

In Memory of David Greenwood

By Peter Volten

On 12 May we received the news that David Greenwood had passed away. It was expected in a way, but still it came as a shock. David had been suffering from a disease one can fight for some time, but never beat. Although at the end he was very weak and never left home anymore, David was not supposed to leave Margaret and all of us so soon.



David Greenwood

David was a rigorous and highly knowledgeable scholar in the field of security and defence studies, particularly engaged in defence economics. He was a well-known defence consultant in the UK and the US, and a gifted teacher in defence studies. To us at CESS he was all of these things, and also a very demanding editor. He would return our drafts for Harmonie Papers with many substantive questions and thoughtful suggestions. The manuscripts had turned red because he had gone through them line by line, making innumerable corrections. A meticulous editor, he was equally critical about his own writing. David's work took time. He required a bit of patience for the perfection he envisaged, and we simply had to get used to his high standards. All the same, his deadlines were strict and feared, even if they had been

laid out very carefully in advance. No excuses; he had told you before. He was a very responsible and great Research Director who instructed many young staff members of CESS in a way they will remember for the rest of their careers. He improved the CESS publications admirably.

His sense of humour was remarkable. An economist by training, he would at the beginning of a seminar warn the audience about his 'dull' contribution by defining an economist as 'a bookkeeper, but one who is lacking in sex appeal.' When David's efforts to convince the armed forces of NATO in the 1980's to get into the business of task specialisation and division of labour found some unexpected support, he told us: 'This should not go too fast, or we will be out of business.' Of course, in the event, nothing happened. Close to nothing has ever been achieved in this field. Equally funny were his imaginative acronyms for the programmes of CESS: Marmara, Catch 33 and Escada, for example.

David was involved in our work in Eastern and Central Europe since the early 1990's. He spoke on countless occasions in our programme 'National Security Education' before he became our Research Director. He continued to travel in Eastern and Central Europe more than anyone else at the Centre, in spite of his rather limited capacity to walk and move around on airports and in cities. Over the years this became more difficult, but he would not relinquish the pleasure and task of helping the region to successfully carry out reforms in the field of security. He would certainly not give up his appetite for shuttling between Aberdeen and Groningen.

I am convinced he missed Groningen a lot during his illness, when travelling had become too troublesome. The Guesthouse of the university, the cafés next door and the restaurants around every corner: he loved them all. We loved having him here, and we will miss his presence in the town's scenery just as Margaret will miss him in her Aberdeen surroundings. We wish her well in overcoming this great loss.

- page 2
Serbia, Georgia
- page 3
Kazakhstan
- page 5
Turkey
- page 6
Germany, Moldova
- page 7
Civil-military relations
- page 8
Turkey
- page 9
Editorial: Child soldiers
- page 10
People
- page 11
Commentary: Rights of soldiers
- page 12
Commentary: Moldova

Winter Course at Belgrade University



Minster of Defence claims he did not break the law

In January 2009, CESS organised a two-week Winter Course for the second year in a row. As in 2008, this event was organised with the University of Groningen and the University of Belgrade. The Winter Course was called “New Challenges in Security: Trends, Lessons, and Developments”, and it was held at the Faculty of Security Studies at the University of Belgrade. The main sponsor was the Netherlands Embassy to Serbia. Working with the University of Groningen, CESS developed the structure and content of the course. CESS was responsible for the contents of the second week, logistics of the entire course and selecting and inviting lecturers from outside the University of Groningen, whilst the university itself was responsible for the contents of the first week and the academic philosophy behind the programme.

One of the main aims of the Winter Course was to introduce the 30 students from Croatia, Macedonia and Serbia (including cadets from the Serbian Defence Academy) to modern, interactive styles of education and ‘western’ perceptions of security, reconstruction and civil-military relations. The Winter Course had an ambitious goal, i.e. to expand and augment the knowledge of students in the western Balkans regarding security policy through the application of western didactic methods and techniques. Consequently, the programme was broad in design. International security, humanitarian interventions, reconstruction, democratic governance in the security sector, civil-military relations, international organisations and even international law were subjects that were taught during the two weeks. Both the students and the visiting lecturers indicated that they were enthusiastic about the contents of the programme.

Overall, the fresh and different way of looking at problems related to international security was appreciated by the students. The acceptance of differing viewpoints in the literature, among the lecturers and among the students themselves, was found very refreshing. This is unheard of in their regular courses, and some students said it had

changed the way they would now approach their studies. Especially the free and open discussions, the simulation game at the centre of the course, and the time the lecturers took for answering questions was new to them and greatly appreciated.

