



SECURITY FORUM 2022

CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS FROM
THE 15TH ANNUAL INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCE,
FEBRUARY 9TH, 2022

MATEJ BEL UNIVERSITY, BANSKA BYSTRICA, SLOVAKIA

*Matej Bel University in Banská Bystrica
Faculty of Political Science and International Relations
Center of Crisis Management at MBU Banská Bystrica
Armed Forces Academy of gen. M.R.Š. in Liptovský Mikuláš
University of West Bohemia in Pilsen
Higher School of Public and Individual Safety –
APEIRON in Krakow
Institute of National and International Security in Belgrade
Kazimierz Wielki University in Bydgoszcz
Police Academy of Czech Republic in Prague
Metropolitan University in Prague
University of Security Management in Košice
Faculty of National Security of National Defence Academy
in Warsaw
International and Security Studies Institute
and
INTERPOLIS*

SECURITY FORUM 2022

*15th Annual International Scientific Conference
February 9th, 2022
at Matej Bel University in Banská Bystrica, Slovakia*

Conference Proceedings

Banská Bystrica, Slovakia 2022

**International Scientific
Board and Reviewers:**

doc. Mgr. Jaroslav Ušiak, PhD.
(Matej Bel University in Banská Bystrica, Slovakia)

doc. PhDr. Rastislav Kazanský, PhD., EMBA
(Matej Bel University in Banská Bystrica, Slovakia)

doc. PhDr. Branislav Kováčik, PhD., EMBA
(Matej Bel University in Banská Bystrica, Slovakia)

Dr.h.c. prof. Ing. Pavel Nečas, PhD., MBA
(Matej Bel University in Banská Bystrica, Slovakia)

prof. Ing. Vojtech Jurčák, CSc.
(Armed Forces Academy of gen. M. R. Štefánik in Liptovský Mikuláš, Slovakia)

prof. Ing. Ladislav Hofreiter, CSc.
(University of Žilina, Slovakia)

Dr.h.c. prof.h.c. prof. Ing. Marián Mesároš, DrSc. MBA LL.M.
(The University of Security Management, Košice, Slovakia)

prof. Želimir Kešetović, PhD.
(University of Belgrade, Serbia)

prof. Ing. Jana Müllerová, PhD.
(Police Academy, Bratislava, Slovensko)

prof. nadzw. dr hab. Donat Mierzejewski
(Stanisław Staszic University of Applied Sciences in Piła, Poland)

doc. Ing. Dr. Štefan Danics, Ph.D.
(Police Academy, Prague, Czech Republic)

doc. PaedDr. Milan Vošta, Ph.D.
(Metropolitan University in Prague, Czech Republic)

doc. Ing. Josef Abrhám, Ph.D.
(Metropolitan University in Prague, Czech Republic)

prof. Ing. Pavel Otrisal, Ph.D., MBA
(Defence University, Brno, Czech Republic)

doc. Vasyl M. Zaplatynskyi, PhD.
(Academy of Security and Health Protection in Kiev, Ukraine)

dr.h.c. prof. nadzw. dr hab. Antoni Olak
(University of Public and Individual Security "APEIRON" in Cracow, Poland)

Siposné prof. Dr. Kecskeméthy Klára ezredes
(National University of Public Service, Budapest, Hungary)

Assist. Prof. Dr. Joseph Jon Kaminski
(International University of Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina)

dr hab. Henryk Spustek prof. UO
(Opole University, Opole, Poland)

COL Assoc. Prof. Tomasz Kośmider
(National Defense Academy, Warsaw, Poland)

PhDr. Pavel Hlaváček, Ph.D.
(University of West Bohemia, Pilsen, Czech Republic)

Assoc. Prof. Juliusz Piwowarski
(University of Public and Individual Security "APEIRON" in Cracow, Poland)

prof. dr. Sead Turčalo
(Faculty of Political Sciences, University of Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina)

prof. Darko Trifunović
(Institute of National and International Security, Belgrade, Serbia)

Assoc. Prof. Łukasz Jureńczyk, PhD. DSc
(Kazimierz Wielki University, Bydgoszcz, Poland)

Assoc. Prof. Paweł Malendowicz, PhD. DSc
(Kazimierz Wielki University, Bydgoszcz, Poland)

Kamila Sierzputowska, PhD.

(Kazimierz Wielki University, Bydgoszcz, Poland)

prof. Dr. Manuela Tvaronavičienė

(The General Jonas Žemaitis Military Academy of Lithuania, Litva)

Organizers:

PhDr. Dagmar Nováková, PhD.

Mgr. Jozef Michal Mintal, PhD.

Mgr. Lucia Husenicová, PhD.

Mgr. Pavol Michalisko

Mgr. Dávid Kollár, PhD.

Mgr. Tomáš Beňuška

PaedDr. Zuzana Horváthová,
PhD.

