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The Research Question

Can countries emerge from civil wars as democracies? And if they can - to what extent and by what means can external actors support such a transition? While much research effort has been devoted to the question of how warring societies break the conflict trap and return to peace, much less effort has so far been spent on investigating under what circumstances warring societies not only end violence, but succeed in creating a stable and democratic polity. Political theorists, from Machiavelli to Huntington, are in general very skeptical with regard to the possibility of democratic regimes arising out of civil war. Instead, many see an intermediate stage of autocratic rule as unavoidable in order to overcome societal divisions and rebuild the fundamental political institutions of the polity. The empirical evidence seems indeed to suggest that countries rarely emerge from war as democracies. When we look at the overall population of countries that experienced a civil war after WWII (regardless of whether there was a peacebuilding mission or not), we find little reason for optimism. Only 10% of the countries that experienced civil wars reached a polity score of +7 or higher (approximately like Kenya, Moldova or Mali) two years after war ended. 53% all war-affected countries show a polity score of -5 or lower two years after the end of civil war, that is, a regime type similar to Gambia or Iran. 37% have a polity score of -7 or lower, similar to Belarus or Uzbekistan (all data is from Sambanis, Nicholas, with Michael Doyle, 2000: International Peacebuilding: A Theoretical and Quantitative Analysis, in: American Political Science Review 94: 4, 779 - 801). The picture looks similarly gloomy five years after the end of civil war: 52% have a polity score of -5 or lower; 39,4% have a score of -7 or lower; and only 10,6% have a score of +7 or higher. Yet, there are historical examples of countries that did emerge from war as democracies: Germany and Japan in the aftermath of World War II, and Mozambique, Namibia or Macedonia in the post cold war period, to name only a few. What made these cases of post-war democratization successful, and what, if any, role was played by external actors? This is, in a nutshell, the puzzle that this research project investigates.
The study of post-war democratization is a relatively new field, and there is surprisingly little empirical scholarly work devoted to the factors that allow a post-war country to become both stable and democratic. This can partly be explained by the fact that the two bodies of literatures, which are relevant for such an endeavor, are concerned with only one half of the problem. The democratic transition literature is predominantly interested in the democratic outcome of a political transition in countries which were authoritarian, but at peace. The literature on peace building is interested in transitions from civil war to peace. Whether this peace is accompanied by a measure of democracy or not is typically not of interest to this body of literature. This division of labor may explain why there is only a very small literature that is explicitly interested in outcomes which are both peaceful and democratic. But is this division warranted, or is it perhaps a consequence of academic inertia? The answer to this question depends on whether we think that post-war countries are in essence a sub-class of transition cases, or whether we think that post-conflict countries are cases sui generis.

The researchers involved in this project think that post-conflict cases are fundamentally different from transition cases, and they assume that these differences may have an impact on the factors which affect peace and democracy. If this is true, then it is necessary to account for the possibility that the factors which affect a transition to democracy are not necessarily the same, or do not necessarily have the same impact, in a post-conflict setting. We must also account for the possibility that the factors which affect peace and democracy respectively do not necessarily simply add up, but that they may cancel each other out. One implication of this is then that we have to disaggregate the concept of “success” into sub-concepts. One way of doing this is to individually look at “absence of war”, “democratic quality of the regime” and “state capacities”. While these three concepts may merge in the case of fully established democracies, we argue that for countries emerging from war we need to disaggregate them in order to be able to empirically explore which sequences and combinations are most conducive to the normatively desirable outcome: stable democracies at peace.

The Research Design

Given these challenges, we opted for a case study oriented research design. Case studies allow for process-tracing, which is indispensable for discovering causal mechanisms. Case studies allow researchers to treat cases a whole, which facilitates the identification of multiple causation and which may lead to the identification of typological sub-classes. Case studies can be arranged into different sets of structured comparisons; and finally, small-n research designs are not dependent on the few available global data sets, because the small number of cases allows researchers to collect the specific original data which they think may be relevant for the explanation of the observed phenomenon.

We collaborated with an international team of country experts, who prepared ten structured cases studies between October 2008 and December 2009. Our sample covers cases on Macedonia, Bosnia, Kosovo, Mozambique, Namibia, Rwanda, Afghanistan, Tajikistan, East Timor and Haiti. We deliberately chose cases from the post cold-war period only,
because our main interest is the contribution of external actors to post-war democratization, and democracy promotion and massive peace building missions became fashionable and feasible after the end of the cold war in the late 1980s.

The Universe of Cases

The universe of cases consists, theoretically, of all civil wars that came to an end after 1989. We count 52 cases (Data from Doyle/Sambanis 2000). Our main interests is the question of whether and how countries that were affected by large-scale violence can emerge as stable and democratic polities, and we are particularly interested in the impact of external support to this outcome. Other outcomes are possible and indeed more probable. Post-conflict countries can relapse into war; post-conflict countries can emerge as stable, yet undemocratic polities; and post-conflict countries could emerge as democratic, yet unstable polities. For comparative purposes, we wanted to include all of these outcomes in our sample. Furthermore, we also want to have variation on the main independent variable, that is, the amount of external support for democracy. Hence, we have four different outcomes, and two different values on our main independent variable. This can be depicted in a table with 2 x 4 cells. In order to group the cases into the cells, we have to define measures for stability, democracy and external support. Because this is not for analytical-descriptive purpose, but for sampling, we do this in a fairly rough and ready way. We classify countries that are still at peace five years after the war ended as stable. We classify countries as democratic when they reach a polity IV score of 10 or higher five years after the war ended. We proxy the amount of external support by the type of UN mission. Countries in which a complex peace building mission, or a peace enforcement mission, took place are coded as having received high external support. For all coding we rely on a data set compiled by Michael Doyle and Nicholas Sambanis (Sambanis 2000).

The next table groups all cases in the eight cells. Case in bold were included in our sample:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High external support</th>
<th>Stable and democratic</th>
<th>Stable and undemocratic</th>
<th>Unstable and democratic</th>
<th>Unstable and democratic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Timor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td></td>
<td>Haiti 1994</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>Yugoslavia-Croatia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low or no external support</th>
<th>Stable and democratic</th>
<th>Stable and undemocratic</th>
<th>Unstable and democratic</th>
<th>Unstable and democratic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh–Hill Eritrea</td>
<td>Burma</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia-ideol</td>
<td>Chad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia-Abkhazia</td>
<td>Congo-Shabba I&amp;II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia-Ossetia</td>
<td>Djibouti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>Ethiopia-Ogaden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India-Sikh</td>
<td>Indonesia-East Tim.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Research Template

In order to generate fine-grained data, we developed a structured research template that consists of 101 questions, divided into four sections. Country experts answered these questions, thereby generating rigidly structured case studies with a tremendous amount of data, which we used for comparative analysis. Only then did the authors shorten the studies turning them into condensed analytical narratives. The original versions of the reports are accessible at the project’s webpage.

The first section is devoted to a description of the outcome. We disaggregate the concepts “security”, “democracy” and “state capacities” into sub-concepts: With regard to democracy, we inquire about various dimensions of democracy. These dimensions are rule of law, participation, competition, and accountability. We also ask how the majority of the population perceives democracy. Is there any cultural bias in favor or against democracy? For example, is it seen as a Western export that suits outsiders more than the local population? By security, we refer to whether the state is able to provide physical security to its population by ensuring the absence of war and providing protection from other forms of organized violence (e.g. criminal violence). By state capacity, we refer to the capacity of the state administration to autonomously make decisions and effectively implement them. In general terms, this implies that stronger states with more capacities can rely on well-developed bureaucratic apparatuses which are staffed by cohesive cohorts of civil servants and steered by flexible elites who have an incentive to hold in check rent-seekers and redeploy available resources in pursuit of strategic policy objectives. Finally, this section asks whether the regime is seen as legitimate, and we differentiate between procedural input

---

1 The Template is available here: http://www.polsoz.fu-berlin.de/polwiss/forschung/international/frieden/ib/projekte/democracypromotion/index.html
2 http://www.polsoz.fu-berlin.de/polwiss/forschung/international/frieden/ib/projekte/democracypromotion/index.html
legitimacy (the regime is legitimate because its procedures ensure that society can voice its preferences and feed them into the decision-making process) and output legitimacy (the regime is legitimate because it provides public goods).

The second section asks about long-term structural factors (such as long-term economic development, the structure of the economy, or previous experiences with democracy), about war-related factors (such as duration and type of war, numbers of fractions, level of war-related destruction, and quality of any peace agreement) which may have had an impact on the countries’ capacities for a democratic peace.

The third section inquires about neighborhood effects on democracy such as linkages and integration; it then asks about the scope and characteristics of the external intervention focusing on both military and non-military aspects. We are interested in state-reconstructing and democracy-promoting measures, and in the question of how intrusive these measures were. We also ask whether and how diplomacy, normative pressure and/or persuasion contributed to the democratization process. Another set of questions explores the interaction between the local elites and the interveners, their respective preferences and constraints. These questions allow us to reconstruct the strategic interaction and bargaining which we assume contributed to the outcome.