Georgia Parliamentary Programme Launched

Since late 2007, Georgia has been going through a period of turbulence. The presidential and parliamentary elections of 2004 had given the Saakashvili government a powerful mandate, which it used vigorously to advance its ambitious modernization plans. For several years, the opposition had failed to mobilise public opinion. However, the latter months of 2007 saw massive public demonstrations in Tbilisi and heavy-handed responses from the government. Security forces attacked protesters, and the government declared a state of emergency, blaming the unrest on Russia. Many domestic and foreign observers feared that Georgia was abandoning the road to democracy. However, the state of emergency was soon lifted, and the government called an early presidential election. International observers said it was largely democratic, despite some irregularities, but opposition forces claimed that the president’s results had been boosted by fraud. Mr Saakashvili won an absolute majority in the first round of polling. At the parliamentary elections, held in May 2008, Mr Saakashvili’s party, the United National Movement, won by a landslide, claiming 119 out of 150 seats. Just when it looked as if the democratic process had been restored, a war broke out with the Russian Federation over the region of South Ossetia. In its aftermath, public unrest in Georgia started to rise again, and the opposition united in massive and peaceful demonstrations against the Saakashvili administration. Since 9 April, thousands of protesters have assembled in front of the parliament every day to demand the resignation of the president.



Official launch of the Georgia Parliamentary Programme



Discussing Georgia NATO relations

Against this background, CESS and its Georgian partner the Centre for European Integration Studies are carrying out a programme to help Georgia's parliament to oversee the government's military and police forces. It aims to promote good governance and strengthen democratic control of the security sector by building capacity in parliament and society. Key groups will develop a better understanding of what democratic control of the security sector entails, and acquire the skills to exercise effective legislative oversight of defence and security.

Georgia's parliament has already become more active, powerful and relevant than it was before the Rose Revolution. However, the oversight it exercises over the executive in the field of defence and security is not as consistent, critical and effective as it should be according to reform-minded Georgians. There are several reasons for this. First, it is never easy for parliamentarians to get a strong grip on defence and security policy, and in Georgia, they only recently began to do this. Second, the country has an ambitious government with a comfortable majority in parliament. While the president and his ministers are committed to democracy, they want to get on with their job without much interference from parliament, and most MPs have so far been happy to comply. And third, people tend to rally around their government when their country faces serious security threats. This is the case in Georgia, and it does not encourage parliamentarians to take a critical stance on security matters.

Despite these problems, or perhaps because of them, there is a strong desire among politicians and civil society in Georgia for their parliament to play a much more active and prominent role in the domain of security matters. The turbulence of lately has added to the urgency of such reforms. The programme wants to facilitate and encourage this change.

On 8 April, just one day before the announced mass demonstrations of the opposition, the Georgia Parliamentary Programme was launched in the parliament buildings. The programme was opened by the deputy chairman of parliament, George Tsereteli, the Netherlands Ambassador to Georgia and Armenia, Onno Elderenbosch, and on behalf of CESS our chairman Wim van Eekelen. After the introduction of the programme by Sami Faltas and the president of our partner institute, Vasili Tchkoidze, the first seminar commenced. During this seminar, we focussed on the role of parliament in reviewing, assessing and evaluating defence-related documents. With the participants we assessed the current status of the legislative framework for defence and security in Georgia. Furthermore we discussed the relationship between Georgia and NATO and the role of parliament in this.

Despite our initial fears that the announced mass demonstrations of the opposition in front of parliament would preoccupy our intended participants to such a degree that it would affect our seminar, the opposite turned out to be true. It suggests that even in turbulent times, Georgia's parliament is committed to reform, which is very encouraging.

Starling Training Courses in Kazakhstan

In November 2008 we travelled to Kazakhstan to conduct a training course dealing with accountable and transparent policy-making in law enforcement. Like the governments in most other former Soviet republics, the rulers of Kazakhstan strictly control their law enforcement bodies (police, border troops, tax police, etc.), but do not necessarily consider themselves accountable for the actions of their civil servants. Oversight bodies do not oversee the executive branch, but provide its actions with a stamp of approval, and the business of government is not transparent, but extremely murky. So accountability and transparency do not follow from strict state control. In a dictatorship, this makes perfect sense, but in a country on the road to democracy, it is a legacy that needs to be overcome. In a democracy, the government may not withhold information just because it believes disclosure is unnecessary. In principle, the people have a right to know everything their government is doing. Besides, in a democracy there is no public power without public accountability. Politicians must account for all their actions and the actions of the people working under their responsibility. In David Greenwood's phrase, they must reveal, explain and justify.