Assoc. Prof. Łukasz Jureńczyk,
PhD. DSc

Editors:

doc. Mgr. Jaroslav Ušiak, PhD.

Mgr. Dávid Kollár, PhD.

Cover:

Mgr. Michaela Melková, PhD.

Paper have been double-blind reviewed before the final submission to the conference. Initially, papers abstracts were read and selected by the conference international scientific board for submission as possible papers for the conference.

Many thanks to the reviewers who helped to ensure the quality of the full papers.

The authors of the articles are responsible for the content and language form of the individual articles.

© Interpolis, 2022
Banská Bystrica, Slovakia

ISBN 978-80-973394-7-0

CONTENT

Oliver Andonov: REGIONAL POLICY AND OPPOSITION IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS	8
Andrzej Dyszkiewicz: CRISIS, FIELD OPERATING ROOM WITH A STERILIZATION SYSTEM POWERED BY AN ACCIDENTAL WATER INTAKE.....	20
Libor Frank: CRISIS COMMUNICATION OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE CZECH REPUBLIC AND ITS IMPACT ON PUBLIC ATTITUDES DURING THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC	27
Pavel Hlaváček – Matěj Boček: INTERPRETATIONS OF MUNICH AGREEMENT, POLICY OF APPEASEMENT AND THEIR UNDERSTANDING	35
Martin Horemuž: SOME ISSUES OF THE CURRENT SECURITY POLICY OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.....	44
Damir Ilić - Tatjana Ilić-Kosanović: CHALLENGES RELATED TO THE USE OF LOITERING MUNITION	53
Tomáš Jakabovič: THEORETICAL AND LEGAL BASIS OF INTERNATIONAL POLICE COOPERATION	60
Andrej Kolárik: CONFESSIONAL FACTOR AND INVOLVEMENT OF FOREIGN ACTORS IN LEBANESE INTERNAL POLITICS	71
Božena Konecka-Szydelko: CYBERSECURITY AND ITS CURRENT TRENDS	79
Tatjana Ilić-Kosanović - Katarina Štrbac: WOMEN IN CYBER SECURITY JOBS	90
Svetozár Krno - Beáta Izsófová: CANARDS AND HOAXES	98
Luka Latinović - Vladimir Tomašević: RUSHING TOWARDS RENEWABLES IN SERBIA – ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENTAL SECURITY, AND ECONOMIC IMPLICATIONS.....	105
Olexander Lysenko - Serhii Chumachenko - Olena Tachinina - Andrii Tureichuk - Valeriy Novikov - Ihor Sushin: JUSTIFICATION OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE SENSOR NETWORK OF INFORMATION SUPPORT OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL SAFETY SYSTEM OF A DISTRIBUTED MAN-MADE OBJECT	114
Paweł Malendowicz: LOCAL SECURITY: DEMANDS AND CHALLENGES FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT POLICIES AND SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH	124

Maciej Maruszak – Dávid Kollár: THE ASSOCIATION OF STATES IN AN ORGANIZATION TOWARDS SHAPING THE INTERNATIONAL SECURITY POLICY	133
Antonín Novotný: THE STRATEGIC COMPASS AS A TOOL TO INCREASE THE EUROPEAN UNION'S DEFENCE CAPABILITIES	153
Antoni Olak - Božena Konecka-Szydelko: DETERMINANTS OF ECONOMIC MIGRATION IN POLAND AND UKRAINIAN MIGRANTS.	160
Jelena Rajković - Ana Jurčić: THE IMPACT OF TERRORISM ON INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS	172
Silvia Ručinská – Ondrej Mital’ – Miroslav Fečko – Katarína Miňová: DISINFORMATION AS A TREAT AND CHALLENGE FOR MUNICIPALITIES AND THEIR COMPETENCIES	184
Jozef Sabol: IMPACT OF THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC ON THE ILLICIT DRUG MARKET, CHANGES IN THEIR SMUGGLING, AND DRUG IDENTIFICATION OPTIONS.....	199
Jozef Sabol – Ján Nejedlý: TEACHING AND RESEARCH AT UNIVERSITIES DURING THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC: NEGATIVES AND SOME PROS.....	207
Kamil Samiczak – Marcin Szymczak: THE ACTIVITY OF THE POLISH POLICE IN THE FIELD OF COUNTERACTING TERRORISM AND CYBER-TERRORISM IN THE CONTEXT OF CONTEMPORARY THREATS OF THE 21ST CENTURY	215
Vesna Stanković Pejnović: “SOFT POWER“ INFLUENCE OF INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY AND SERBIA TOWARD KOSOVO ...	231
Břetislav Štěpánek – Pavel Otřisal: KEY ASPECTS OF SECURING THE REQUIRED QUALITY OF DECISION-MAKING	242
Richard Stojar: SECURITY CHALLENGES IN THE WESTERN BALKANS IN THE SHADOW OF A GLOBAL PANDEMIC	247
Katarina Štrbac - Damir Ilić - Branislav Milosavljević: PUBLIC HEALTH MANAGEMENT IN THE REPUBLIC OF SERBIA DURING THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC.....	254
Božena Konecka-Szydelko - Dagmar Nováková: DIPLOMATIC MISSIONS AND THE ARMED CONFLICTS VERSUS GLOBAL CHANGES.....	261
Tomáš Škurka - Pavel Otřisal - Břetislav Štěpánek: PROBLEMS OF VIOLENCE AND ITS MANIFESTATIONS IN THE MUNICIPALITY OF KOJETÍN AND ITS SURROUNDINGS	283