The fourth and final section covers development aid. Development aid is a specific form of external intervention; we investigate it separately in order to be able to detect its distinct effects. This section is intended to map the resource flows in the conflict country and to assess how they contributed to democratization and stabilization. This section inquires about the most important donors and about the prevailing modalities of delivery. We also asked country experts to collect disaggregated data on the sectoral distribution of aid where available. Experts provided annual figures for: elections and political processes; rule of law, accountability, anti-corruption, human rights and minority rights; institutional infrastructure (parliamentary and public administration, decentralization, administrative capacity); civil society, media, civic education, empowerment; civil-military relations, DDR, security sector reform. Please note that these are our generic categories which may differ from those used by donors or by the OECD-DAC, and that this data should be treated as illustrative rather than complete for most case studies due to a lack of availability of such information. Finally, we asked our experts to identify instances of applied aid conditionality and to assess the impacts.

The Case Studies

The case studies are available from our website. We think that they provide a valuable source of fine-grained data which help us to better understand the processes which lead to a much desired, yet rare outcome: A successful transition from war to peace and democracy.
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Executive Summary

Macedonia experienced a short conflict between the Albanian National Liberation Army (NLA) and the Macedonian security forces, which took place between February and August of 2001. The following examination of the outcome of the international intervention encompasses the issues of democracy, state capacity, and security.

Firstly, regarding the establishment of democracy, the two largest Macedonian political parties and the two largest Albanian political parties signed the Ohrid Framework Agreement, which put an end to hostilities in August 2001. Up to 2006, the Macedonian government had made significant progress in implementing the main components of the Ohrid Framework Agreement. The adoption of a new law regarding territorial organisation initiated the process of decentralisation of competencies from the national to the municipal level. This granted municipalities a high degree of self governance in the areas of public services, urban and rural planning, environmental protection, local economic development, culture, local finances, education, social welfare, and health care. Moreover, the Ohrid Framework Agreement improved the access of ethnic minorities to state institutions by calling for a set of measures to improve equitable representation.

Special new parliamentary procedures, the so called ‘double-majority’, ensured that laws which directly affected ethnic minorities could only be passed with a majority of the votes from those ethnic minorities. The Framework Agreement also improved the use of minority languages and symbols in state institutions. The NLA disbanded in 2001, and the NLA leadership created a new political party, the Democratic Union for Integration (DUI), which formed a government coalition with other Macedonian political parties between 2002 and 2006.

Secondly, Macedonia implemented a process of decentralisation and public sector reform aimed at improving the capacity of state institutions. This process was promoted and supported by Macedonia as a move towards meeting the Copenhagen Criteria. As a result, the European Union granted Macedonia the status of a candidate country in late 2005, which was a great success considering that Macedonia had been on the brink of large scale civil war only four years earlier.

Thirdly, in terms of security, the situation in Macedonia has remained largely peaceful since the end of conflict in 2001; although minor incidents of violence have taken place. The NLA ceased to exist, and the Macedonian government disbanded their paramilitary units, which had been created during the conflict in 2001.

How can this outcome be explained? In order to understand the outbreak and the subsequent cessation of fighting in 2001, the impact of neighbouring countries and the spill-over effects have to be taken into account.

The NATO intervention in 1999, and the subsequent establishment of an international protectorate in Kosovo, created an opportunity for the NLA to start an insurgency in Macedonia. The Kosovo War created a class of entrepreneurs of violence, who had gained
fighting experience in Kosovo, and who controlled illegal activities on the border between Macedonia and Kosovo. These entrepreneurs had the financial and political resources to attack Macedonian state institutions. The outbreak of hostilities in Macedonia also coincided with the outbreak of fighting in Southern Serbia.

However, NATO, the CSCE/OSCE, the United Nations, and the European Union had a track record of almost a decade of conflict prevention in Macedonia. Consequently, the international community already had the structures in place to react quickly to the outbreak of conflict in early 2001. In addition, the international community could not afford to allow Macedonia to slide into civil war, because a large scale war in Macedonia would have jeopardized the political stability in neighbouring Kosovo.

The international community appointed special envoys who were responsible for brokering the Ohrid Framework Agreement. The European Union made a clear commitment to granting Macedonia full membership, if Macedonia implemented the Ohrid Framework Agreement and the reforms required by the Copenhagen Criteria. This process was supported by international aid, which covered the bulk of the financial costs. The European Union, NATO, and OSCE also maintained missions in Macedonia which monitored and facilitated the implementation of the Framework Agreement.

Finally, the Macedonian government argued that the international community had put pressure on it not to crack down on the Albanian insurgency. It also complained that it had to implement unpopular reforms regarding decentralisation and the use of minority languages, in order to meet the criteria for membership in the European Union. Metaphorically speaking, the international community played three roles: scapegoat, watchdog, and guide dog.
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1. Introduction

The Republic of Macedonia was the only country from the former Yugoslav Republic to gain independence in a peaceful way from Socialist Yugoslavia in the 1990s. When violent conflicts erupted in Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina, many political and academic observers thought that Macedonia would be the next country in the Balkans to suffer from large-scale violence. Political developments in Macedonia since 1991 have often been described as an “ethnic war that did not take place” (Troebst, 1997 #259). Indeed, many of the structural factors, which make countries prone to large-scale ethnic violence, were present in the Republic of Macedonia.

First, the ethnic composition and ethnic geography of Macedonia constitutes a structural risk factor. Macedonians, as the titular demographic, account for approximately 65 percent of the population. Albanians constitute the second largest ethnic group, accounting for 25 percent of the population. Albanians live in the western and north-western parts of Macedonia (Republic of Macedonia. State Statistical Office, 2005 #595).

Second, Macedonia underwent a process of democratisation since the early 1990s. According to quantitative and qualitative scholarship on conflict, democratisation processes increase the likelihood of large-scale violence if political institutions are weak and incomplete at the beginning of the political reform processes.

Third, large-scale ethnic conflicts took place in Macedonia’s neighbourhood, which resulted in the influx of refugees, as well as small arms, from Bosnia-Herzegovina and Kosovo. The conflicts in the former Yugoslavia had shown that violence did pay off, and the conflict in Kosovo radicalised both Macedonians and Albanians. In addition, the Macedonian economy suffered from the international embargo against Yugoslavia in the 1990s, as well as from the Greek embargo against Macedonia in the early 1990s.

As I will show in this paper, there was no shortage of political tensions and violent incidents between the Macedonians and Albanians in the 1990s, which could have triggered large-scale ethnic violence. Still, violent conflicts did not happen until 2001, when a conflict between the Albanian National Liberation Army (NLA) and Macedonian security forces pushed Macedonia to the brink of war. The conflict of 2001 lasted from February to August, and claimed the lives of 180 people. A United States- and European Union-led diplomatic facilitation process between Macedonian and Albanian political parties resulted in the signing of the Ohrid Framework Agreement in August 2001, which put an end to hostilities. The implementation of the Ohrid Framework Agreement was later facilitated and monitored by NATO, the OSCE and the European Union.

Thus, the starting point of the analysis of the section of my case study is the state of democracy, security and state capacity in Macedonia in 2006. Macedonia suffered only from a relatively short and low-intensity conflict in 2001, when compared to the conflicts elsewhere in the former Yugoslavia, which are analysed within the FU-Stanford project. Still, the case of Macedonia raises a number of puzzling questions on external intervention and international influences on democratisation.

The international actors who would later facilitate and monitor the implementation of the Ohrid Framework Agreement were already active in Macedonia long before the outbreak of the conflict in 2001. The United Nations and the CSCE/OSCE deployed preventive missions
in Macedonia in 1992. Multilateral and bilateral donors provided funding for civil society projects that were concerned with the improvement of interethnic relations. Yet a conflict broke out in 2001, which raises questions on how to assess the influence of external actors on political developments in Macedonia. Does the mini-war of 2001 indicate a failure of almost a decade of international assistance and conflict prevention work in Macedonia? Or would the conflict have happened much earlier without the involvement of external actors? Did a decade of civil society aid and monitoring by international organisations prevent a large-scale conflict in 2001?

Finally, Macedonia provides a unique opportunity for testing the hypothesis that the prospect of EU membership prevents conflicts in potential EU member states. One of the underlying rationales of EU-enlargement was to make future members in East Central Europe and the Baltic States solve possible conflicts with ethnic minorities or neighbouring states before joining the European Union. Therefore, the process of EU-enlargement played the role of long-term, structural conflict prevention.

In the case of Macedonia, the process of EU-integration gained momentum during the conflict in 2001. The Macedonian government signed a Stabilisation and Association Agreement (SAA) in April 2001, almost two months after the outbreak of fighting between the National Liberation Army (NLA) and Macedonian security forces. As I will show in this paper, the European Union played a key role in elevating political crises that could have put an end to the Ohrid reform process and led to large-scale violence. Thus, the process of EU-enlargement appears to provide operational, short-term conflict prevention.

Section 1: Defining international success or failure

1.A Democracy: How democratic is the regime that has emerged after the intervention?

1.A.1.i The rule of law
The constitution of the Republic of Macedonia guarantees the rule of law and fair access to the judiciary to all its citizens. The Macedonian constitution prohibits “discrimination among citizens on the ground of sex, race, religion or national, social or political affiliation.” Furthermore, the constitution defines courts as autonomous and independent entities {Assembly of the Republic of Macedonia, 2006 #580}.

