *diplomacy of non-aligned countries*."²³ The rivalry of officials in power in the United States and the Soviet Union did not turn out only at the international and diplomatic field, but also in the military, in the context of the development and use of highly sophisticated weapons and technology generation of a higher level of training such as nuclear weapons. After throwing nuclear bombs on the Japanese cities – Hiroshima on 6 August 1945 and Nagasaki 9 August 1945, the nuclear era has started in international relations as well as the bipolar diplomacy. "By the end of the forties, the USA was the only nuclear power in the world until 1949, when the Soviet Union carried out an explosion of a nuclear bomb. Since 1955, the West no longer has a monopoly on nuclear weapons, and in the late fifties, the USSR became a strong nuclear force. And from that moment begins 'nuclear diplomacy', as in the historical period that followed; the destructive power of nuclear energy knew no bounds in the destruction of the values of our civilization. For possible survivors all illusions were gone; all the theories about the possible destruction of the opponents gaining the benefits based on rapid effects of nuclear missiles became meaningless."²⁴ Thus began the era of nuclear diplomacy in the new international relations that was particularly evident in the days of the Cuban Missile Crisis,

²³ M. Janković, *Poreklo i razvitak diplomatije*, op. cit., p. 48. For the Non-Aligned Movement states there are two important international events that are a precursor to their first conference held in Belgrade from 1 to 6 September 1961, as follows: 1) Asia-Africa Conference held in Bandung from 18 to 24 April 1955, and 2) Meeting of president Josip Broz Tito, Gamal Abdel Nasser and Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru at Brioni on 18 and 19 July 1956. On this see closer and more detail: 1955–1992, Documents of the Conferences of the Non-Aligned Countries – Volume 1, Department of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia, Jakarta, 1992, pp. 5–11.

²⁴ M. Janković, *Poreklo i razvitak diplomatije*, op. cit., p. 48.

which lasted 14 days, from 14 to 28 October 1962. Thanks to the engagement of the best diplomats and so-called discreet diplomacy, it was peacefully ended.

The end of the twentieth century, among other important historical events, marked the demolition of the Berlin Wall and the end of communism,²⁵ as opposed international system of the world to the capitalist system of the world. "In the night between the 9th and 10th of November 1989, the Berlin Wall, that frightening symbol of the bipolar world, ideological intolerance and bigotry was demolished."²⁶ Disintegration of the bipolar system of diplomacy in contemporary international relations began with the arrival of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev came to power in the USSR in 1985. "When on March 11, 1985, he was elected for the general secretary CC CPSU, from that moment on, nothing was the same as before in the USSR, which was leading the typical communist (totalitarian) state, and especially in April when he started process of perestroika (re-alignment) as a means to this "glasnost" (loudness). An initiator, strategist and chief promoter of the reform, but essentially of a communist project of pe-restroika, was and remains Gorbachev."²⁷

By the Summit on the top of two of the then president, Ronald Reagan, the United States and the Soviet Union Mikhail Gorbachev, first in Reykjavik (the meeting ended without concrete results, but resulted in Agreement on nuclear disarmament, which is the specific contribution of their foreign policy of detente). In 1986 and later, by the meeting and their signatures in Malta, finally the era of bipolarity and the Cold War²⁸ in international relations was over, but not – nuclear diplomacy. At the Summit in Malta and by the signatures of the two aforementioned presidents, the end of the international order – the Cold War was marked on December 3, 1989.

²⁵ The fall of communism has been announced, before the fall of the Berlin Wall, by Zbigniew Brzezinski. For him, communism was a big failure. See: Zbigniew Brzezinski, *The Grand Failure: The Birth and Death of Communism in the Twentieth Century*, Charles Scribners's Sons, New York City, 1989.

²⁶ Jovica Trkulja, *Osvajanje demokratije – Ogled o postkomunizmu*, SING λογοζ, Belgrade, 1995, p. 21.

²⁷ Nenad A. Vasić, *Krah realnog socijalizma u SSSR-u i Istočnoj Evropi – Socijalističkoj Federativnoj Republici Jugoslaviji*, u: *Baština*, Priština-Leposavić, Vol. 21/2006, p. 233.