Srdjan Tomić – Stanko Bulajić: CYBER SECURITY AND IMPLEMENTATION OF ISO STANDARDS IN ONLINE BANKING.....	296
Katerina Veljanovska Blazhevskaja: SECURITY ASPECTS OF MIGRATION CHALLENGES INITIATED BY ECOLOGICAL MIGRANTS AND SOCIETAL SECURITY CONTRIBUTIONS.....	307
Mohamed Badine El Yattioui - Dusko Tomic - Eldar Saljic: CHALLENGES FOR MOROCCAN’S ECONOMY AFTER COVID-19, BETWEEN NECESSARY REFORMS AND MAINTAINING POLITICAL STABILITY	317
Krzysztof Źołyński: HE SECURITY SYSTEM OF THE REPUBLIC OF POLAND AS AN ANSWER FOR THE EUROPEAN UNION REQUIREMENTS.....	326

REGIONAL POLICY AND OPPOSITION IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Oliver Andonov¹

ABSTRACT

The relations between the states within the regional geopolitics are filled with mutual contradictions and resistances. Undoubtedly, these oppositions and resistances are the result of cross-national interests that are in conflict with each other. In terms of interests, the interests of the great powers in the region have an additional impact, but most of the opposition and resistance are the result of mutual neighborly policies that burden the relations between the countries. In this paper we will make a theoretical review of the creation of opposition and resistance in regional politics according to the matrix of global-world politics, but to avoid a purely theoretical approach to this issue we will briefly address the mutual oppositions of the Balkan countries, i.e. countries. in the environment of Macedonia, and through the case of mutual relations between Macedonia and Bulgaria. Through this approach, the paper in front of you acquires the character of a theoretical analysis of a case study, which has an impact on regional relations and European Union policy with strong security implications creating a source of threat, threats, and risks to European security. The different national interests and the influence of the national romanticism from the 19th and 20th century in the neighboring countries of Macedonia, as well as the completely appropriate influence in Macedonia are the basis on which the national interests of the Balkan states are still defined. Unfortunately, the spirit of the Balkan wars still lives on in the national strategies, interests and ideologies of all Balkan countries. This fact, combined with weak and corrupt state institutions, a weak economy, and no offer to its citizens for a better future, increases the opposition and resistance in each other's neighborly relations. This behavior or opposition of states in their mutual relations in practice raises the theoretical approach to their sovereignty. Undoubtedly, sovereignty or the role of sovereign has a key or decisive contribution to the situation in the states, their strategies, government and policies, which is a key notion for the behavior of states in regional politics and mutual opposition. The sovereign is the one who decides on the exceptional situation, and in modern politics it is not only the state as an international legal entity, but also the citizens from whom it originates, sovereignty is drawn.

Key words: *sovereignty, sovereignty, neighborly relations, regional policy, opposition*

Introduction

Opposition between states, within the framework of regional policy or in neighborly relations, is part of policymaking, i.e., trivially speaking, the creation of enemies, which is the basis for constituting a lasting political position. If we translate this approach of Carl Schmidt into the 21st century and connect it with modern theories of framing security, we can see its modernization within the Copenhagen School and Ole Weaver through the existence of "Securitization" as

¹ Oliver Andonov, Assoc. Prof., Military Academy „General Mihailo Apostolski“, Str. Vasko Karangeleski BB, 1000 Skopje, andonov.oliver@yahoo.com

a modern term that helps constitute of a stable - justified political position. If we add to that the fact that states (small or large) are international legal entities formally legally equal on the international stage, as well as that international security is only a synonym that does not exist in practice, but only in practice there is national security, and it exclusively depends on the interests and goals of the state or its political elite, of course the political position that is sustained and justified in addition to its basic internal political purpose has a foreign policy or in the first place inter-neighborly use value.

Hence, the position of opposition of the states in the regional policies is nothing more than a simple "securitization" of a certain political challenge through which a solid political position is created whose public basis is a certain security threat to the vital interests of the state. In fact, this is a pragmatic everyday political approach in modern society characterized by the fragmentation of the sub-political existence in the country. It is characteristic not to take any ideological political responsibility, but to transfer politics to an individual and sub-individual level.