Macedonian laws were aligned with major international human rights conventions, including the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the Convention on the Elimination of

1 The United Nations Preventive Deployment Force (UNPREDEP) would remain in Macedonia until 1999.

However, the reports by local and international human rights organisations, as well as the Macedonian Ombudsperson, regularly referred to blatant deficiencies regarding the implementation and application of laws. The problems in the judiciary can be grouped as follows: first, political parties influence judges and prosecutors. The lack of independence from political actors is considered to be a legacy of Socialist Yugoslavia, where the outcome of court trials was determined by political factors and was often described as “telephone justice.” Human rights reports claimed that judges and prosecutors understood their role as protecting the state from its citizens, rather than making independent decisions. Macedonian courts were heavily subject to political influences and corruption. There were hardly any sentences levelled against high-ranking politicians or businessman. In addition, there was no effective legal protection against ethnic discrimination.

The second group of criticism referred to the inadequate qualification and preparation of judges. Numerous court decisions contradicted Macedonian laws, as well as international conventions. Third, the judicial system was characterised by endemic inefficiency and ineffectiveness. The duration of court trials and detention was very long. As of early 2005, Macedonian courts had to deal with a backlog of 1.2 million (!) cases. There were very few cases of unlawful killings. In early 2002, Macedonian police forces murdered five nationals of Pakistan and one national of India, whom they had accused of being Al Qaeda members planning to bomb Western embassies in Macedonia.

Over 67 per cent of the complaints regarding the judiciary involved issue of delays in litigation and executive procedures {Ombudsman of the Republic of Macedonia, 2008 #582; Helsinki Committee for Human Rights of the Republic of Macedonia, 2004 #56; Helsinki Committee for Human Rights of the Republic of Macedonia, 2005 #34; U.S. Department of State, 2008 #581; Coalition "All for Fair Trials", 2004 #32}.

In 2007, 27.2 per cent of the complaints, which citizens of the Republic of Macedonia issued to the Office of the Ombudsman, were related to the judiciary, followed by labour relations (12 per cent), police procedures (11.4 per cent), property rights (10 per cent) and urban planning and construction (6.7 per cent) {Ombudsman of the Republic of Macedonia, 2008 #582}.

Human rights activists stressed that it was very difficult to change the functioning of the judiciary in contrast to other state institutions, such as the Ministry of the Interior, where changes in the behaviour of police forces were very palpable. Article 20 of the Macedonian Constitution {, 2006 #231} guarantees the freedom to form, join and leave associations of citizens or political parties. According to Article 21 of the constitution, citizens have the right [to] assemble peacefully and to express public protest without prior announcement or a special license.”

1.A.1.ii Participation
In general, citizens’ associations were able to express their opinions on political, social, and economic issues through their own publications, events or in the press. There were no attempts by the government or political parties to close NGOs five years after the conflict. However, politicians promoted prejudices toward foreign-funded NGOs, which they often accused of spying or money-laundering.

By the end of 2006, over 6,000 registered non-governmental organisations existed in Macedonia, including sports clubs, choirs, service and advocacy NGOs. However, most organisations faced financial problems. Western-style service or advocacy NGOs were usually dependent upon external-donor funding. Local organisations, like sports clubs, were dependent upon membership fees. Charitable giving was still too underdeveloped to constitute a regular income stream for non-profit organisations. The lack of a culture of philanthropy was aggravated by unfavourable laws.

The first law, which made donations to charitable organisations tax deductible, came into effect in early 2007. Since 1991, the Macedonian governments have subsequently simplified the registration process for organisations that wanted to be registered as charitable organisations. In 2006, the process to register an organisation with the court was very straightforward {United States Agency for International Development (USAID), 2006 #1116; United States Agency for International Development (USAID), 2007 #1115}

A very vivid media existed in Macedonia in 2006. The Macedonian Parliament abolished prison sentences for press offences in May 2006. The government had accused journalists of libel several times, which resulted in fines or prison sentences. However, the owners of several main TV stations are also the heads of political parties. In fact, the major nationwide newspapers are owned by the German WAZ-group {Freedom House, 2006 #153}.

Due to the proportional electoral system in Macedonia, citizens voted for electoral lists rather than candidates, who have to win electoral districts. Thus, citizens did not know which members of Parliament actually represented their electoral districts. Regardless of their ethnicity, about 80 per cent of respondents of public opinion surveys argued that corruption and rent-seeking were virulent in all state institutions, including the Parliament, the government and the judiciary {Bilali, 2007 #591}.

1.A.1.iii-v Competition, vertical and horizontal accountability

Macedonia witnessed several peaceful changes of government, on the national as well as local level, since its independence from Socialist Yugoslavia in 1991. Citizens of Macedonia voted along ethnic lines, as there were no genuine multiethnic political parties represented in the Macedonian Parliament. However, since its independence, Macedonia has been governed by multiethnic governments consisting of one major Macedonian party, smaller Macedonian parties and one major Albanian political party. Macedonian political parties have never formed coalition governments without including one of the major Albanian political parties, although they could have joined forces with other Macedonian parties to do so.²

² The VMRO-DPMNE has won the absolute majority in the 2008 elections. It will be interesting to see whether the VMRO-DPMNE will form a coalition government with an Albanian party.
One of the two major Macedonian political parties, either the Social Democratic Union of Macedonia (SDSM), or the International Macedonian Revolutionary Organisation-Democratic Party of Macedonian National Unity (VMRO-DPMNE), ruled with one of the main Albanian parties, the Party of Democratic Prosperity (PDP), the Democratic Party of Albanians (DPA) or the Democratic Union for Integration (DUI).

During the election campaign for the Parliamentary elections in 2006, clashes between followers of the two major Albanian and Macedonian parties were frequent, including verbal and physical attacks on campaign officers and non-fatal shooting incidents. OSCE observers also noted serious irregularities in seven percent of the counts they investigated. Two weeks after the election on the 6th of July, elections had to be rerun in 29 out of the 2,976 polling stations. Numerous irregularities involving the intimidation of voters by party representatives or employers, buying of votes, ballot box staffing, and early and homebound voting were noted by OSCE observers during the local and national elections in 2005 and 2006. Still, the OSCE also made clear that even in the case that all allegations were justified, the election results would not have changed {Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe. Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights, 2005 #1052; Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe. Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights, 2006 #599}.

A large percentage of eligible voters in Macedonia were members of political parties, which was due to the fact that job positions in public institutions and state-owned companies were filled based on party affiliation. Thus, changes of government resulted in huge staff turnovers in public institutions and state-owned companies. On both the national and local levels, elected politicians were expected to supply their supporters with jobs or other services. A culture of nepotism and corruption had already thrived in Socialist Yugoslavia. This problem was reinforced by a culture of laissez-faire, along with the lack of accountability of elected politicians and state officials during the first decade of Macedonia’s independence.

Corruption was endemic in Macedonia. Surveys showed that the majority of the population in Macedonia thought that politicians and senior officials were highly corrupt. There is plenty of anecdotal evidence regarding high-level corruption and the misuse of state monies; however, only very few allegations have resulted in trials or convictions against senior officials {International Crisis Group, 2002 #596}.

The lack of communication and collaboration within different departments of ministries, as well as between ministries on the national and local levels, was characteristic of Macedonia’s political system. This problem featured prominently in the reports by the European Commission on the political and economic reforms in Macedonia {Commission of the European Communities, 2002 #205; Commission of the European Communities, 2003 #206; Commission of the European Communities, 2004 #207; Commission of the European Communities, 2005 #201; Commission of the European Communities, 2005 #202; Commission of the European Communities, 2005 #204; Commission of the European Communities, 2006 #203}.

The lack of communication and collaboration has also been acknowledged by Macedonian politicians and senior officials. Several donor projects worked towards the strengthening of administrative capacities and improvement of cooperation between different administrative entities.\(^3\)

\(^3\) Interviews with Petra Andersson-Erhardy (European Union); Damjan Manchevski (Cabinet of the President); Govert Vissert (Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands). Interviews with the mayor of the municipality of
Senior officials have been notorious for bending administrative regulations. The judiciary has had a very bad reputation, not only among the population but among other state institutions as well. The Macedonian Parliament established an Office of the Ombudsperson in 1997, which has documented numerous civil rights violations. The members of the Ombudsperson institution could operate quite freely. Still, public institutions often refused to cooperate with the Office of the Ombudsperson even though the Macedonian constitution required them to do so. In addition, the Macedonian state institutions, including the government, proved to be very reluctant to implement the recommendations of the Office of the Ombudsperson. The Deputy Ombudsperson summarized the problems of the Office of the Ombudsperson the following way: “We are independent, but no one listens to us.”

1.A.1.vi-1.A.1.ix Democracy, duration of democratisation process, opponents of democracy, entity after conflict

I consider Macedonia to be a full democracy. Compared to the other former Yugoslav republics, domestic elites have shown a high degree of maturity during political crises. Since its independence, Macedonia has been governed by changing government coalitions.