²⁸ See: Džon Luis Geddis, *Hladni rat: mi danas znamo*, Clío, Beograd, 2003. Still, the famous British historian Eric Hobsbawm believes that the Cold War ended in Reykjavik and Washington. "Practically the Cold War ended with the two summits in Reykjavik (1986) and Washington (1987)." Erik Hobsbawm, *Doba ekstrema – istorija kratkog dvadesetog veka*, Beograd, Dereta, 2002, p. 191. In this context it is interesting to comments Predrag Simić for Faculty of political Science in Belgrade. "The End of the Cold War marked, however, and the end of the system of international relations..." . Predrag Simić, *Evropa posle hladnog rata*, in: *Međunarodni problemi*, Institut za međunarodnu politiku i privredu, Belgrade, No. 3-4/1991, pp. 268-269.

*The Old and the New World Order – between European integration and the historical burdens:
Prospects and challenges for Europe of 21st century*

Table 1. Incidents of near nuclear use

Date Incident	States involved	Cause
October 1962 Miscommunication	Operation Anadyr	Soviet Union
27 October 1962 Conflict escalation	British nuclear forces during the Cuban missile crisis	United Kingdom
27 October 1962 Conflict escalation and miscommunication	Black Saturday	United States
22 November 1962 Espionage	Penkovsky false warning	Soviet Union
October 1973 1973 Conflict escalation	Arab-Israeli war	Israel
9 November 1979 Exercise scenario tape causes nuclear alert for reality	NORAD: Exercise tape mistaken	United States
3 June 1980 Faulty computer chip	NORAD: Faulty computer chip	United States
25 September 1983 Technical error	Serpukhov-15	Soviet Union
7–11 November 1983 exercise Misperception of military training	Able Archer-83	Soviet Union, United States
18–21 August 1991 Loss of command and control structure	Failed coup	Soviet Union
25 January 1995 Mistaken of research rocket launch	Black Brant scare	Russia identity
May–June 1999 Conflict escalation	Kargil crisis	India, Pakistan
December 2001–October 2002 Conflict escalation	Kashmir standoff	India, Pakistan

Source: Patricia M. Lewis, Heather Williams, Benoît Pelopidas, Sasan Aghlani, *Too Close for Comfort Cases of Near Nuclear Use and Options for Policy*, The Royal Institute of International Affairs, London, 2014, pp. VI.

In his famous speech, which was held on November 9, 1991 in the House Chamber (The House of Representatives) on Capitol Hill in Washington, then US President, George Herbert Walker Bush, in a live broadcast of the national television and radio, mentioned that Americans together with Arabs, Europeans, Asians and Africans were working on achieving the “principle and the dream of a new world order.”²⁹

After that there was created a so-called post-cold war era of mono polar world order³⁰ in the 90-ies of the twentieth century, that would get, at the beginning of the twenty-first century, the new contour elements and dimensions of uni (multi polar) world order in international relations as well as the globalization of diplomacy. It was also the period of the American cultural domination and cultural diplomacy. “The level of American cultural dominance itself has neither rivals or historical comparisons, nor there is a rival in sight. Moreover, as the world is becoming more urbanized, as humanity becomes increasingly interdependent and interactive, and that more traditional and predominantly rural parts of the world are becoming smaller and softer, the American cultural dominance is becoming more and more stronger.”³¹ Brzezinski once saw America as the only country in the role of a global leader of mankind. However, this was not the case with Joseph Nye who has warned the officials of the government of the United States that “our desire to go alone may ultimately weaken us.”³² In that context the next question is inevitable: what was the essence of Nye’s once true and useful warnings to government officials in the United States? “Modern information and its accompanying sign, globalization, transforms and reduces our world. At the beginning of this new century, these two forces have increased American power, including our ability to influence others

²⁹ George Herbert Walker Bush, *Address Before a Joint Session of the Congress on the Persian Gulf Crisis and the Federal Budget Deficit*, (Internet, 14/04/2014), http://bushlibrary.tamu.edu/research/public_papers.php?id=2217&year=1990&month=9. Interestingly, this is a particular occasion to note the observation of an theorist of international relations and former Ambassador of the USA, Christopher Hill regarding the beginning of the crisis in the Republic of Ukraine since October 2013, the annexation of the Crimea neighboring country to the Russian Federation until 21 April 2014, resulted in the end of the new world order. “The new world order lasted almost 25 years.” Christopherr Hill, *The End of the New World Order*, (Internet, 07/30/2014), <http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/christopher-r-hill-calls-on-the-west-to-prepare-for-a-long-struggle-with-a-revanchist-russia#wPdpHrWdiCYP1BRH.99>. Otherwise, according to Hill, “a conciliatory spirit of Russia and its commitment to a ‘new world order’, no matter how problematic it was, represents one of the greatest achievements of the era of the Cold War.” Hill, *The End of the New World Order*, *ibid*.