It is in fact the avoidance or disappearance of politics from the real world, and knowing that the creation of a political position in classical politics depends on political ideology or classical political theories, we come to the conclusion that opposition within regional politics and neighborly relations is not conditioned by real disputes between states, but from the individual political level of existence of political leaderships, which on the basis of the expressed created securitization or hostility (political-security-vital) provide exclusively and exclusively personal political existence. Whether this political existence-survival and the created securitization will cause threats and thus risks to regional security, these phenomena are constantly present in political relations, and are not perceived as a real security challenge but simply as a political game. at different levels with extremely high levels of significance.

It is not usual to present concluding views in the introduction but based on theoretical considerations we will have to defend this "conclusion" on the example and role of sovereignty, is the sovereign who decides on the political views of his country, and thus on behavior in neighborly relations. Regarding the resistance of the states in the neighborly relations and the regional policy and its securitization (creating enemies in this context) as a vital national interest, the sovereign has a key role, and hence sovereignty as a modern phenomenon. It is the sovereign who, in order to be able to show (in some form to be used) his key role in the creation of state policy in relation to resistance within regional politics, often has to rely on the ideological basis of the state (the ruling party).

There are countless historical examples, but is that so in modern times?

This is not a conclusion but a question that should lead us to a very important answer, which refers to the state ideology as a factor in inciting resistance or the decision of the sovereign to protect vital interests and resistance, outside the established ideological matrix which lasted throughout the twentieth

century and where resistance and wars were largely the result of ideological conflicts between states. Modernity in the 21st century is increasingly moving away from political ideologies, because neither liberalism nor conservatism in all their forms are strong enough or attractive to the citizens, which would ideologically lead to regional political disputes or neighborly relations of resistance. Simply, we do not see the states in the 21st century as international legal entities anymore as ideological creations, but only as communities of citizens (sovereigns) who are united around the idea of statehood, and where for their common language, culture, history and tradition is taken the heritage of the most numerous people with admixtures and characteristics of all other nations, while creating a nation based on the sovereign right of the citizens. In that context, human rights and freedoms, the economy and entrepreneurship, education and health or the corpus of personal and public security of the citizens above the one of the state security are of exceptional importance.

Thus the classical sources of threat are reduced and the new risks and threats are asymmetric and relate to everyday life with a reflection on long-term economic, political, environmental, social, social and human security. Hence, resistance within regional politics and neighborly relations is deeply rooted in human rights and freedoms, and not on any ideological basis or national-state ideology to be defended. In the paper before you we will try to explain this phenomenon of changing interests in resistance, as well as the role of the sovereign and his interests due to which countries resist in regional politics and neighborly relations, which is extremely tumultuous and characteristic. on relations in the Balkans.

1 Politics as resistance and challenge to regional policies

In the theoretical approach to resistance, some authors within the conceptualization of politics as a constant struggle for power between sovereign states and war as the final and worst result of this struggle, dwell on the dichotomous explanation of resistance. Namely, the policy as resistance and as management in its action should result in specific new or favorable conditions for the state. There are three vital components to any policy action (Armstrong et al., 2009): conflict, relations and power, and some form of collective action. Collective action by state or non-state actors is crucial. Hence the role of politics in civil relations or civic interaction according to Kenny or the so-called coexistence that we often use in Macedonia.

It is this coexistence that is the decision of the sovereign and his role in dictating (consciously or unconsciously, consciously or emotionally) the political movement. At this point of thinking we have the beginning of the creation of the state policy and here we enter into several possible open theoretical discussions on how the creation of the state policy is encouraged on a regional-international level, with what goals and interests and at what time. In order to design politics at

the international level, of course, it must undoubtedly rely on group interests and the power that the state has in the region, but it must be promoted through the values, ethics and political and cultural identity of the state (sovereign). Political and cultural identity are based on values and ethics, and they in turn arise from the tradition, history, level of education and modern development of the leading people in the country and the sovereign as an individual.

The sovereign as an individual has the indisputable right and capacity to engage himself as a human subject in action on behalf of interests, beliefs, values and feelings. Of course, actions, intentions and consequences cannot be fully predicted and it is equal to the well-known view that there is no one hundred percent certainty of risk and threat to security, but politics manages to resist its conceptualization and therefore all tendentious actions and concrete motivations must be taken into account and the consequences of the same must be analyzed or in the context of the risks these are the possible damages to the state.