Still, Macedonia shows serious shortcomings regarding the efficiency and effectiveness of state institutions. Corruption and nepotism are endemic in state institutions. Party officials exercise a high degree of influence upon civil servants, who are usually appointed and promoted on account of party affiliation, rather than merit.

Democracy is the only game in town in Macedonia. There is a widespread consensus among politicians and citizens that democracy is the only viable system for Macedonia. According to a December 2006 UNDP-commissioned survey, 42.5 per cent of the respondents indicated that they had confidence in the Parliament, while 53 per cent of the respondents stated that they had no confidence in the Parliament, and only 55 per cent of the respondents stated that they had confidence in the government. Religious institutions, the army and the police enjoyed the highest levels of confidence, with over sixty per cent of the respondents stating that they trusted these institutions. The judiciary performed more poorly, as only 29 per cent of the respondents said that they had confidence in the judiciary {United Nations, 2006 #656}

Interestingly, 91 per cent of survey respondents thought that politicians contributed to ethnic tensions. 85.2 per cent of Macedonians surveyed (45.3 per cent Albanians) stated that the use of violence was not justified in order to change a government {United Nations, 2006 #1108}.

According to the UNDP Early Warning Report Series, the citizens of Macedonia displayed a high level of political maturity. Over 85 percent of respondents stated that there were worried most by the problems of unemployment, corruption and poverty, whereas only one percent of the respondents said that they were worried most by ethnic problems {United Nations, 2006 #656}

Vratnica, interviews with representatives of the Fund for an Open Society in Macedonia (FOSIM), the European Centre for Minority Issues (ECMI), the Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA) and the Macedonian Centre for International Cooperation (MCMS).

4 Interview with Susana Saliu, Deputy Ombudsperson, Skopje.
The UNDP-commissioned surveys indicated an especially high level of dissatisfaction with the government between September 2004 and November 2006.\textsuperscript{5}

Over 86 per cent of the surveyed Macedonians and over 73 per cent of the surveyed Albanians listed the improvement of the economy, the decrease of unemployment and the decrease of poverty as the top priorities for the government. Only 1.3 per cent of the Macedonian and 2.1 per cent of the Albanian respondents stated that the maintenance of peace and stability should be the top priority of the government (United Nations Development Program [UNDP], 2006 #584).

The Ohrid Framework Agreement, which put an end to the hostilities between Albanian insurgents and Macedonian security forces, was signed by the two major Macedonian (SDSM, VMRO-DPMNE) and Albanian (DPA, PDP) political parties. The Ohrid Framework Agreement featured a set of drastic constitutional changes:

First, the Framework Agreement foresaw the development of a decentralised state. A new law regarding local self-government was to be drafted and implemented, which would provide municipalities with increased competencies in the fields of public services, urban and rural planning, environmental protection, local economic development, culture, local finances, education, social welfare, and health care. At the same time, the new law on local self-governance would redefine the boundaries of the municipalities in Macedonia. These changes granted the municipalities in western and northern Macedonia, where Albanians constituted the majority of the population, a high degree of local self-governance.

Second, the Framework Agreement included articles on the provision of equitable representation of ethnic minorities in state institutions. Third, the Framework Agreement established a double majority requirement - the so-called Badinter principle - for the adoption of laws directly affecting the issues of culture, use of language, education, personal documentation, and use of symbols, as well as laws on local finances, local elections, the city of Skopje, and boundaries of municipalities. Laws affecting these issues could only be adopted with “[a] majority of votes, within which there must be a majority of the votes of the Representatives claiming to belong to the communities not in the majority in the population of Macedonia.”

Fourth, the law enhanced the status of minority languages. In particular, new legal provisions enabled members of minorities, who were living in municipalities where at least 20 per cent of the population spoke another language other than Macedonian, to address state institutions in the language of the community. The state would fund university-level education in languages other than Macedonian if those were spoken by at least 20 per cent of the population. In addition, official documents were also to be issued in the languages of national minorities. Finally, the Framework Agreement allowed ethnic minorities to display their national symbols next to the emblems of the Republic of Macedonia {American Bar Association and Central European and Eurasian Law Initiative (CEELI), 2004 #178}.

The end of the conflict in August 2001 resulted in the formation of a new political party, the Democratic Union for Integration (DUI), which was founded by former Albanian insurgents.

\textsuperscript{5} Only two out of eight surveys conducted between September 2004 and November 2006 indicate a dissatisfaction of citizens for the government of less that 64 per cent. In May 2005, 59 per cent of the respondents said that they were disappointed by the government, whereas this number fell to a record low of 32 per cent in November 2006. The same month, NATO had indicated that Macedonia could receive an invitation to join NATO in April 2008.
1.A.1.x Additional section: Domestic demand for democracy

Although Macedonia is formally democratic, the state apparatus is characterized by corruption, rent-seeking and nepotism. Was there ever an uprising or demonstrations by the people against these conditions? Was the Ohrid Framework Agreement and the subsequent democratization process primarily elite-driven? What role did the masses play? Is the democratic system, as it functions today, vulnerable to being challenged by the people for its inefficiency and ineffectiveness? Elaborate more on the elites-people relationship.

There were no mass-based uprisings or major protests against these conditions. The implementation of the Framework Agreement was solely elite driven. Mass-based actions, like mob violence during the conflict in 2001, protests against the government, or clashes between protesters and security forces during the referendum campaign in 2004, were entirely orchestrated by political parties.

From a legal point of view the political system is vulnerable to being challenged by the people. However, the factors organising the people are ethnicity and affiliation with political parties.

There are no independent and multiethnic civil society groups that can mobilise the people. Western-style NGOs are entirely funded by foreign donors. Put simply, they are not paid to build up local constituencies. Such NGOs are working against the people, not with them.

1.A.1.xi Freedom House assessment

For your information: Freedom House rates Macedonia as partly free in 2006 (3 on political rights and civil liberties since 2003; 4 on both dimensions for the period 2001-2002); the Polity IV score for Macedonia is 6 until September 2002 and 9 afterwards. Do you share these assessments?

To make it short, I fully agree with the Freedom House ranking.

1.B Security

1.B.1.i Assessment of security situation

There has been no major fighting since the end of the conflict in August 2001. However, several incidents could have resulted in serious security problems (see section 3B).
57.2 per cent of respondents of the UNDP-commissioned Early Warning Survey stated that street crime and the proliferation of weapons posed the greatest threats to personal security, while only 2.5 per cent argued that other ethnic communities posed the greatest threat (United Nations Development Program [UNDP], 2006 #584).

1.B.1.ii-1.B.1.iii Phases of instability. Has the country relapsed into war?

Macedonia witnessed several episodes of political instability since the end of the conflict in 2001.

In early 2002, Macedonian police forces killed five nationals of Pakistan and one national of India. The police forces and the hard-line Minister of the Interior, Ljube Boskovski, accused the victims of being members of Al Qaeda, who had allegedly plotted attacks against Western embassies and government buildings in Skopje. The Ministry of the Interior presented weapons and NLA uniforms as evidence. However, Western embassies and human rights organisations quickly questioned the official version of the incident. In contrast, human rights activists argued that the Ministry of the Interior had seized illegal migrants on their way to Greece and murdered them because they wanted to gain sympathy from Western countries in wake of the terrorist attacks of September 11th. Ljube Boskovski fled to Croatia after SDSM and DUI won the Parliamentary elections in 2002. In 2004, the Macedonian government declared that the six Pakistanis and the national of India had been the victims of an extra-legal killing. The government issued warrants against Boskovski and the policemen who had participated in the extra-legal killings. While Croatia extradited Boskovski to the ICTY in The Hague due to war crimes in 2001, the trials against the policemen resulted in acquittals (U.S. Department of State, 2005 #187; U.S. Department of State, 2006 #185; U.S. Department of State, 2003 #189; U.S. Department of State, 2004 #188; Helsinki Committee for Human Rights of the Republic of Macedonia, 2003 #609; Nietsch, 2004 #52).

The World Macedonian Congress and the VMRO-DPMNE managed to collect over 150,000 signatures in order to push through a referendum against the new law on decentralisation, which granted municipalities additional powers. The law on decentralisation and the territorial reorganisation were key components of the Ohrid Framework Agreement. Representatives of the major Albanian parties emphasized that a successful referendum might result in new violence between Albanian and Macedonians. The referendum would finally fail in November 2004 (see chapter B on diplomacy and normative pressure).

At the same time, about 50 heavily-armed and uniformed Albanians took control over the village of Kondovo, northwest of Skopje. The international community put pressure on the Macedonian government not to launch a large-scale offensive against the insurgents. Instead, the government played down the threat while the two major Albanian parties, the ruling DUI and the opposition party DPA, negotiated with the armed men in Kondovo. The militants disappeared in December. Many analysts believe that the DPA staged the whole Kondovo incident in order to show that it could exercise leverage on Albanian-populated areas in Macedonia.

In November 2007, Macedonian police forces launched an operation (“Operation Mountain Storm”) against Albanian extremists and smugglers who had taken control of the village of
Brodec at the Kosovoar border. The multiethnic police forces killed six extremists and arrested another 13. The police forces displayed the seized weapons and ammunition to journalists. According to the Macedonia police, the amount of weapons was sufficient to arm 650 soldiers.