These democratic principles are fundamental and unambiguous, but not always seriously applied. Sometimes they are used as window-dressing, to lend a democratic appearance to undemocratic practices. In the security sector, this is always hazardous and undesirable, but in law enforcement it can be an immediate threat to people's lives. Unlike the military, the police and other law enforcers are in constant



Disaster relief course in Almaty

touch with the population. Interacting with the public is part of their daily work. If the police do not enjoy the trust of the population, they will be unable to fight crime and provide an adequate level of security. Indeed, they may themselves be a threat to human security. The population will fear and mistrust them. So effectiveness and good community relations go hand in hand. Both are indispensable to successful policing. CESS strongly believes that democratic governance of the security sector provides the best possible basis for both.

This was the essence of our law enforcement training course in Kazakhstan. After Bauke Snoep introduced the above-mentioned principles of democratic governance, Starlink instructor Peter Hobbing emphasised the need for an effective system of border security. This could help prevent smuggling and support the fight against terrorism and organised crime. It will not only provide for security and stability in Central Asia, but also have direct positive effects on the wider region and the EU. To stress this point, Hobbing went deeper into the workings of the EU Border Mission in Central Asia (BOMCA). The next speaker was Peter Heepen, another seasoned Starlink instructor. Heepen's theme was police, state and community, so he dealt with the philosophy outlined above. Besides, he compared Soviet policing with community-based policing. Mark Galeotti of New York University dealt with the issue of organised crime. He said, you need to understand what organised crime is and does before you can fight it. Organised crime will fill the vacuum if democratic governance fails. As Galeotti put it, the weaker democratic governance is, the more organised crime will flourish, and the other way around.

The role-play of the law enforcement course deals with an incident in the fictitious country Croania, where a few immigrants were shot by the police after they robbed a store.

Parliament conducts an investigation about supposed police brutality. Was the shooting racially motivated? Why did this robbery climax into a dramatic shooting? Should the political leadership of Croania take responsibility for the drama? And what does this mean? Questions like these were raised during the role-play. Erik Sportel moderated the game in Astana, and Merijn Hartog performed this task in Almaty. In Astana committee proceedings were not conducted in an orderly fashion: every committee member followed his or her own agenda. We also saw a serious breach of the separation of state powers: the parliamentary committee started interfering actively in the criminal trial of the police officers involved in the incident. The trainees highly appreciated the role-play and most of them were eager to learn from what had gone wrong in the game.

In March 2009 we returned to Kazakhstan for our final course, on a new topic: disaster relief and crisis management. The reasoning behind this is that Kazakhstan is very vulnerable to natural disasters like earthquakes and environmental degradation. Natural disasters are a clear and present security threat to Kazakhstan and the wider region. An interesting aspect of disaster relief management is that interagency cooperation is critically important when a disaster occurs. Parliament needs to remain involved during the entire process, although the executive has more powers during a state of emergency than at other times. Of course, in a democracy, the government is accountable for its actions to parliament when the state of emergency has ended. The mechanisms that come into operation before, during and after a natural disaster or national crisis (interdepartmental cooperation, extended powers of the government during a state of emergency, accountability to parliament after the state of emergency, communication with the population during and after a disaster, etc) are much more interesting and relevant for CESS than the technical and operational side of disaster response.



Disaster relief trainees in Almaty

We developed and organised this final training course together with the COT Institute for Safety, Security and Crisis Management in The Hague. Karen Engel of the COT Institute provided a case study on Hurricane Katrina during the course, which was considered very helpful by the trainees because of the many mistakes made in the United States. In another session, she analysed public communication and societal engagement during and after a disaster. Karen Engel also conducted an exercise together with CESS staff member Pollien van Keulen. This dealt with interagency cooperation before and during a disaster. The original idea of Van Keulen and Engel was to divide the trainees in two groups and let them design a model which reflected interagency cooperation in Kazakhstan. However, in Almaty the trainees came up with an interesting alternative. The trainees drew the model of Kazakhstan while the instructors drew the scheme of interagency cooperation in the Netherlands. The differences that came to light were dramatic: in the Netherlands the dynamic runs from the bottom to the top, while in Kazakhstan it is top-down.