Due to this approach to politics and its management and resistance, it is a challenge in regional politics within which it is necessary to anticipate the consequences of securitizing a particular political issue and raising it to an issue of vital interest to the state and the nation. In the context of this approach, a very essential question arises that is interesting for the topic we are dealing with. Namely: "Is politics primary for the preservation of our interests as individuals or political groups or is it equivalent to defending - promoting our values, beliefs, political identity, cultural identity or different ways of existence?" (Armstrong et al., 2009, pp. 19)

Exactly this issue, which is not rhetorical at all, introduces us to the essence of the resistance in the regional policy, and especially in the neighborly relations and explicitly in the issue of the conflict between Macedonia and Bulgaria. If we add to this the role of the power of politics and its influence on shaping some dominant political logic in the international relations of the state towards its neighbors, then we have a very clear picture of the fundamental imperatives for the often irrational behavior of political leaderships and tendentious actions. translated into conflicts. No matter how we try to explain this in practice, we will see that politics governs resistance, whether that resistance in regional politics and neighborly relations is logical or worthwhile for both sides. The problem with creating conflicts, using power and relations, and even more so with managing resistance (this can also be synonymous with conflict management) is political actors (we tend to use "political" rather than political) because they do not they manage the resistance, but on the contrary they are participants in the resistance (participants in the conflict). While the politicized actors who are the participants in the resistance in the improper management of the resistance become uncontrollably marginal, and the politicizing actors themselves due to their tendentious action which they are unable to manage become subject to the influence of other stronger centers of power over regional politics. Thus, we come to the conclusion that the conflict of interest approach created by the political

actors actually pretends that the interests can be negotiated or markets with a tendency to play more or less profit or loss for one of the parties. Instead of managing the resistance to values, cultural and political identity (national identity can also be placed under political identity, because the nation is a political construction) as well as convictions, in the wrong foundation of the resistance and the political actors who should govern it we have the abuse of politicized actors and an open space for the involvement of other centers of power with stronger relations and influences.

The damage that will be suffered both at the regional level and in the neighborly relations and in the long run will be visible and long-lasting in terms of the still unresolved issue of values, beliefs and cultural and political identity, which is why securitization has been used as a mobilizer. a tool in achieving political goals.

The issue of individualism, which causes sub political behavior in politics, is much more pronounced, especially through political actors who reduce politics to a more individual level, thus preventing institutional political management of the resistance, but emphasizing personal perceptions, ie personal interests and the resources of the state and the sovereign are used.

This is where the role of the sovereign begins, which will specifically point out where political actors have erred in managing the dispute by failing to protect its values, beliefs and identities and bargaining for interests that the sovereign does not recognize as vital. interests, but are the political interests of the political elites. The values, beliefs, and interests of the sovereign will be discussed in the next chapter. Although, I must mention that the role of securitization is precisely to present the interests of political actors as vital interests of the sovereign, because of which the sovereign will relinquish his beliefs, values and identity or find an enemy that threatens his values, beliefs and identity. This is simply a political game of creating public support for a political market with the interests of managing the resistance, and through the illusion of threat.

2 The values, beliefs, identity and role of the sovereign as a policy

Values, beliefs and identities are related to interests, but they can be manipulated politically for different interests and it is usually very difficult for them to be fully and clearly expressed by the sovereign, without political leaderships applying methods of determination and adjustment. to their interests. This is a feature of the Balkans and has a direct impact on the politics and management of the resistance, especially on the creation of politicized actors within the resistance. As a feature we can mention the impact of the configuration of power, which does not always arise from the political, military, economic or other power of the state, but simply it is an abuse of power gained through international institutions and membership in various alliances, especially as is the case with NATO and the EU. This diffusion of power through international

organizations or alliances is the expansion of a new form of real politics in international relations defined as global politics that directly affects regional and interstate bilateral relations in all aspects. Hence the role of the sovereign (in terms of the constitutional bearer of sovereignty - the citizens, the people) is questioned, because the influence of global centers of power through international organizations and membership in various alliances emphasizes the role of government or political leadership in relation to the sovereign, especially in the creation and management of regional relations. In this context, the values, beliefs and identity that are extremely important for the sovereign are brought to a state of relativity in relation to political interests. That is why the possibility of trading in values, beliefs, culture and identity is completely open as political issues that are easier to resolve, than as identity and cultural, religious issues that are unequivocally impossible to trade.

This change in the concept of approach to resistance management in international politics, especially in interstate and regional relations, is a relativization of the role of the sovereign and the question of sovereignty. Therefore, knowledge, empiricism, historical memory, especially the collective one are extremely important for the sovereign and his political survival as an internal political factor that transmits its political power, and through social knowledge and cognition, the state reflects in its international relations. From this point of view, the existence of a structured society is simply extremely important, a society that is framed, legally regulated and in which there are indigenous political structures capable of preserving the interests of the sovereign through resistance in international relations and regional policies. Of course, those political structures framed in the state system under the threat of losing their political positions will have to disagree with trading in values, beliefs and identities even under the pressure of a global center of power. This is possible to implement in practice exclusively in regulated state structures with a built political and legal system. Because the structure is a component that extends throughout the system and allows the system to be thought of as a whole. (Waltz, 2009) That goal should be regulated and harmonized at the highest level.