The police operation had been approved by the United States Embassy and the special representative of the European Union to Macedonia. The Serbian Deputy Prime Minister, Bozidar Djelic, stated that Serbian intelligence had provided key intelligence. The Macedonian government denied this statement, later followed by the Serbian government. A short verbal exchange with Kosovo’s Prime Minister, Agim Ceku, deteriorated relations between Macedonia and Kosovo.6

1.C State capacity, legitimacy, service provision

1.C.1.i-iv Assessment of bureaucratic apparatus, military, policing, economic and regulatory capacities. Assessment of capacities for providing services and public goods

The Macedonian state could certainly provide basic services in areas like health, education, infrastructure or social welfare. The quality of these services was at a much higher level in Macedonia than in neighbouring Kosovo or Albania. However, in terms of state capacity and the provision of services to citizens, Macedonia lagged far behind neighbouring Bulgaria, Romania or Croatia, not to mention Slovenia or Greece.

Like other former Communist countries, Macedonia inherited a large bureaucratic apparatus. Yet, state institutions lacked qualified staff and financial resources. NGO staff members and scholars often spoke of the issue of “functional illiteracy” as a communist legacy when describing the problems of the lack of pragmatism, cooperation, communication and professional criteria among employees of Macedonian state institutions.

Many laws could not be fully implemented on the national or local levels for many years, which has created a laissez-faire culture among state representatives and the population. For example, most homeowners have built their houses without the required construction permits. This problem applied to small cottages as well as to large and visible premises in larger cities. In recent years, state authorities have torn down illegal buildings. Several cases, including the demolition of buildings owned by the church, made the public wonder about the reasons behind these moves. Many observers considered the demolitions of illegally-constructed buildings to be motivated by party politics or corruption, rather than the strict adherence to laws.

Another example is the lack of revenues from purchase taxes. In order to solve this problem, the government introduced mandatory fiscal cash registers for all types of businesses in 2004.

6 The Macedonian government held early elections in 2008. Clashes between Albanians and police forces on election day resulted in one fatal casualty and several injured Albanians. Due to ballot stuffing, election fraud and physical threats against members of election committees, the Parliamentary elections had to be repeated in several Albanian-dominated electoral districts. I would like to deal with the dissolution of the Parliament and the early elections in later drafts of this paper.
The government promoted this new policy with a huge public relations campaign. The government also emphasised that customers had the right not to pay for goods or services if the vendor could not issue a receipt from a fiscal cash register. However, many shops continued to not register their sales income. Macedonian businessmen often complained that their Albanian counterparts did not abide by the fiscal requirements. They accused state authorities of being to reliant with Albanian businesses in western Macedonia in order to maintain ethnic peace.

Corruption was endemic in state institutions, especially in the areas of health, education and the customer service. Also, Macedonian state authorities were not committed to enforcing the compulsory school education among members of the Albanian and Roma communities.

The nexus between democracy, state capacity and security has a clear ethnic dimension in the case of Macedonia. Macedonian security forces did not exercise any control over many Albanian-populated villages along the border of Kosovo during the 1990s, which would later become centres of the trafficking in drugs, weapons and people. Multiethnic police forces managed to re-establish a regular presence in Albanian-populated areas in north-western Macedonia, a process which was facilitated by NATO, the EU and the OSCE.

Yet, a long history of laissez-faire policy, in terms of the loose interpretation of laws among civil servants and ordinary citizens, has created a situation in which attempts by the state to forcefully enforce laws could lead to social and ethnic unrest. For example, it is difficult to imagine that the state would fine all homeowners in Macedonia who built their houses without a construction permit. It is also very unlikely that the state would close all businesses which did not operate a fiscal registration policy.

1.C.1.v-vi Public evaluation and perception of state capacity

Additional questions from case study evaluation: How is the state’s capacity perceived specifically by the Albanian population? Are provisions of Ohrid Framework Agreement (language, decentralisation) carried out as specified and are they ‘appreciated’ by the Albanian minority? Or are they rather a source of Albanian unrest?

Lack of capacities, or lack of political will, or both, regarding bureaucratic inefficiency?

Albanians were not equally represented in either state institutions or socially owned enterprises in socialist Yugoslavia. This under representation was due to the communist promoted process of building a Macedonian nation, which favored the access of Macedonian speaking people to state institutions and socially owned enterprises. The integration of Albanians into the Macedonian state and economy was also hampered by the lower level of education of the Albanian population. During the period when Yugoslavia was socialist the Macedonian state either tolerated or ignored the fact that many Albanian and Roma children did not complete compulsory education. This problem was aggravated by the traditional position of women as inferior to men in Albanian society. State institutions already lacked legitimacy and access to Albanian communities during this period. This legacy was prevalent during Macedonia’s transition to a democracy and market economy. It was worsened by the policies of filling positions in state institutions with party members of the ruling political parties {Roux, 1992 #688; United Nations Development Programme, 2004 #687; Troebst, 1997 #689; Stawowy-Kawka, 1998 #690}. 
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The Macedonian state did not provide many state services in Albanian populated villages bordering Kosovo or Albania. In turn, mainly Albanian populated villages showed a particularly poor record of paying electricity bills and other taxes. The Ohrid Framework Agreement aimed at improving the legitimacy of state institutions among the Albanian population of Macedonia. The agreement called for the decentralisation of state structures and the transfer of competencies from the national to the municipal level. It also provided for equitable representation of minorities in state institutions, and mandated that parliamentary procedures take into account the needs of minorities and the use of minority languages and symbols (Framework Agreement, 2001 #594).

Only a couple of weeks after the signing of the agreement, multiethnic police forces started entering former crisis areas, including villages where the Macedonian police had not maintained a presence for years. This process was facilitated by the OSCE and NATO. The fact that there have only been minor incidents involving attacks on multiethnic police forces suggests that this move was appreciated by the Albanian population. In addition, Albanian politicians complained that some provisions of the Ohrid Framework Agreement were not implemented as quickly as the Albanian population desired.

Yet, Macedonians and Albanians have different understandings of the functions of the state. A socialist attitude of relying on state services is still prevalent among Macedonians. The state is expected to provide jobs in state institutions or state owned enterprises, not matter whether these jobs are needed or not. In contrast, Albanians were traditionally underrepresented in state institutions and socially owned enterprises, which forced them to create their own small and medium sized businesses. Albanians had a much longer experience with hard budget constraints and demand driven services than their Macedonian counterparts. Likely, Albanian entrepreneurs want a much less intrusive state, which has low standards regarding taxes and social security (European Stability Initiative, 2002 #695).

Section 2: Pre-war and war variables most important in explaining external democratisation

---

7 The state owned electricity company ESM tolerated outstanding debts of unpaid bills. Members of staff could not enter mainly Albanian populated villages in order to cut off indebted households from the electricity grid, because they were physically attacked by angry Albanians. In order to maintain social peace and to avoid ethnic unrest, the Macedonian government refrained from using security forces to enforce the cut off of individual households from the electricity grid. The situation changed when the Macedonian government sold 90 percent of its share of ESM to the Austrian EVN corporation in 2006. The new company owners framed the problem of unpaid electricity bills in purely financial terms. They made clear that they would cut off all households from the electricity net which were not willing or able to pay their electricity bills. The management offered needy households the option to pay their outstanding debts in several instalments. However, when this scheme did not yield the desired results, ESM started cutting off whole villages from the electricity net. Among those villages was the mainly Albanian populated village of Aracinovo, which had been an NLA stronghold in 2001 and a no-go area for Macedonian security forces. It would have been unthinkable for the Macedonian government to cut off Albanian villages from the electricity net without risking the break-up of the multiethnic coalition and ethnic unrest. However, while the ethnic component featured prominently in the media, the whole issue was communicated as an economic and a social agenda, rather than a political issue.
2.A Long-term, structural factors

2.A.1.0 Additional section: Structural factors which made Macedonia prone to ethnic violence

When applying the Collier-Hoeffler model of opportunity structures, Macedonia shows several features, which have made the country prone to ethnic violence. These features encompass ethnic composition, terrain, access to conflict specific capital, diaspora funding and revenues from criminal activities, military capability and social cohesion {Collier, 2001 #584}.

First, the ethnic composition and ethnic geography of Macedonia constitutes a structural risk factor. Macedonians, as the titular demographic, account for approximately 65 percent of the population. Albanians constitute the second largest ethnic group, accounting for 25 percent of the population. Albanians live in the western and north-western parts of Macedonia. The majority of Macedonia’s Albanians, which constituted a quarter of the population, inhabited the North-Western and Western parts of Macedonia, where they constituted the majority.

Second, the areas bordering Kosovo and Serbia are mountainous and forested. Thus, terrain offered an opportunity for an insurgency {Republic of Macedonia. State Statistical Office, 2005 #595}.

Third, the collapse of pyramid investment schemes in Albania in 1997 led to the temporary breakdown of Albanian state structures. Angry rioters looted hundreds of thousands of small weapons from army stores. As a result of the wars in Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina, small arms had already become easily available on the black market in the Balkans. The riots in Albania in 1997 added additional small arms to the black market. Volunteers from Macedonia had joined the Kosovo Liberation Army {Vickers, 2000 #1117; Grillot, 2004 #1035}. In short, conflict specific capital, as Collier and Hoeffler put it, was unusually cheap.