Bauke Snoep moderated the role-play in Astana, Merijn Hartog did the same in Almaty. This new game deals with the aftermath of a natural disaster in Croania. Did the government abuse the rights it has under the state of emergency? Did they breach the law on emergencies? And why did the government refuse to make use of several offers of foreign aid? In both cases the games were played with a lot of passion, but in the end the government could rebut most accusations. However, we always tell our trainees before the role-play that there is no correct or wrong outcome. Rather, we want to show them that it is very difficult to uphold the law, and why it is vital for parliament to be critical and assertive, and for the government to reveal, explain and justify their actions. In Kazakhstan we brought this message across.

Workshop on Security Studies at Bilkent University

'Security is a global issue and an overall problem that belongs to all of us.' This true and valid statement was made during a workshop at Bilkent University last December. CESS and Bilkent organised this workshop with the aim of promoting research and teaching programmes on security studies at Turkish universities. The organisers wished to encourage their colleagues to address subjects and use teaching methods suited to the needs of the 21st century. In these times of transition, security policies and strategic cultures are changing, both in Western Europe and in Turkey. Security studies programmes should address the issues arising from system change. Lecturers from 16 universities over the country, from Izmir to Trabzon, travelled to Ankara to participate in this two-day programme.

The workshop was preceded by some welcoming words of the rector of Bilkent university, professor Ali Dođramacı, after which professor Peter Volten officially handed him the first



Professors Dogramaci and Volten

copy of the CESS Harmonie Paper on 'Common Norms and Good Practices of Civil-Military Relations in the EU'. After this the programme took off with two comprehensive introductions by professors Volten and Karaosmanođlu on security and strategic studies. With these introductions, the groundwork was laid for a more detailed discussion of subjects like theories of civil military relations, the concept of the nation-state and supranationalism, and the relationship between Turkey and the EU Lisbon arrangements.

In this workshop some key issues were identified, and it served as a stepping-stone to a more extended programme during a summer course, to be held this year in Ankara. In the coming event, these issues and in particular the implications for security studies curricula in Turkey will be further discussed.



University teachers from all over Turkey during workshop

German Training on Interagency Cooperation

In 2004, the German government published an Action Plan on Civil Conflict Prevention which laid out Germany's plans to help counter security threats around the world. The specific feature of this approach is that it relies mostly on civilian policy instruments such as diplomacy, arms control, development co-operation, reconstruction assistance, disaster relief and support for civil society. However, it also comprises a defence component involving Germany's armed forces, known collectively as the Bundeswehr. This multidisciplinary approach calls for close co-ordination and co-operation between the various government agencies involved, as well as NGOs working for the government.

At one of their round-table meetings, the ministries most involved in the execution of the Action Plan launched a programme to develop teaching material on 'civil-military interaction in the framework of peacebuilding'. They avoided the term Civil-Military Co-operation (CIMIC), because they felt that it had taken on a military connotation. Their plan was to review the state of the art, formulate a draft curriculum and then produce training modules on various aspects of interagency co-operation in peacebuilding. The management of this programme was assigned to the para-statal organisation GTZ, which hired the consultancy firm GOPA. GOPA selected three experts to do the work, including Sami Faltas, who was mostly responsible for the draft curriculum. The training modules are to be used by German government training centres like the Führungsakademie der Bundeswehr, which trains senior military officers, InWEnt, which trains development practitioners, and ZIF, the Centre for International Peace Operations, in Berlin, which works mainly for the German Foreign Office.

Parliamentary Programme in Moldova

In autumn of last year, the second phase of the Moldova Parliamentary Programme began. This consists of four training courses on exercising legislative oversight and democratic control of the security sector. The courses are designed for staff of the Moldovan parliament, young politicians, representatives of the relevant ministries and NGO representatives. The two courses we organised so far were at the premises of the NATO Information and Documentation Centre in Moldova. Based on the Starlink formula, these courses are a mix between learning and doing, in which again the role play is the central point of the two-and-half day event. Special attention is given to Moldovan reality by discussing the principles of democratic governance and parliamentary oversight in light of Moldova's current affairs.