For this reason, in international relations, i.e. international politics, the domestic political structure should first be examined in order to be able to draw a distinction between the expectations of possible behaviors, and thus outcomes in domestic and foreign policy. This approach when entering into conflict or resisting in interstate relations must be observed by every state if it has an organized and strong state-political structure. It is the assessment of one's own internal political structure and its behavior as well as the assessment of the adversary's internal political structure that is an introduction to certain possibilities for successful resistance. Especially for the pre-defined weakness, this is crucial in policy making, especially the internal mobilization policy through securitization of the sovereign. This mobilization to resist, especially in

neighborly relations, uses the issue of protection of values, beliefs and identity as a strong motivation.

3 Mutual resistance in the Macedonian-Bulgarian dispute (case study)

The Macedonian-Bulgarian dispute is an obvious example of mutual resistance in the mutual relations between Macedonia and Bulgaria, against the political processes with regional influence and influence on the EU as a global actor. At the same time, this resistance has its values, beliefs and identity at its core, which is why managing it, even with an external mediator in the form of the EU or the US, is a great challenge and can create additional resistance.

The role of the sovereign in both countries is crucial, but at the same time the sovereign is maximally securitized, due to which the solution of this resistance requires parallel action within the intensive process of desecuritization of the sovereign and specific political procedures in removing or bypassing the disputed points, which cause resistance on the part of the parties.

It is through these procedures that the pitfalls of threats and risks that will jeopardize the dispute resolution process should be avoided. In fact, especially in this case study, the resistance has a historical dimension, it is related to historical events, connections, conflicts and contradictions between the two countries and peoples. Threats to historical issues are therefore pitfalls that produce a risk that will increase resistance.

Human civilization is undergoing a far more extensive, comprehensive and profound change, in many directions and on many levels of structural transformation of the system, related to security, political, economic-financial structure, energy, ecological and information connection, social, cultural and religious structure. These epoch-making changes and this ethical transformation have four main measurements that can be talked about in the analysis of the quality of the new type of society, namely: globalized society, postmodern society, infrastructure and information society and risk in society. (Slatinski, 2019)

It is these changes in the understanding of modern civilization changes in the structure of the system, as Slatinski says, that we consider that can be taken as levels of measurement in resistance in this case study. Namely, both the Macedonian and the Bulgarian society are with a pronounced social risk, but not from the mutual endangerment, but exclusively from the internal political situation and the social role of the political elites. In this context, it is the globalization of society that imposes the involvement of mediators in resolving the dispute and reducing resistance. In fact, it is the mediator who makes the connection (networking) of the two societies and reduces the risk by directing the solution towards strengthening the cooperation in other fields and building a common interstate structural system in the economy, energy, infrastructure, social

and culture, avoiding the risk of encouraging historical issues and thus avoiding the debate on the values, historical beliefs and identities of both parties.

Our case study as a basis for resistance in world political processes through interstate relations, and thus the assumption that that resistance will continue, has precisely the values, beliefs and identity through the prism of historical issues and disagreements between the two countries and peoples (sovereign). Hence, if we continue with the current model of encouraging historical issues, including the role of Bulgaria in World War II, as well as issues of Macedonian identity and its historical connection with Bulgarian identity through the prism of the role of the Orthodox Church, its schools, fighters for national freedom of the Macedonian people or the issues of the Macedonian language and its semantics, then surely no solution will be reached. On the contrary, the resistance, especially in Macedonia, will increase, not only in relation to Bulgaria but also to the EU.

Therefore, the behavior of Slovakia and the Czech Republic on the issue of the draft negotiating framework submitted to the EU by Bulgaria and its blocking is completely understandable (although Macedonia and Bulgaria did not understand that). The diplomats of both countries, Slovakia and the Czech Republic, fully understood the absurdity of establishing a negotiating framework proposed by Bulgaria on resolving historical issues between the countries. They undoubtedly correctly assessed the risks posed by the adoption of this framework by the EU for the future in relation to the resistance of other EU member states to the accession of new members (for example the case of Croatia and Serbia), and even the relations between the countries. EU member states. Such a framework would raise additional questions among EU Member States regarding the historical chapters that are considered completed and that each country interprets in its own way, but does not link them to the present and does not allow them to influence contemporary relations between countries in EU or bilaterally. It is quite clear that in Europe there are no two countries, especially neighbors that do not have a negative historical experience and which if they enter into a discussion on historical topics and events will never agree with each other which will activate a dispute in mutual relations and thus resistance to political processes in the Union or globally. In such a case, the survival of the European Union is put at complete risk, and because of issues that in essence cannot change anything in the present nor contribute to improving the future, especially the preservation of values, beliefs and identity.