³⁰ Egon Macner, *Monopolarni svetski poredak: o socioekonomiji dominacije SAD*, Dosije, Belgrade, 2003.

³¹ Zbignjev Bžežinski, *Američki izbor: globalna dominacija ili globalno vođstvo*, Politička kultura – Zagreb/CID – Podgorica, 2004.

³² Džozef S. Naj, *Paradoks američke moći: zašto jedina svetska supersila ne može sama*, BMG, Beograd, 2004, p. 11.

through our attractive or 'soft' power. But over time, the technology will spread to other countries and people, and our relative superiority will be reduced."³³

This *pro futuro* insightful statement and accurate statement of Joseph Nye on the decline of American power reflected on the soft power³⁴ as opposed to former normal, highlighted findings of a theorist and international relations strategist Zbigniew Brzezinski was valid until 10 February 2007. The upward continuation and culmination in foreign policy and public diplomacy of Russian Federation, was presented on the annual Munich Conference on Security Policy, where on 10 February 2007, the active participation took the then President of the Russian Federation Vladimir Vladimirovich Putin. In the history and science of international relations it is considered as the *differentia specifica* of the previous unipolar world order with hegemony and dominance of the United States and NATO and the establishment of a new (uni) multi polar world order, which marks the return of the authorities of the Russian Federation in the global international relations and strong economic growth in the People's Republic of China with a restriction of its culture (it's not universalistic), viz cultural diplomacy³⁵ which is now in a modest advent and expansion in all parts of the modern world.

But let's get back to aforementioned international conference in Munich. To then President of the Russian Federation Vladimir Vladimirovich Putin, the type and format of the conference itself, and not only that, allowed him this to say: "The unipolar world has nothing in common with democracy."³⁶ On that occasion, Putin particularly emphasized and read to his critics: "Russia has been always taught about democracy but those who teach us, for some reason are reluctant to learn about democracy."³⁷ Unquestionably, it is understood that basically – (uni) multi polar world order is still in nuclear diplomacy.

"The international order in the twenty-first century will be marked by something that at first glance seems contradictory: on the one hand there will be fragmentation, on the other increasing of globalization. At the level of inter-state

³³ S. Naj, *Paradoks američke moći: zašto jedina svetska supersila ne može sama*, op. cit., p. 11.

³⁴ Joseph S. Nye, Jr. *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*, Public Affairs, New York, 2005. Also: Jan Melissen, *The New Public Diplomacy: Soft Power in International Relations*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2005.

³⁵ About Chinese cultural diplomacy, see: Herbert Passin, *China's Cultural Diplomacy*, Praeger, New York, in 1963.

³⁶ Владимир Владимирович Путин, *Выступление и дискуссия на Мюнхенской конференции по вопросам политики безопасности*, (Интернет, 26. 09.2010.), http://archive.kremlin.ru/appears/2007/02/10/1737_type63374type63376type63377_type63381type82634_118097.shtml.

³⁷ Путин, *Выступление и дискуссия на Мюнхенской конференции по вопросам политики безопасности*, также.

relations, the new order will be more like the European system of the states from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, but the rigid structures of the Cold War.”³⁸ The beginning of the twentieth century was characterized by intensive development of multilateral diplomacy, in addition to the traditional, well-known, double-sided and in our previous review, partly mentioned, as it was necessary, as described – bilateral diplomacy. “At the same time, international relations for the first time have truly become global. Communications are current; world economy operates simultaneously on all continents.”³⁹ Many of the problems that have emerged in the modern era and contemporary international relations (nuclear proliferation, environmental and climate change and environmental protection, demographic growth and economic interdependence of humanity) can be resolved only at the global level administration. All this has contributed to a significant increase in the number of subjects of public international law, with all its flaws and shortcomings. This is especially true for the new states and the newly formed international organizations, which has led to an increase not only of international contacts, but also to strengthen the diplomatic service in the world as such.