After the second training course in December, a CESS team, consisting of programme managers Erik Sportel and Merijn Hartog, as well as instructors Bauke Snoep en Kees Homan, visited Transdniestria. Situated on the left bank of the river

Dniestr, it emerged as a de facto independent region after the independence of Moldova in 1991. After a short but violent conflict, the central authorities in Chişinău lost control over Transdniestria, or the Pridniestrovskaja Moldavskaia Respublika (PMR, or Moldovan Republic Transdniestria) as it calls itself in its preferred language Russian. Transdniestria rapidly started to build state structures after its separation from Moldova, in order to emphasise its legitimacy. Nowadays, the PMR has its own elected president (Igor Smirnov), parliament, constitution, flag, and national anthem. In addition, Transdniestria has a national bank and its own currency: the rouble. Moreover, the PMR has an army, a judicial system, including a police force, and even a secret service. However, Transdniestria is not recognised by any country as a sovereign state. Today, the Transdniestrian issue constitutes an enormous impediment to the development of Moldova and is creating instability near the borders of the European Union.

CESS has always tried to involve representatives from the Transdniestrian side in its projects in Moldova, so far unfortunately without success. The aim of the visit was to speak to representatives from Transdniestrian NGOs in order to raise interest in one of our upcoming training courses in the framework of the Moldova Parliamentary Programme. The visit was organised by Promolex, a Chişinău-based NGO that cooperates intensively with NGOs from the left bank to promote and defend human rights and strengthen civil society.





Training at the NATO Information and Documentation Centre.

During a working lunch, the various NGOs presented themselves and explained their activities. On behalf of CESS, Erik Sportel introduced the Centre and elaborated on its activities in Moldova. The invitation to participate in one of the upcoming courses was met with great enthusiasm, so we are working hard to be able to welcome representatives from Transdniestrian NGOs at our upcoming training course.

Our training courses have also raised the interest of the faculty of International Relations at the State University of Chişinău. With the permission of our sponsor, the Matra



CESS delegation at the 'border' with Transdniestria

fund of the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs, we are planning a pilot training course for students and lectures of the faculty in September. We hope this will be the start of a cooperation in which we will introduce our teaching material and methods at the university.

Recently, Moldova made the headlines because of violent protests after the parliamentary elections of 5 April. During this turbulent period we remained in close contact with our partner, the European Institute for Political Studies. Things have calmed down now, but the situation is still cause for concern. However, we will go on organising our training courses; the next is scheduled for the beginning of July.

Brussels Seminar on Civil-Military Relations

In April 2009, the European Commission's Directorate-General for Enlargement convened an international seminar on civil-military relations in member states and countries seeking accession to the union. The Brussels event was funded and organised by the TAIEX instrument of the Commission, with help from CESS regarding the content and the programme. Presentations were made by the governments of Croatia, Macedonia and Turkey and four other countries from South East Europe that are considered potential candidates for accession to the union. It was the first time the Commission had organised a TAIEX seminar on such a politically sensitive subject. So when the meeting proved a success, a sigh of relief wafted through the Crowne Plaza Hotel.

The European Union does not interfere in the way member states organise their defence establishments. But when dealing with other countries, the EU does address issues like civil-military relations. It does this when supporting security-sector reform, in its relations with its eastern and southern neighbours and in enlargement negotiations. Before a country can even start negotiating accession to the EU, it must meet the political criteria spelled out by the European Council that met in Copenhagen in 1993. These include "stability of institutions guaranteeing democracy, the rule of law, human rights and respect for and protection of minorities," which implies democratic control of the military.

Countries wanting to join the EU are expected to align themselves with European standards and practices in civil-military relations. However no one knows what these standards and practices are. That is why CESS put together a book of essays, edited by Anne Aldis and Margriet Drent, called 'Common Norms and Good Practices of Civil-Military Relations in the EU.' The book identifies some practices that are considered desirable, good, or even essential in the way armed forces operate in democratic countries. It served as a reader for the Brussels seminar.

During the seminar, the governments of the ten countries seeking accession to the EU described their civil-military relations, first focussing on civilian direction of the military, and then on parliamentary oversight. The Albanians, who had just joined NATO, were suave and relaxed. The Turks, often criticised for their army's political role, did not engage in discussion. And the Macedonians frankly admitted that it was a bit unpractical to have their chief of general staff reporting both to the minister of defence and to the president. Belgian foreign policy expert Sven Biscop dwelled on the European Security and Defence Policy, while Simon Lunn shared experiences gained in a long career at NATO.

Meetings on Good Governance in Turkey

October 2008 saw three days of public meetings in provincial towns across Turkey. Pollien van Keulen and Ritske Bloemendaal had planned the itinerary with military precision. Their objective was to exchange views with students about democratic governance, transparency, accountability and parliamentary oversight.