Exactly the issue of changing the present and the impact on the future is what is crucial in the dispute between Macedonia and Bulgaria and which maintains the resistance in the mutual relations and in the political processes of interest to the EU and both countries. Namely, both sides have their own interests and goals that through the prism of "victory" over the other side will enable a dramatic change in the situation in the future based on historical "facts". This approach only intensifies the resistance of each side and increases the risk to the entire European Union. But at the heart of this behavior is mistrust of the Union's

future. The states in dispute and the states in the Balkans in general think that one day the European Union will cease to exist and that now is the time to use the power given by EU membership to establish historical dominance in the Balkans and establish their own national interests as strong, and dominant in the region.

This approach applies to both Macedonia and Bulgaria. Basically, if the historical approach is realistically perceived and used, until the second half of the 19th century, more precisely until 1870 and the joint Macedonian-Bulgarian formation of the Bulgarian Exarchate as a local Orthodox Church which at that time was not the national church of the Bulgarians, but the desire of the Slavic population in the Ottoman Empire to get rid of the spiritual power of the Greek Patriarchate in Constantinople, we cannot find an organized political struggle to create a state and state institutions neither in Bulgaria nor in Macedonia. The basis of the organization is the linguistic proximity through the Church-Slavic language and thus the Orthodox Church is a unique institution. In fact, in the Ottoman Empire, the important social institutions towards which the non-Islamic population was oriented were shaped by the personal connection with the household and the kin group, with the only depersonalized institution being the church. Only after the creation of the first states in the Balkans and thus the need to build institutions that provide access to government resources appears the interest of the Bulgarian state in the territories and population of Macedonia. This is where the modern dispute between Macedonia and Bulgaria begins historically, because until 1878 the struggle was based on the Slavic initiative against the Greek Church for the ecclesiastical domination of Constantinople and the class-religious struggle against the Ottoman Empire. (Kaser, 2001)

In modern conditions, both countries have their own goals related to history, but although they are not crucial for the current situation, they are extremely important for their national interest, especially in relation to the environment in the Balkan region and in their mutual relations.

Macedonia believes that now is the last moment when the existence of the Macedonian people should be confirmed through the long historical struggle in which it was disputed. This confirmation should not refer only to Macedonia, but also to the territories where the Macedonian people exist in neighboring countries with all the attributes of a people (language, culture, history), full acceptance of the uniqueness of the Macedonian identity as special in the Balkans, including the acceptance of the minority rights of Macedonians in neighboring countries.

Bulgaria, on the other hand, believes that the historical injustice inflicted on it since 1878, when the Bulgarian state was established after the San Stefano Peace Treaty, and was revised by the Berlin Congress, especially in the territorial sense towards Macedonia, should be corrected. For Bulgarian political strategists, it is best if Macedonia is forced to make a historical revision of its identity, language, culture, beliefs and values by accepting the definition of 19th-century identity in the Ottoman Empire related to church activity, and how Bulgarian. In this way, Bulgaria expects that in the future it will be able to claim Macedonia as

a territory that historically belonged to Bulgaria and that today's Macedonians are in fact historical Bulgarians. Then, it is very easy for the Bulgarian political elite in the near or distant future to refer to what is documented through an agreement, the "self-denial" of the Macedonian people of their Macedonian identity and the acceptance of the Bulgarian identity. When it comes to the historical fears of Bulgaria, of course we must not forget the impact of the Bucharest Agreement of 1913, and later confirmed as a historical fact the cultural autonomy of the Macedonians in Bulgaria (Pirin Macedonia) in the period after World War II. until 1965 for which there are documents and facts.

Unfortunately, in practice, the European Union itself has for a long time in the last thirty years encouraged this model, perhaps unknowingly creating risks and threats to its own security. Allowing Moldova to be transformed into a second Romanian state, Cyprus into a second Greek state, and Republic of Srpska into a second Serbian state, the EU has in practice instructed Bulgaria to pursue a policy that is not European, democratic, modern, good-neighborly and which, by creating resistance to the political processes of EU enlargement, destabilizes the Balkans and the EU through the state relations between Bulgaria and Macedonia.

Understandable is the tendency of Bulgaria, which if it succeeds in forcing Macedonia to "recognize" its "Bulgarian roots" and revise its history, including the role of Bulgaria in World War II, will secure its influence in Macedonia versus Serbia and Greece. From this point of view, although Bulgaria considers itself a dominant and powerful or stronger side in relation to Macedonia, it is politically short-sighted, because at some point neither Greece nor Serbia will allow Macedonia to be under the control of Bulgaria (or a second Bulgarian state), as imagined by the political elite in Sofia. Of course, this would create an extremely high risk in the Balkans that could raise many issues related to Moldova and Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia and Croatia, and that would mean a problem in the European Security Area.