Unlike the old image of international relations, which a political writer and a renowned theorist of the foreign policy of Morton Kaplan,⁴⁰ described as a balance of power, bipolarity compared to other model of the international system, we are according to Richard Haass’s⁴¹ finding in a non-polar world, with a tendency

³⁸ Kisindžer, *Diplomatija*, op. cit., p. 10.

³⁹ Kisindžer, *Diplomatija*, op. cit., p. 10.

⁴⁰ Morton A. Kaplan, Balance of Power, bipolarity and Other Models of International Systems, in: Edited by James N. Rosenau, *International Politics and Foreign Policy – A Reader in Research and Theory*, The Free Press, New York, Collier-Macmillan Limited, London, 1968, p. 343.

⁴¹ Richard Haas finds that there are three main reasons that have contributed to non-polar world: “First, some states have gained power through economic progress. Second, globalization has weakened the role of all states by allowing other entities to gain significant power. Third, American foreign policy has accelerated the relative collapse of the United States compared to other states.” Ričard N. Has, *Živeti u nepolarnom svetu*, u: *Danas*, Beograd, No. 3859/2008, p. 16. Also see: Richard N. Haas, *The Age of Nonpolarity – What Will Follow US Dominance*, in: *Foreign Affairs*, New York, Volume 97, No. 3/2008, pp. 44-56. For us it is especially important that Haas reviewed the consequences of all previously mentioned in the perception of power in the world. “The consequence of all this is a world in which power is more shared and not concentrated.” Has, *To live in a non-polar world*, op. cit., p. 16. We could say that in the world, on foreign policy and diplomatic field, it’s definitely there, a change of polarity. The polarity of the power in the world’s foreign policy and diplomatic transition from (uni) multipolarism through non-polarism to the extended bipolarity, not the new multipolarity. So, there is a new extended bipolarity. In addition, the new expanded bipolarity is an essential feature of the modern world on foreign policy and diplomatic fields. However, all this will be in the context of national and state interests of Serbia and on our foreign policy strategy only partially (more positive than negative) has an impact. This is all the more so because it is still the power of the

towards a multi polar world. Note also that one of the former American ambassador in Belgrade, otherwise outstanding connoisseur of regional foreign policy and domestic political processes and relationships among actors in the Western Balkans and the region of Southeast Europe - William Montgomery wrote an analytical column titled - Welcome to a multi polar world.⁴² Starting from the realistic theory in contemporary international relations, the current situation in the international world system I have called - *extended bipolarity*. What is the extended bipolarity and how I define it?

The extended bipolarity is a new order in the international system of the world as opposed to a neutral and non-aligned states, where on the western half of humanity of planet Earth there is a dominance of the US with most Allied governments of full United Nations member states, in regard to its eastern half with formed a three-state counterpoint - Russian federations - People's Republic of China - Republic of India as an integral part of the group of states or BRICS with the Eurasian Union, without generally accepted leadership and clearly profiled molded center of interdependent power. So, there is no multi polarity in the modern world, although such interests undoubtedly exist. We, as mankind are, however, in an extended bipolarity dominated by the USA and its strategic partners and allies.

According to the scholar and analyst of international relations Dragan Petrović, from the Institute of International Politics and Economics in Belgrade, the formation of BRIC⁴³ (now BRICS after joining South Africa on April 13, 2011 - Federative Republic of Brazil, Russian Federation, Republic of India, People's Republic of China, Republic of South Africa), marked among other things, an attempt to turn towards a multi polar world order. The former old paradigm (the old center of the world in terms of organization - the seat of the largest international organizations of the UN remains in New York and institutionally in Washington, IMF and World Bank), has been changed by the new reality of

United States in local spheres of interest of their diplomatic activity and regional international relations in the Western Balkans and Southeastern Europe so far dominant with all prospects will be so in the near future with a strategic partnership with the EU and NATO, but with significant influence officials and businessmen from the Russian Federation. Although still a possibility is that even such a dominant position may change in someone else's benefit. All this certainly should not be a reason to neglect the bilateral and multilateral relations with all relevant actors to acknowledge in international relations - the representatives of the UN member states.

⁴² Vilijem Montgomeri, *Dobrodošli u multipolarni svet*, in: Danas vikend, Belgrade, No. 3862-3863/2008, p. VII.