The series of discussion sessions was organised with ARI Movement, an NGO working throughout Turkey to build a strong civil society. Together with ARI, Wim van Eekelen, Ritske Bloemendaal and Pollien van Keulen started their 'democratic governance' tour by travelling from Istanbul to Eskişehir, near Ankara, for the first session. Then they headed back to Istanbul's neighbour city Kocaeli for the second session. On the third day they were in beautiful Fethiye,



Students during discussion in Kocaeli

near Marmaris, for the final session. During the three seminars the difficulties faced today in upholding the principles of democratic governance were explored and discussed. Introductions were given from a European perspective by Wim van Eekelen, and from a Turkish perspective by various Turkish speakers. This format was chosen to explore the principles of democratic governance and the possible differences between European and Turkish practices. The sessions provided ample opportunity for the mixed audience, coming from an academic, political and business background, to respond to the subject and voice their opinions.



Cem Toker from ARI, Wim van Eekelen and Ritske Bloemendaal in Eshisehir

Child soldiers: acknowledging reality

Napoleon considered children unfit for fighting, so he did not allow them into his army. However today, children are the recruits of choice for warlords and rebel armies. In earlier times, the law of war was supposed to protect people who by their nature were not involved in the battle. These included women, the elderly and children. Now there are 300,000 children under the age of eighteen serving as combatants in some 75 per cent of the world's conflicts. In most cases the children are under fifteen, and in several they are under twelve.

Most child soldiers come from the poorest regions of the world and from broken homes. They have little or no education or job prospects. In such a bleak situation, becoming a combatant can seem an attractive option. Rebel armies offer children things like food, education, a livelihood, camaraderie, a uniform and a gun. And if children do not join their forces voluntarily, warlords often kidnap and forcibly recruit them. Sometimes, reluctant child soldiers are forced to kill people in their own villages so that it becomes impossible for them to go home.

The massive use of child soldiers took flight in the early 1990's. Since the Liberian Charles Taylor pioneered what is sometimes called the 'child soldier doctrine', the use of children as combatants has become common in many of today's wars.

These practices violate the rights of the child, codified in an international convention that entered into force in 1990, and were specifically forbidden by an optional protocol to the convention on the rights of the child, which entered into force in 2002. This protocol prohibits the use of persons under 18 as combatants. Violations of this prohibition have been reported from many countries around the world. Among these is the Netherlands, which is opposed to the use of child soldiers, but reserves the right to enlist 17-year-olds.

The use of child soldiers raises other issues as well. In the short and the longer term, it is a threat to the security of the children involved, and of the wider community. This is not only because a large part of the fighting forces consists of children. It is also because the future security and development of the communities involved lies in the hands of the young. The international community's standards for the disarmament and demobilisation of combatants, and their reintegration into civilian life (DDR), firmly determine that child soldiers are to be treated as abused children and not as combatants. Consequently, they are not demobilized, because this would amount to an acknowledgement of their previous status as fighters, but released. They are supposed to receive special counselling, together with children who have not been part of an armed group, and to be reunited with their family as soon as possible.

This may sound humane and child-sensitive, but it does not necessarily do justice to the harsh reality the child soldiers are coming from. If children have come to see themselves as soldiers and behave like soldiers, then it may be necessary to acknowledge this rather than deny it. It may be impossible to help them return to the life of a child without first dealing with the soldier's life they have been leading. In most cases, it is wrong to view child soldiers merely as children affected by armed conflict. They grew up as soldiers, think like soldiers, act like soldiers, experienced all the horrors of war just like adult soldiers, and often spend the larger part of their adolescent life being soldiers. Besides, many deliberately chose to be a combatant because they felt it was impossible to go to school or find a job. To simply send them home is to deny them the one thing they feel suited for. It could be highly counter-productive. They may run away to become soldiers again. Children and war are a match made in hell, but acknowledging the reality of it might be the best option in the end. We can only fight the use of child soldiers if we come to terms with it first.

Pollien van Keulen

Publications

Anne Aldis and Margriet Drent, editors, *Common Norms and Good Practices of Civil-Military Relations in the EU*. Groningen, CESS, 2008. Harmonie Paper 21.

Erik Sportel, "Wachten op de Twitterrevolutie", *Prospekt. Tijdschrift voor Rusland*, nr. 2, mei 2009.