The question of Bulgaria's role in World War II is historically problematic. This is not a question exclusively related to Macedonia and whether the Bulgarian army occupied Macedonia or "liberated" it from the Serbian occupation. It is a question of the de facto participation of Bulgaria at that time on the side of fascism as an ally of the fascist coalition. It is anti-fascism that is at the core of Europe and its values and beliefs, and if a revision of the historical facts about fascism is made, then European values move, and that is already a serious problem not only for the survival of the EU but of every member state. most of which were created precisely on anti-fascist grounds. On the other hand, it would be a historical revision in the direction of relativizing totalitarianism against democratic values, which is certainly not in line with the modern political processes that Europe aspires to.

Therefore, the active involvement in the settlement of the dispute and the practical management of the resistance in the mutual relations between Bulgaria and Macedonia by the United States and the indirect reaction of Slovakia and the

Czech Republic is a necessary mediation to resolve this dispute. The approach to highlighting global connectivity, networking, infrastructural connectivity, and cultural rapprochement is in fact a definite and planned avoidance of the risks of getting stuck in historical and identity issues that the mediators have seen.

In practice it remains to be seen how the dispute will end, primarily due to the complexity of the process of desecuritization of sovereignty in both countries, and what may cause some political elites to cause a change in the real political structure in both countries or in one of the countries and with to prolong or even strengthen the position of resistance. In such a situation, managing the resistance would be almost impossible because any intensification of the resistance would be based on additional ethno-political mobilization and securitization of the sovereign, which would prolong and complicate the process of de-securitization and convince the sovereign that the solution was not the mediator's will. on both sides.

Hence, directing the dispute to non-historical issues is an exceptional opportunity for a speedy resolution.

Conclusion

Focusing on scientific and professional analysis as a case study in relation to the mutual relations between Macedonia and Bulgaria and the creation of a practical emergence of resistance in the relations between the two countries, and thus including the potential for managing this resistance by a mediator, in this case at the diplomatic level it is the United States, we can say that the tendency of labor is not finding a solution in relations between the two countries. Simply, through this paper we have only opened the perspective for finding a solution, and using the opportunities for managing the policy of the two countries despite their mutual resistance.

In fact, we can clearly conclude that despite the existence of pronounced risks and threats to security in the region, and as a result of the dispute, there are extremely important points of contact that can contribute to reducing mutual resistance and resolving the dispute. Of course, those points are not the values, beliefs and identity, although in the end the goal to be achieved, defined as unblocking Macedonia's path to full EU membership, means accepting and promoting common European values and beliefs while preserving the identity.

However, the tendency of the dispute management and political process for Macedonia's full membership in the EU and the resistance offered by Bulgaria shows a strong capacity if the focus shifts from historical issues as key to infrastructural, economic, financial, social and cultural issues for mutual cooperation. The shift of focus provides an opportunity, although it does not guarantee that there will be desecuritization of both societies in relation to this dispute and the historical, especially identity issues related to the language and nation of the Macedonians.

If we think about why there would be no guarantee of desecuritization, we can say with great confidence that due to the already encouraged securitization and setting this problem at the level of a vital state and national issue, the political elites who securitize it will least want to desecuritize it. In this political-pragmatic behavior there is only internal political logic of these political elites, because if they actively participate in the desecuritization of the dispute they will have to explain to their own people why, for what reason they previously securitized it. Additionally, the question will have to be answered: "What has changed in the dispute and have the established vital national interests that were determined to be endangered been realized?"

The answer to this question is extremely difficult for both sides in the dispute and with extremely high potential for political losses in domestic politics for political actors. For these reasons, we can expect that this will be the most difficult part of the desecuritization and return of the political process for full membership of Macedonia in the EU with a strong positive role and support from Bulgaria. Both sides, ie political elites will have to give an explanation within the domestic policy for the time and resources spent at such a visible opportunity for not moving this dispute at all and creating resistance by influencing the region.

In the end, we can conclude that even within the movement of other points of contact in relation to the dispute, which do not cause mutual resistance, we cannot be completely sure of full success, but it is necessary to move the other points of the long-term touch on historical issues.

The role of the EU through the use of soft power and positive influence on the behavior of sovereigns that need to be desecrated is great and is a unique chance for the Union to close a significant chapter in the Balkans by bringing together Macedonia and Albania.

Regarding Macedonia, the role of Slovakia, the Czech Republic and Poland, as well as Slovenia and Croatia, can be extremely important in ensuring that Bulgaria does not use historical issues as part of the framework for Macedonia's full EU membership negotiations.

References

- ARMSTRONG, D., FARRELL, T., MAIGUASHKA, B. 2009. *Governance and Resistance in World Politics*. Skopje: Magor, 2009
- KASER, K. 2001. *Friendship and Fellowship in the Balkans*. Klagenfurt / Celovec: Wieser Verlag, 2001
- WALTZ, K. 2009. *Theory of International Politics*. Skopje: Magor, 2009
- SLATINSKI, N. 2019. *Risk: the new name of security*. Sofia: East-West, 2019