⁴³ Dragan Petrović, *Ka multipolarnom svetskom poretku*, Pešić i sinovi/Centar za razvoj međunarodne saradnje, Belgrade, 2010, p. 11. The first summit of BRIC countries was held on June 16, 2009 in Jekatarinburg in the Russian Federation.

the extended bipolarity of the USA with state officials and allies and RF officials allied countries, including the member states of BRICS.

The project of Vladimir Vladimirovich Putin – Eurasia⁴⁴ from the 3rd of October 2011, as an Agreement on the Eurasian Economic Union⁴⁵ and an alternative to the existing European Union, has begun with its realization in Astana on May 29, 2014, when it was approved and signed by Nursultan Nazarbayev Abishuly,⁴⁶ the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Vladimir Vladimirovich Putin, then president of the Russian Federation and Alexander Grigoriyevich Lukashenko, President of the Republic of Belarus.

In the first part - Establishment of the Eurasian Economic Union, Chapter I General provisions in Article 1, Establishment of the Eurasian Economic Union, paragraph 1, it is written: "By the existing contract, the parties have established the Eurasian Economic Union (here and after – EAEU) within which the free movement of goods, services, capital and labor, will be implemented by a coordinated, coherent and unified policy in the sectors defined in this Treaty and with international agreements within the Union."⁴⁷ In Article 1, paragraph 2, the following is provided: "The Union is an international organization of regional economic integration, which has an international legal subjectivity."⁴⁸

In the second Section II - Basic principles, objectives and competencies and Union law, in section 4 – basic principles of functioning of the Union, it is written:

⁴⁴ Владимир Владимирович Путин, *Новый интеграционный проект для Евразии – будущее, которое рождается сегодня*, (Интернет, 17. 05. 2014.), <http://izvestia.ru/news/502761#ixzz320jQM6Br>. Among the most important ideologues, theorists and promoters of Eurasia and future Eurasian Union are the philosopher Aleksandr Dugin Gelyevich and historian and director of the Russian Institute for Strategic Studies, Leonid Petrovich Reshetnikov. The two were the closest associates to current RF Prime Minister, Putin. See: Александр Гельевич Дугин, *Мистерии Евразии: Сакральная география*, Арктогея-Центр, Москва, 1996. Александр Гельевич Дугин, *Наш путь: стратегические перспективы развития России в XXI веке*, Арктогея центр, Москва, 1999. Александр Гельевич Дугин, *Евразийский путь как национальная идея: стратегические перспективы развития России в XXI веке*, Арктогея центр, Москва, 2002. See especially: Александр Гельевич Дугин, *Основы Евразийства*, Арктогея-Центр, Москва, 2002. с. 5-787. Александр Гельевич Дугин, *Проект "Евразия"*, ЭКСМО, Язуз, 2004. Леонид Петрович Решетников, *Вернуться в Россию: Третий путь, или тушки безнадежности*, ФИВ, Москва, 2013.

⁴⁵ *Договор о Евразийском Экономическом Союзе*, (Интернет, 29. 07. 2014.), http://online.zakon.kz/Document/?doc_id=31548839. Otherwise, the Eurasian Economic Union can be compared to the European Economic Community of 25 March 1957 to the formation of the Economic Community of July 1, 1967, prior to the European Union, which was established in the Maastricht Treaty on 7 February 1992, and began to be implemented from January 1, 1993.

⁴⁶ Александр Гельевич Дугин, *Евразийская миссия Нурсултана Назарбаева*, РОФ "Евразия", Москва, 2004.

⁴⁷ *Договор о Евразийском Экономическом Союзе*, также.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*

“The Union operates within the jurisdiction assigned to it by the Member States in accordance with this Agreement, based on the following principle:

- compliance with universally recognized principles of international law, including the principle of sovereign equality of member states and their territorial integrity;
- respect for diversity of political structures;
- member states;
- mutually beneficial cooperation, equality and national interests of the parties;
- adherence to the principles of market economy and fair competition;
- functioning of the customs union, no exceptions and limitations after a transitional period.

Member States should create favorable conditions for the realization of its functions and the Union and shall refrain from measures which could jeopardize the attainment of the objectives of the Union.”⁴⁹

In Chapter III - The bodies of the Union, Article 8 of the bodies of the Union, paragraph 1, the following is regulated:

“1. The bodies of the Union are:

- High Eurasian Economic Council (hereinafter - the High Council);
- Eurasian Intergovernmental Council (hereinafter - the Intergovernmental Council);
- The Eurasian Economic Commission (hereinafter - the Commission, EEC);
- The Court of the Eurasian Economic Union (hereinafter - the Court Union).