People



Polina Panainte is from Chişinău, Republic of Moldova. She is a graduate student of political science and a programme assistant at the European Institute for Political Studies (EIPS) in her home town. In March and April, she worked as an intern at CESS. With her knowledge of her country, her fluent Romanian and Russian, she was of great assistance to Erik Sportel in the Moldova Parliamentary Programme.

Her only failure at CESS was that she did not learn to ride a bicycle, which is a rite of passage for new residents, as well as being very useful. She assures us: "I promise I will work on that, here in Moldova, where bike traffic doesn't exist. During my internship I was happy to understand that the skills I had acquired during my studies and my knowledge of Moldova were valuable. I learned a lot about security sector reform, democratic oversight of the security sector, and the need for healthy civil-military relations. There have been a few challenges during my internship at CESS, but luckily my patient and understanding colleagues helped me out."

Polina took the opportunity of being here to visit several other cities, explore Dutch culture and learn about Dutch history, economy, politics and traditions. "I got to like Netherlands even more. I was impressed to hear about the squatters who use houses that have been unoccupied for a year, and that everyone gets a vacation allowance before the summer holidays. I enjoyed the friendly atmosphere at CESS and the wonderful people I worked with. I hope there will be more possibilities to work and cooperate with CESS. I was sad to leave, but glad I've learnt great things, and am grateful for the valuable experience I gained."

It was fun to have Polina with us, and we are grateful for the good work she did. What a pity that Moldovan politics took a turn for the worse while she was here. We hope bright and idealistic people like Polina will build a better future for their country.



Thomas Claassen is a Groningen student of history with a deep interest in the politics of eastern and southeastern Europe. He joined us as an intern in April. Minority issues, democratisation and conflict studies are among his interests fields. He recently spent some months as an exchange student in Uppsala, Sweden, where he took course on peace and conflict. In his spare time, he travelled to Finland, Denmark, Estonia and Russia. He was particularly impressed by Lapland, the land of the Sami. "The natural beauty of Sweden is absolutely stunning," he says.

"Currently, I am writing my bachelor thesis on ethnic relations in Macedonia. If I am admitted to the Master Programme on Eastern European Studies in Amsterdam, I will move to our capital in September. At the moment, I am assisting Merijn Hartog in several projects, including Starlink Kazakhstan, and in this manner I have significantly improved my knowledge of security sector reform. Furthermore, it gives me the opportunity to work closely with persons who have lots of expertise in this field. In my spare time I play football, spend time with my friends and read books about European history and the two world wars."

Thanks to Thomas, our coffee break discussions now cover not only the exploits of our children and FC Groningen, but also the battles of Ypres and the Somme. Welcome, Thomas. It's good to have you on board.

Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms in the Armed Forces

A Commentary by Bauke Snoep

People used to think it was natural for soldiers to be separated from civilian society. The military had a special job and were expected to lead a different life, in barracks, out of sight and unapproachable. People used to fear that if soldiers participated in society, this would lead to a politicisation of the armed forces. So keep them apart from society! The government fed, housed and dressed them, in addition to paying their wages. They were separate and privileged. In this view, it seemed fair to deny them some of the rights that ordinary citizens enjoyed. They should be obedient and grateful, and shut up! Of course, in reality, soldiers were human beings. When a knife cut their skin, they bled like everyone else. What a surprise!

At the end of the 19th century, soldiers in Western countries started demanding better healthcare, pay, housing, career prospects, opportunities for their children, and so on. They wanted to be part of the society they worked and lived in. They refused to be marginalised, either as an elite or an underclass. They began to establish representative associations (or even trade unions), especially in Northern Europe. After World War II, the idea that a soldier is a citizen in uniform became commonplace throughout Europe. People now increasingly agreed that, basically, soldiers should have the same rights and duties as other citizens. Any restriction of these rights would have to be legal, proportional and in the interest of security of the State. These rights were guaranteed by various international agreements, such as the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR), which entered into force in 1953. It is based on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

All 47 member states of the Council of Europe are obliged to ratify the ECHR, but almost half of them still deny their soldiers to fully exercise fundamental freedoms. Are they afraid that organised movements of soldiers may lead to anarchy in the armed forces? Do they want to stop commanders from becoming more open and accountable? Is it fear of the unknown? Today, the work and the life of soldiers are changing, and so are views of the military's place in society. More and more, we see soldiers as citizens in uniform who can, and indeed should, participate in their society. This makes all the more sense because it is this society they will have to defend with their own lives if need be. But in Europe, and even within the European Union, opinions differ on how far this should go. In some countries organised representation of soldiers, with the aim of looking after their social interests, is seen as a threat to the security of the State. What an antiquated idea!