Fourth, Kosovo conflict created several opportunities for a rebellion in Macedonia in terms of funding. The NLA could not extort natural resources nor was it funded by hostile governments. Diaspora funding was key in the emergence of the Kosovo Liberation Army. The Macedonian Albanian diaspora channelled remittances to the Albanian community in Macedonia. The leadership of the NLA had gained fighting experience during the war in Kosovo. They knew that the diaspora funding could also finance a conflict in Macedonia.

In the wake of the Kosovo War the trade in forced prostitutes became a lucrative market for cross-border criminal activities. Criminals opened numerous brothels in mainly Albanian populated villages, which were tolerated by corrupt authorities and frequented by internationals and locals alike. The trade in forced prostitutes and drugs substituted the lack of natural resources {Hockenos, 2003 #691; Sullivan, 2004 #692; Perritt, 2008 #693; Heinemann-Grüder, 2001 #694; European Stability Initiative, 2002 #695}.

Fifth, the Macedonian government lacked military capability. It lacked night vision devices and helicopters, which were purchased from the Ukraine after the outbreak of the conflict in 2001.

Sixth, the Albanian population in Macedonia was not fractioned in terms of language or religion. Social cohesion was very strong among Albanians. Extended family networks structured the life of individuals. There was a high sense of solidarity and trust among
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Macedonian Albanians, which became visible during the refugee crisis in 1999 when tens of thousands of refugees found shelter in Albanian households (Collier, 2001 #584). In addition to the Collier-Hoeffler model scholarship on conflict has shown that democratisation processes increase the likelihood of large-scale violence if political institutions are weak and incomplete at the beginning of the political reform processes (Mansfield, 2004 #586).

Finally, large-scale ethnic conflicts took place in Macedonia’s neighbourhood, which resulted in the influx of refugees, as well as small arms, from Bosnia-Herzegovina and Kosovo. The conflicts in the former Yugoslavia had shown that violence did pay off, and the conflict in Kosovo radicalised both Macedonians and Albanians. In addition, the Macedonian economy suffered from the international embargo against Yugoslavia in the 1990s, as well as from the Greek embargo against Macedonia in the early 1990s.

2.A.1.i-2.A.1.ii Regime type before the war. Were there earlier, previous attempts of democratisation?

Before the conflict erupted in 2001, a Parliamentary democracy had been in place for almost a decade. Many political parties, including parties of the ethnic minorities in Macedonia, were represented in the unicameral Parliament. The political system did not change during the conflict. However, the international community put pressure on the two largest Macedonian and Albanian political parties to form a grand coalition during the conflict, which they did.

Unlike the other republics of the former Yugoslavia, Macedonia could not refer back to a record of democratisation attempts during the era of Socialist Yugoslavia. The preamble of the Macedonian constitution in Socialist Yugoslavia referred to two episodes in the history of Macedonia, which served as reference points for the Macedonian nation: first, in August 1903, an uprising against Ottoman rule took place throughout Macedonia. The insurgents could only take control of the town of Krushevo, where they announced the so-called Manifesto of Krushevo. The manifesto called for all inhabitants of Macedonia to take-up arms against the Ottoman Empire. The self-proclaimed goal of the movement was to establish a multiethnic, autonomous state. The so-called Republic of Krushevo lasted only for ten days before Ottoman troops crushed the resistance movement. The Krusevo Republic became the point of reference for the nation-building process, which took place after the Second World War, as well as for the alleged inclination of the Macedonian people towards democratic systems. Second, after 1945, all Macedonian constitutions referred to the resistance movement against the occupation of Macedonia by Nazi-Germany during the Second World War.

2.A.1.iii-iv Level of economic development before the war. Structure of the economy

Macedonia was the poorest republic of Socialist Yugoslavia and the poorest region after Kosovo. The Macedonian GDP only averaged between 61 und 69 percent of the Yugoslav GDP between 1951 and 1981. By the end of the 1980s, the official unemployment rate had reached 27 percent. Yet, there were also huge differences within Macedonia. The per capita income in the capital of Skopje was three times as high as in the predominantly Albanian
populated cities of Gostivar, Tetovo and Debar. The main industries were food and textile
{Hoepken, 1987 #1131; Singleton, 1982 #1132}.

Economic indicators also mirrored differences between ethnic groups in Macedonia. Albanians were underrepresented in the secondary and tertiary sectors.

**Representation of Macedonians and Albanians in economy sectors in 1981**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Share of workforce</th>
<th>Share of total population</th>
<th>Albanians</th>
<th>Macedonians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39.3 %</td>
<td>25.2 %</td>
<td>44.5 %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.3 %</td>
<td>25.2 %</td>
<td>44.5 %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.2 %</td>
<td>21.2 %</td>
<td>40.6 %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.1 %</td>
<td>51.3 %</td>
<td>29 %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.8 %</td>
<td>30.1 %</td>
<td>34.2 %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.7 %</td>
<td>16.2 %</td>
<td>35.7 %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.6 %</td>
<td>2.4 %</td>
<td>12.7 %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.5 %</td>
<td>5.3 %</td>
<td>10.5 %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Roux {, 1992 #688@139}

Macedonia was heavily dependent on transfers from the Yugoslav state. It was also heavily dependent on exports to the other Yugoslav republics. In the wake of the wars in the former Yugoslavia and the international economic embargo against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia the output of the Macedonian economy registered a loss of 33 percent compared to pre-independence outputs. Independent Macedonia only experienced positive economic growth from 1996 onwards. Since the mid-1990s, Macedonia was one of the successful transition economies in terms of price stability.

Macedonia was badly hit by the Greek embargo against Macedonia between 1994 and 1995, which was because of a name dispute. The economic embargos against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in the 1990s took away Macedonia’s most important market. The Kosovo Crisis led to the withdrawal of deposits from commercial banks, which caused liquidity problems among several problems during 1999. Privatisation of socially owned enterprises started in 1993, yet, agricultural enterprises and “strategic” enterprises in areas such as energy, telecommunications and transportation were privatised over the next few years.

The government established a very open trade regime in 1996. The IMF’s trade restrictiveness index calculated Macedonia’s trade regime as 3, where 1 was the most open and 10 the most restrictive. By the end of the 1990s, the Macedonian government had signed free trade agreements with several countries in Eastern and East Central Europe.

Compared to other transition economies the revenues and expenditures of the government were very high. The state had an extensive social safety net and large civil service. Expenditures in the form of wages and salaries, social transfers, and expenditures for health and interest payments accounted for 85 percent of government expenditures {International Monetary Fund, 1998 #1130; National Bank of the Republic of Macedonia, 1999 #1133; International Monetary Fund, 2000 #1135}.

Yet, the official unemployment rate accounted for about 30 percent of the workforce throughout the 1990s.8 Young people between 15 and 24 years of age were particularly affected by unemployment, as the unemployment rate among young people was about 50-70

8 The official data are highly contested, because many formally unemployed people work in the grey economy.
percent in the second half of the 1990s (International Monetary Fund 2000: 83). Unemployment rates were also above average among ethnic minorities.

Unemployment rates among ethnic minorities in 1998:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic group</th>
<th>Unemployment rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roma</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albanians</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turks</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total population</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


2.A.1.v Were there sharp elite cleavage structures before the war?

Macedonian and Albanian elites were divided along their affiliation with the biggest Macedonian and Albanian political parties. There were two sharp cleavages between the main ethnic Macedonian parties, the Social Democratic Union of Macedonia (SDSM), which was the successor of the Macedonian League of Communists, and the nationalist Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organisation – Democratic Party of Macedonian National Unity (VMRO-DPMNE). Albanians formed the Party for Democratic Prosperity (PDP) in 1990. However, the PDP party leadership resigned during the second party congress in February 1994. The radical wing would create a new party, which they claimed to be the legal successor of the PDP. Yet, the radical wing lost the dispute with the old party leadership and transformed itself into the Democratic Party of Albanians (DPA) in 1997.

Left-right dichotomies are not applicable to the party system of Macedonia. Neither the SDSM nor the VMRO-DPMNE had sophisticated party platforms for long periods. The same applies for Albanian parties. Citizens voted along ethnic lines. The change in elected governments on the national and local level resulted in huge turnovers in the state administration. Political parties were expected to supply their party followers with jobs in state institutions or other services.

The SDSM and the PDP formed a government coalition from 1994 until 1998, which was followed by a government coalition of the VMRO-DPMNE and DPA from 1998-2002. Smaller Macedonian parties like the Liberal Party and the Democratic Alternative also joined these coalitions [Skaric, 2005 #1594]. The cleavages within the Macedonian and Albanian communities had very strong effects on the political party system. The two largest Macedonian parties were not willing to form government coalitions, thus, they had to form a government coalition with one of the two largest Albanian parties. The Albanian political elites were not willing to unite under one large Albanian political party.