2. Councils of the Union shall act within the powers given to them by this Treaty and with international agreements within the Union.

3. Councils of the Union are based on the principles set out in Article 3 of this Agreement.

4. Presidency of the Supreme Council of the Intergovernmental Council and the Council of the Commission shall be on a rotational basis by the Russian alphabetic order of a Member State of the Union within one calendar year without a new opportunity.

5. The conditions of stay in the territory of the member states are determined by specific international agreements between the Union and state of residence.”⁵⁰

⁴⁹ Ibid.

⁵⁰ Ibid.

In Chapter XXVIII Final Provisions, Section 108, allows the Member States as follows:

“Joining the Union

1. The Union is open to all countries that pursue their goals and principles, under the terms agreed by the member states.
2. In order to obtain the status of a candidate country for membership in Union, the states send their requests to the President of the Supreme Council.
3. For the decision about giving the status of a candidate to some state, it is necessary to have the prior approval of the Supreme Council of the Union by the consensus.
4. Based on the decision, the Supreme Council forms a working group of representatives of the candidate countries, Member States and the Union (hereinafter - a working group) to investigate the level of preparedness of the candidate to assume the obligations of Union law, to make an action programme on the accession of the candidate countries to the EAEC, as well as a draft of international Agreement on the accession of the State of the candidate to the Union, which defines the scope of the rights and responsibilities of candidates, as well as the format of participation in the work of the Union.
5. The programme of Action for the candidate to enter the Union should be approved by the Supreme Council.
6. The Working Group regularly submits a report to the Supreme Council on the implementation of the State Program of candidates for the Action accession to the Union. On the recommendation of the working group that the candidate country has fully complied with the obligations arising from Union law, the High Council shall take a decision on the signing of the candidate international agreement on accession. The achieved contract is subject to approval.”⁵¹

In the above mentioned Section XXVIII of Final Provisions, Article 110, it is provided the usage of the working language of the Union Councils as well as the language of international treaties within the Union and the Commission’s decisions.

- “1. The Working language of the Union Council is Russian language.
2. The International Contracts within the Union and the Commission’s decisions are binding on member states, adopted in Russian and then translated into the national languages of the Member States, if so provided by its law in a manner determined by the Commission.

⁵¹ *Договор о Евразийском Экономическом Союзе, также, op. cit.*

Translations into national languages of the Member States shall be paid from the account of funds allocated in the budget of the Union provided for this purpose.

3. In the case of differences in interpretation of international treaties and decisions referred to paragraph 2 of this article, the text in Russian is being used.”⁵²

Finally, in the above mentioned Section XXVIII Final Provisions, Article 118, it has been provided the possibility of leaving the Eurasian Economic Union, of the rightful member states to clearly prescribed manner.

“Withdrawal from the Union

1. Any Member State may withdraw from this Agreement, submitting to the Depositary Agreement by the diplomatic channel, written notice of its intention to withdraw from the existing contract. The implementation of the existing Agreement with respect to such State shall cease after 12 months from the date of receipt by the Depositary of the Contract of such notification.
2. Member State which has notified in accordance with paragraph 1 of this Article, of its intention to withdraw from this Agreement shall be obliged to repay financial obligations incurred in connection with its participation in this Agreement. This obligation applies despite the withdrawal of the state from this Agreement to its full implementation.
3. Based on the information specified in paragraph 1 of this Article, the Supreme Council makes the decision about the beginning of the process of fulfilling obligations in connection with the participation of member states in this Agreement.
4. Withdrawal from this Agreement automatically entails the termination of membership in the Union and exit from international agreements in the framework of the Union.”⁵³

Active implementation of the Treaty on the Eurasian Economic Union will start from January 1, 2015. Otherwise, the Eurasian Union is in many ways a replacement for the former Soviet Union, and the completion of the aforementioned advent of perestroika took place Anatolyevich Dmitri Medvedev of the Russian Federation President Vladimir Vladimirovich Putin after 7 May 2008, which once started Mikhail Sergeevich Gorbachev.

⁵² Ibid.

⁵³ Ibid.