For many years now, the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (PACE) has been trying to guarantee fundamental freedoms for soldiers and promoting the view that in most ways, they are like everyone else. In 2006, PACE adopted a report (Doc. 10861) and urged its 47 member countries (Recommendation 1742), among many other things, to allow soldiers to set up professional representative bodies, join legal political parties, exercise their full voting rights, register as a conscientious objector and take action to put an end to bullying in the armed forces. The Committee of Ministers is still considering how to respond. Clearly, it is difficult to find a joint answer.

Excluding military personnel from society because of hierarchy, discipline or state security is a very short-sighted approach. It is almost always unfair and unnecessary to deny soldiers the same rights that other citizens enjoy. There are plenty of good reasons to give them equal rights. Through their participation as citizens, the military can make an active and useful contribution to politics and society. The more they are treated like ordinary, responsible citizens, the more they are likely to behave accordingly, and the less inclined they will be to undermine the constitutional authority of parliament and the government. It only requires a simple law that provides a framework for participation. Many countries have already made the change and I strongly believe that in the 21st Century, this change can be made everywhere. Yes, we can!



Bauke Snoep teaching

Commentary

Moldova in Reverse Gear?

A Commentary by Erik Sportel

Since the recent violent demonstrations, the Republic of Moldova has been in a state of paralysis. On 7 April, a large number of young people took to the streets of Chişinău to protest against the results of the parliamentary elections held on 5 April. The prospect of another four years of communist government was unbearable to them. Many felt the need to express themselves as pro-European and pro-reformist. Amongst large parts of the demonstrators there was a strong conviction that the elections were rigged, a view that the OSCE Mission and other international observers did not share.

The protests escalated when some of the demonstrators stormed Parliament and the Presidential Palace, set fire to furniture taken out of Parliament and pelted Mr Voronin's office with stones. All of a sudden, Moldova found itself at the centre of world attention. Could this be a new revolution like the ones we saw in Georgia and Ukraine? Although some Russian politicians tried to compare the Chişinău protests to the Rose and Orange revolutions by calling it a Lilac revolution, the protests stopped short of a revolution. Quite rapidly, a dialogue between the departing president and the opposition was established and it was decided to recount the votes to address the suspicion of election fraud. After the recount, the Communist Party (PCRM) received 60 seats of the 101 available. This meant they did not have the two-thirds majority required to elect a new president.

Amidst allegations of human rights abuses by police forces and alleged attempts by Romania to stage a coup d'état, the newly elected parliament was ready to commence its work. The three opposition parties in the new parliament, with a total of 41 seats, limited their work in the legislature to a minimum. This could not prevent the parliament from electing a chairman. It was Vladimir Voronin, the former president, who had to leave office after two terms.

However, for the election of the President of the Republic, at least one oppositional vote was needed. The ruling Communist Party and its adversaries in the opposition were expected to cooperate in order to overcome their differences and elect a new head of state for their country, now politically adrift. The opposition twice refused to take part in the election procedure. This meant that parliament is to be dissolved and new elections are to be called. As a result, Moldova faces at least another three months of deadlock.

Moldova's problems are many and diverse. The current stalemate is paralysing the country and distracting from the huge challenges it faces. Moldova is still the poorest country in Europe, and its economic problems are getting worse in the current international recession. Furthermore, the country is still lagging behind in the reforms agreed with EU and NATO. And all these problems are affecting each other. International partners and friendly governments are more than willing to help, but without a functioning government on the Moldovan side, there is little they can achieve.

The question is whether new elections would bring a change. The elections of 5 April were generally labelled free and fair by international observers and organisations, so to what extent can one expect the domination of the PCRM to decrease when the Moldovans cast their vote again in the coming months? The current situation is only paralysing the country even further. Further stagnation could even lead to the total collapse of the fragile Moldovan state. A Dutch saying comes to mind: stagnation means decline.

Colophon

Security Matters is published by the Centre for European Security Studies (CESS).

Editors: Sami Faltas and Erik Sportel. Contributors to this issue: Ritske Bloemendaal, Thomas Claassen, Sami Faltas, Merijn Hartog, Pollien van Keulen, Polina Panainte, Bauke Snoep, Erik Sportel and Peter Volten.