The fractionalisation of the Albanian community along party lines is a factor for explaining the lack of large ethnic conflict between Albanians and Macedonians until 2001. Both the DPA and PDP benefited from the status quo since they were included in the multiethnic government coalitions. The situation changed in 2001 when the National Liberation Army, which had been formed by Albanians with strong ties to Kosovo, challenged not only the Macedonian state but also the established Albanian political parties. The ruling DPA initially downplayed and heavily criticised the attacks by the National Liberation Army on Macedonia.
security forces in early 2001. It only changed its position when the fighting challenged the support by its Albanian electorate.

The Democratic Union for Integration consisted of the former leadership of the National Liberation Army, former party members of the DPA and PDP and several famous Albanians, who had not been involved in party politics before 2001. Interestingly, the NLA leadership proposed to the DPA and PDP leadership to form one big Albanian political party in Macedonia. Both the DPA and PDP rejected this offer.

2.A.1.vi What is the ethnic structure of the country? Did the country have a specific ethnic or religious structure that put it at risk?

According to the census of 2002 [Republic of Macedonia. State Statistical Office, 2005 #1478] the ethnic composition of the population was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Macedonians</td>
<td>1,297,981</td>
<td>64.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albanians</td>
<td>509,083</td>
<td>25.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turks</td>
<td>77,959</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roma</td>
<td>53,879</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbs</td>
<td>35,939</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosniaks/Muslims</td>
<td>17,018</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vlachs</td>
<td>9,695</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>20,993</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,022,547</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ethnic structure put Macedonia at risk because Albanians constituted the majority of the population in many regions in Western Macedonia. The ethnic dispersion of Albanians reduced the costs of the National Liberation Army to recruit and organise fighters. The mainly Albanian-populated regions also bordered Kosovo and Albania, which also reduced the costs of trafficking fighters, weapons, drugs and money. In addition, unemployment was particularly high among young Albanian males (see section 2.A.1.iii-iv).
2.A.1.vi Assessment of the state’s pre-war capacity to autonomously make decisions and effectively implement them. Was there a well-developed bureaucratic apparatus, solid enough for governance? Please assess the state’s pre-war capacity with regard to military, policing, economic and regulatory capacities (cf. section 1!). Assessment of the state’s pre-war capacity for providing services and public goods

As a former socialist country, Macedonia inherited a large bureaucratic apparatus, which could provide services and public goods. Economic and social activities were overregulated by laws and administrative procedures. The state or the ruling government coalitions had to make political and economic decisions in order to fulfil conditionality by the international organisations. The Macedonian Parliament made use of urgent parliamentary procedures to
pass laws very quickly, yet the state apparatus lacked the administrative capacity to implement laws in a clear and transparent way.

In terms of scope, the bureaucratic apparatus was well developed to implement laws. Yet, despite the seize of the civil service, the state institution lacked the capacity to implement laws cleanly and transparently. This was partly due to frequent staff turnover in the bureaucracy after elections, the promotion of civil servants based on nepotism or party affiliation and widespread corruption.

When the Yugoslavian Army (JNA) withdrew from Macedonia in early 1992 the JNA took most military equipment with it. The newly established Army of the Republic of Macedonia (ARM) had virtually no tanks and fighting aircraft at its disposal. The army consisted of conscripts and a small number of special units. The ARM was also in charge of guarding the borders. The army lacked the organisational capacity to plan and conduct large military operations, which became apparent at the outbreak of the conflict in 2001.

The Macedonian police faced the same problems as the bureaucracy: corruption and nepotism were endemic among the police forces. Security forces did not prohibit the organised breaches against the economic embargo against the Federal Republic of Macedonia. Security forces did not access several mainly Albanian populated areas at the border with Kosovo, where the insurgency against the Macedonian state started in early 2001.

In terms of economic and regulatory capacity, the Macedonian government operated a very successful monetary policy, which kept prices stable and reduced inflation in the second half of the 1990s. The government allowed for insider privatisation. About 60 percent of all privatisations were insider privatisations, which resulted in the emergence of companies that were not viable financially (Zalduendo, 2003 #1136).

2.B War-related factors / Factors referring to the peace process

2.B.1.i Type of War

Many incidents took place in 1990s; however, Macedonia remained calm until 2001 when a conflict between fighters of the National Liberation Army (NLA) and Macedonian security forces pushed the country to the brink of large-scale war. The war was fought along ethnic lines. Although Turks, Serbs and other minorities were affected by the fighting, the conflict mostly took place between Macedonians and Albanians. Strikingly, and in contrast to the wars in Croatia, Bosnia-Herzegovina and Kosovo, most fatalities of the conflict in Macedonia were not civilians but members of the Macedonian security forces or the Albanian insurgents.
2.B.1.iii Warring parties

Two major parties were involved in the conflict: Macedonian security forces on the one hand, and the National Liberation Army (NLA), which had been formed by Albanian insurgents, on the other.

The Army of the Republic of Macedonia and the Macedonian police collaborated since the outbreak of the conflict in early 2001. However, the relationship between the police forces and the army changed during the conflict. The representatives of the European Union and NATO, Javier Solana and Oscar Robertson, visited Macedonian on several occasions between March and May and put pressure on the Macedonian government to not declare a state of war. Due to international pressure, the two biggest Macedonian and Albanian parties formed a Government of National Unity in May 2001.9

The Macedonian VMRO-DPMNE had controlled both the Ministries of Defence and the Ministry of the Interior. After the formation of the grand coalition, the Social Democrats (SDSM) gained control over the Ministry of Defence. The moderate Minister of Defence, Vlado Buckovski, and the hawkish Minister of the Interior, Ljube Boskovski, clashed about the use of force and other relative questions during several public occasions.

In June 2001, the Ministry of the Interior established a new special unit, the so-called Lions10, which consisted of police reservists and regular police officers, most of them young men who were affiliated with the ruling VMRO-DPMNE. The SDSM-controlled Ministry of Defence heavily opposed the creation of the Lions Unit. Members of the Lions were involved in several violent incidents in 2002, including threatening or attacking members of other political parties and journalists (Helsinki Committee for Human Rights of the Republic of Macedonia, 2002 #610; Helsinki Committee for Human Rights of the Republic of Macedonia, 2003 #609)

While the two main Albanian political parties initially condemned the military actions of the NLA, they radically changed their positions when the conflict escalated from February 2001 onwards. The DPA had already been established as a political party in the Macedonian government when the European Union and the United States put pressure on Macedonian political parties to form a grand coalition in May 2001.

The Macedonian government decided not to negotiate directly with the National Liberation Army. Leaders of the National Liberation Army granted the heads of the DPA and PDP the authorisation to negotiate with Macedonian political parties in regards to constitutional changes and issues of disarmament.

The Albanian National Army (ANA) emerged in the summer of 2001. The goal of the ANA was to unite all Albanian-inhabited territories in southeast Europe. The ANA killed 10 members of the Macedonian security forces in an ambush in early August. The ANA opposed the Ohrid Framework Agreement. Yet, the ANA did not launch any other major operations in

---

9 The government consisted of the following parties (short description of parties).
10 The lion is the heraldic animal of the VMRO-DPMNE.
Macedonia after August 2001. However, the ANA became active in Kosovo from 2003 onwards {International Crisis Group, 2001 #607; International Crisis Group, 2001 #1018}.

2.B.1.ii Spill-over effects

Why did the conflict break out in 2001 after a decade of tense but peaceful ethnic relations? What had changed in Macedonia since the 1990s? Why did a violent conflict occur in 2001 and not earlier? In order to answer these questions, it is key to factor in political developments in Macedonia’s neighbourhood.

A number of external events impinged upon the security situation in Macedonia since the late-1990s. First, the collapse of pyramid investment schemes in Albania in 1997 led to the temporary breakdown of Albanian state structures. Angry rioters looted hundreds of thousands of small weapons from army stores. As a result of the wars in Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina, small arms had already become easily available on the black market in the Balkans. The riots in Albania in 1997 added additional small arms to the black market {Vickers, 2000 #1117; Grillot, 2004 #583}.

Second, the Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA) emerged as a powerful influence in the late 1990s. KLA attacks on Serbian security forces in Kosovo in 1998 led to brutal retaliation against Kosovar civilians. The Kosovo conflict showed that violence did pay off. The Kosovar Albanians had applied a policy of peaceful protests until the mid 1990s. The violent attacks on Serbs and alleged Albanian collaborators and the brutal response by Serbian security forces put the Kosovo issue back on the international agenda.

The conflict escalated in 1999 when NATO launched a bombing campaign against Serbia. Serbian security forces expelled hundreds of thousands of Kosovar civilians into neighbouring Macedonia and Albania. About 350,000 Kosovar Albanians sought refuge in Macedonia. The Macedonian government was overwhelmed by this number of refugees. International organisations and NGOs provided humanitarian aid to the refugees from Kosovo, and Albanian families sheltered tens of thousands of refugees from Kosovo.

The Kosovo conflict radicalised both Macedonian Albanians and ethnic Macedonians. On the one hand, Macedonian Albanians were disgruntled by the apparent failure of the Macedonian state to provide shelter for the refugees from Kosovo. On the other hand, ethnic Macedonians interpreted the fight against the Milosevic regime as a fight for a greater Albania, which would sooner or later affect Macedonia.