Nevertheless, the Warsaw Pact compensates for the Shanghai Cooperation Organization,⁵⁴ and for the OSCE (Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe), the Organization of the Collective Security and Cooperation i.e. CSTO– the Collective Security Treaty Organization.⁵⁵

Table 2. Summary of the history of international relations from the sixteenth century to the 29th of June 2014

Period	leading countries	main sources of power
Sixteenth century	the Kingdom of Spain	Gold bars, grocery colonies, mercenary armies and dynastic connections
Seventeenth century	The Kingdom of the Netherlands	Trade, capital markets, Navy
Eighteenth century	The French Republic	population size, industry of agricultural products; efficient public administration, military, culture (soft power)
Nineteenth century	The UK - Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Industry, political unity government in the state, stable finances and efficient credit system, the Navy, the liberal norms (soft power), the insular position of the country (which makes it easy for military defense in case of an attack)
Twentieth century	The USA – The United States of America	- Economic power leadership in the field of scientific and technical achievements, geographic location, military might and power ally, universal culture and the formation of international regimes that reflect liberalism (soft power)
Twenty-first century	The United States until June 29, 2014 (with military allies and strategic partners) versus BRICS and the Eurasian Union (with allies and strategic partners in the era of expanded bipolarity of the international system of the world)	

⁵⁴ 上海合作组织, Шанхайская организация сотрудничества, (Internet, 30. 07. 2014.), <http://www.sectsc.org/>.

⁵⁵ Организация Договора о коллективной безопасности, (Internet, 30. 07. 2014.), <http://www.odkb-csto.org/>.

3. The order of EU and integration of Serbia

As we have detailed and multidisciplinary reviewed all the relevant aspects and dimensions of change and establishment of orders that they caused in the history of international relations, then it is also necessary to think and analyze the current order of the EU as well as the position and possible perspective of integration into the same, for our country – the Republic of Serbia.

For each country in the world and its people, that is to say the citizens, it is important the type of dominant constitutional and political order with the leadership elite. This is definitely the case with the European Union. However, there is one, among other important issues in the science of international relations and diplomacy theory: what is actually present, newly established political and legal order of the European Union, with its 28 full-fledged member states by the Treaty of Lisbon in 2009?

Map 1. EU with its 28 full-member states



There are four of our thesis and supporting arguments that we could use to identify and explain how it has been created and changed the order of the EU.

1. The history of the idea of Europe from the myth to the most successful peace project of the United Nations and the governments of current European Union – is the result of thoughts and work of many known and unknown people, first of all, Jean Monnet, Robert Schumann and Konrad Adenauer.
2. Without the support of the Americans, approval of officials of the United Kingdom and finally, the Franco-German strategic partnership would not have been the Coal and Steel Community, Euratom, the Treaty of Rome, the European Economic Community, the European Community, the Copenhagen criteria, European Monetary Union (EMU) and therefore not present EU.
3. Undoubtedly, the current EU have has a very powerful monarchical tradition, nobility, county, labor and liberal and social capitalism, the Christian heritage with Islam and other small religious communities, the *acquis communautaire*, electoral, representative and participatory democracy in the European Parliament but also republicanism⁵⁶ as a form of government, consensual decision-making in the European Commission and the European Council.
4. Finally, the current EU is a part of the North Atlantic collective defense – NATO with Euro corpus and security police system with Europol.

As rightly pointed and commented on the Lisbon Treaty by Juan Mayoral, the democratic legitimacy⁵⁷ of the European Union is first mentioned in the Preamble, and later in the Article 10, which we will analyze later. Of course, in the center of the political system of the European Union there is a person i.e. a citizen in the name of the citizen of full member states.

In the Title II Provisions on democratic principles, Kosnsolid's Treaty for the European Union which came into force on 1 December 2009, Article 9 regulates the issue of the citizens. "In all its activities, the Union respects the principle of equality of its citizens, who are equal before its institutions, agencies and bodies. EU citizen is any person who has the nationality of a Member State. Citizenship of the Union shall be added to the national citizenship and does not replace it."⁵⁸

⁵⁶ Damian Charlmes, Gareth Davies, Giorgio Monti, *European Union Law*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge/New York/Melbourne/Madrid/Cape Town/Singapore/Sao Paulo/Delhi/Dubai/Tokyo, 2010, p. 132.

⁵⁷ Juan Mayoral, *Democratic improvements in the European Union under the Lisbon Treaty: Institutional changes regarding democratic government in the EU*, European Union Democracy Observatory (miracle)/Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies / European University Institute, Fiesole, 2011, p. 1.

⁵⁸ *Konsolidovani Ugovor o Evropskoj uniji: od Rima do Lisabona*, Preveo i priredio Milutin Janjević, JP Službeni glasnik, Belgrade, 2009, p. 32.

Also, the Title II, Article 10, regulates the functioning of the European Union, which is based on democratic representation. "The functioning of the Union shall be founded on the democratic representation.

2. The Citizens are, at the level of the Union, directly represented in the European Parliament. The Heads of State or Government of the Member States are in the European Council and in the Council by their governments, which are in line with democratic principles accountable to their national parliaments and to their citizens.
3. Every citizen has the right to participate in the democratic life of the Union. Decisions are made in public and on the level as close as possible to the citizens.
4. Political parties at European level contribute to forming European political awareness and to expressing the will of citizens of the Union."⁵⁹

However, the question arises: what is the current EU – the state or an international organization? The present EU is a semi-state, semi-national organization with a common foreign and security policy and personality in international relations. Otherwise, in 48 countries around the world there are diplomatic missions of the EU.

According to the keynote address, Prime Minister of the Republic of Serbia Aleksandar Vučić, Serbia is a candidate country in the accession negotiations for full EU membership by 2020. This goal is not impossible if good access negotiations with the harmonization with the EU *Acquis communautaire* are completed by 2018, and the negotiations for full membership of our country successfully come to an end by 2020, which is publicly proclaimed goal. "I want clearly to say – The European Union is not an ideal community, for it has its own flaws and problems. But it is the best state association that currently exist in the world and our place is in its membership. Already during the negotiations on the EU membership, our society will be modernized and changed, because we are going to adopt a number of standards in the public administration, the judiciary, education, health, economy and society. Small and poor societies, such as ours, these standards alone would never have reached and that is why for us the EU membership is a great advantage and opportunity. We continue negotiations in good faith that we will finish them by the end of this government. This process is our priority and if we work hard, I believe that Serbia by the end of this decade could become a member of the European Union."⁶⁰

⁵⁹ *Konsolidovani Ugovor o Evropskoj uniji: od Rima do Lisabona*, op. cit., p. 32.

⁶⁰ Aleksandar Vučić, *Okvirni ekspozé: „Predsednika Vlade Republike Srbije Aleksandar Vučić”*, Vlada Republike Srbije, 27/04/2014, p. 8.

Final review

The issue of changes in international relations and the conduct of foreign policy is essential for all officials in power in any internationally recognized state of the world, of any full member of the United Nations. Bearing in mind our overall, the previous detailed and multidisciplinary review of change in international relations and the order of the European Union, we draw four conclusions.

1. Changes in international relations are frequent, dynamic by its contents and numerous by the direct and indirect participants, and finally, far-reaching by the significance.
2. As humanity, we are in an era of the *extended bipolarity*, but not in the stage of a new Cold War.
3. The Order of the EU as a semi-state and semi-international organization is incomplete and will be subject to further reforms, constitutional, institutional and organizational structuring but also further intensification of the process of enlargement on the European and Asian continent.
4. The crisis and the war in Cyprus from 20 July to 15 August 1974, a military air campaign of NATO bombing and the war in Kosovo from March 24 to June 10, 1999, the war in Georgia (Abkhazia and South Ossetia) from 7 August to 16 August 2008, with the rejection of the EU's enlargement policy of the Eastern partnership with Ukraine on 21 November 2013, a democratic referendum secession of Crimea on 16 March 2014 and the civil war, the open question of the status of the city Kaliningrad (Russian territory between the Baltic sea, the Republic of Poland and the Republic of Lithuania with a total area of 15,100 km² within a distance of 320 km from the state border of the Russian Federation to the European Union) and the pro-Russian secession of Transnistria (Republic of Moldova) with occasional complications in negotiations on integration European Union with the Turks, will result in de facto obtaining eastern and southern territorial borders of the EU.

In the Republic of Serbia as a pro-European and military neutral country in the Western Balkans in Southeastern Europe, the most serious alternative to 2020, before eventually full-fledged membership in the EU, will represent the project and support together with the followers to the Eurasian Union with the Shanghai Cooperation Organization and the CSTO. Thus, there is an alternative to the European Union, and whether Serbia will be a full member state of the European Union, the citizens will decide on the publicly announced and conducted democratic referendum.