Third, the United Nations Preventive Deployment Force (UNPREDEP) had to leave Macedonia in 1999. The United Nations had deployed a preventive force to Macedonia in 1993, which had since monitored Macedonia’s borders as well as interethnic relations. When the Macedonians took up diplomatic relations with Taiwan, the Chinese government vetoed the renewal of the UN mission in the UN Security Council.

Fourth, the United Nations Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK) and the Yugoslav government agreed on a three mile buffer zone between the border of Kosovo and Serbia and Montenegro. The Yugoslav army was not allowed to enter this zone. The northern and north-western regions of Macedonia neighboured the Presevo Valley in the demilitarized buffer zone, as
well as Kosovo. The Albanian extremist Liberation Army of Presevo, Medveda and Bujanovac (UCPMB) launched attacks on Serbian police forces, civilians and Albanian politicians in the Presevo Valley between 1999 and 2001. At the same time, several violent incidents occurred in the mainly-Albanian populated regions neighbouring Kosovo and Serbia.

The Northern village of Tanusevci, which borders Kosovo, played a key role in the escalation of the conflict in Macedonia in 2001. Tanusevci became a base in the 1990s for those who smuggled goods into neighbouring Serbia and Kosovo. The Tanusevci region had witnessed several minor violent incidents between Albanian smugglers and the Macedonian border patrol. However, these clashes were of criminal, rather than political, nature. UNPREDEP troops patrolled the area until 1999.

2.B.1.vi Cleavages and issues of conflict

The conflict in 2001 was fought along ethnic lines. Macedonian media and nationalist politicians argued that the conflict was fuelled by the problems in Kosovo and portrayed the conflict as a fight for a greater Albania. The NLA demanded constitutional amendments regarding the use of the Albanian language and symbols, Albanian language instruction in higher education, better access to state institutions and improvements in local self-governance.

Indeed, the Macedonian constitution privileged the Macedonian majority, while Albanians and other ethnic groups faced grievances in the areas of education, equal representation in state institutions and language rights. The NLA wanted constitutional upgrades regarding the status of the Albanian population, rather than constitutional changes indicating a switch from an ethnic to a civic understanding of nationhood and citizenship.

The NLA did not propose any demands that had not already been put forward by the ethnic Albanian political parties in the Parliament. Albanian political parties had been represented in all governments since Macedonia’s independence. Still, major parts of the Albanian population in Macedonia had lost trust in the Albanian party establishment. In order to understand why the conflict erupted in 2001, it is important to take into account the political economy of interethnic relations in Macedonia, which leads to the role of entrepreneurs of violence.

2.B.1.vii Entrepreneurs of violence

Transnational Albanian criminal networks operated in the border region between Kosovo, Macedonia, Albania and Serbia, which became a pivotal location for trading in weapons, drugs and prostitutes. The influx of tens of thousands of international soldiers and civilians as a result of the war in Kosovo fuelled the sex industry in Kosovo and Macedonia. Transnational criminal networks used Kosovo and western Macedonia as transit areas for forced prostitutes from Eastern Europe, who had to work in the Balkans before being transported to Western Europe.
These operations were made possible by corrupt and ineffective Albanian, Macedonian and Serbian security forces. Criminal networks took advantages of the unsettled status of the Macedonian-Serbian/Kosovar border. The outbreak of the conflict in Macedonia coincided with the demarcation of the Macedonian-Serbian/Kosovar border, which had allowed Macedonian security forces to better patrol the border areas.

Two major Albanian political parties, the DPA and the PDP, participated in government coalitions because of the access to state resources. A growing dissatisfaction with the Albanian political parties created an increasing Albanian Diaspora in Western Europe, which provided funding to the Albanian shadow institutions in Kosovo during the 1990s. The Albanian Diaspora also played a key role in funding the insurgency in Macedonia in 2001. Revenues from the trade in narcotics, human beings and weapons, as well as foreign remittances, allowed the NLA to challenge the state in 2001 (Bekaj, 2005 #125; Bekaj, 2005 #125; Hislope, 2002 #597).

Rumours persisted that Macedonian politicians and senior army officials had personally benefited from the government purchases of arms from the Ukraine, Bulgaria and Croatia during the conflict.

2.B.1.viii Recruiting mechanisms

The NLA recruitment seems to have taken place in a relatively organised fashion. The NLA had many Albanian fighters in their ranks, who had already fought in the wars in Croatia, Bosnia-Herzegovina and Kosovo. After years of combat experience, these insurgents knew how to organise fighting units and how to secure supplies of weapons and ammunition. There is not much known about the structure of the NLA, apart from the fact that transnational family ties played a major role. NLA units consisted of fighters who came from the same regions.

The Macedonian government launched a wide-spread public relations campaign in order to encourage reservists and new staff to join the ranks of the Macedonian security forces. The government also increased the salaries of members of the Macedonian security forces.. This measure proved to be a very effective recruitment tool, given the high unemployment rates among young man in Macedonia.

2.B.2 War variables

2.B.2.i When did the war start?

Although there had been violent incidents throughout the year 2000 and January 2001, the beginning of the conflict is usually considered to be February 2001, when a television crew was captured by members of the NLA in the village of Tanusevac at the Macedonian-Kosovar
The release of the television crew resulted in a heavy gun battle between the NLA and the Macedonian police.

Only two weeks after the Tanusevci incident, the Macedonian and Yugoslav governments reached an agreement on the demarcation of the joint border, including Kosovo, which enraged Albanian politicians in Kosovo and Macedonia. At the same time, NATO allowed Serbian security forces to commence military operations against the UCPMB in the Presevo Valley in southern Serbia. Thus, UCPMB fighters entered Macedonia in early March; only a few days later, fighting began in the Macedonian town of Tetovo {Bekaj, 2005 #125; Bekaj, 2005 #125; Bekaj, 2005 #125}.

2.B.2.ii Battle-related deaths

In numerous statements, media and government officials claimed that the security forces had killed hundreds of NLA fighters. According to the NLA, 64 NLA members were killed in 2001. The Macedonian government provided the number of 63 victims of the Macedonian security forces. In addition, 50 Albanian civilians and 10 ethnic Macedonians were killed in 2001, which brings the total number of fatalities to 167.

2.B.2.iii Civilian population

According to UNHCR data, some 140,000 people became displaced during the conflict. About 90,000 persons fled to neighbouring Kosovo and Serbia, while 50,000 people became internally-displaced persons. The vast majority of internally-displaced persons stayed with family and friends, while 2,900 persons had to seek refuge in collective centres. The number of internally-displaced persons fell to 16,370 by the end of 2001, while 9,000 persons did not return to Macedonia {Framework Agreement, 2001 #594}.

2.B.2.iv Highest number of casualties

The conflict lasted for seven months only. According to the sources used for this paper, there seem to be no periods which resulted in a high number of casualties.

2.B.2.v Dynamics of war

In April 2000, Albanian militants abducted four Macedonian soldiers, who had been patrolling the Kosovo border... The soldiers were later released when the Macedonian government released Xhavit Hasani, an alleged former KLA commander, who had been

11 There are conflicting data on the exact numbers of deceased persons, but all accounts agree that between 150 and 180 people were killed.
arrested for shooting at a Macedonian official from the Ministry of Urban Planning. In the second half of the year 2000, vehicles of the Macedonian border patrol were twice targeted by explosives. Several soldiers were injured, but there were no fatalities. This changed in January 2001, when a police station in the northern Macedonian village of Tearce was hit by a propel grenade. The grenade killed one policeman and wounded three others. The self-proclaimed National Liberation Army (NLA) claimed responsibility for the attacks.

A television crew of the television station A1 was captured for one day by members of the NLA in February 2001, as it tried to enter the village of Tanusevci. After the release of the journalists, the attempt by Macedonian police forces to enter the village resulted in a heavy shoot-out between NLA fighters and Macedonian police forces. Violent incidents continued throughout February 2001.

In early March 2001, the Macedonian and Yugoslav governments signed an agreement on the demarcation of the Macedonian-Yugoslav border. The agreement enraged Albanian politicians in Kosovo and Macedonia, since Kosovar politicians had not been included in the negotiations. At the same time, NATO allowed Serbian security forces to start military operations against the UCPMB in the Presevo Valley in Southern Serbia.

Clashes between Albanian insurgents and Macedonian security forces continued in the Tanusevci area throughout February and March. The Macedonian government requested that KFOR cut off the movement of Albanian fighters from Kosovo to Macedonia. The Macedonian government closed the border to Kosovo in early March. A new front emerged in the area of the north-western town of Tetovo. In mid-March, NLA fighters started shooting from the hills surrounding Tetovo. On March 20th, the Macedonian government gave the insurgents a 24-hour deadline to disarm and leave the country, claiming that the fighters were from Kosovo rather than Macedonia. The government started a major offensive on the 22nd of March and announced the end of the offensive by the end of March.

In early April, Macedonia signed a Stabilisation and Association Agreement (SAA) with the European Union. United States secretary Colin Powell visited Macedonia and urged the Macedonian and Albanian political parties to participate in a dialogue. On April 28th, NLA fighters ambushed a convoy of Macedonian security forces, killing and emasculating eight soldiers and policemen. Two days later, mob violence erupted in the southern Macedonian city of Bitola, the hometown of four of the murdered soldiers. Macedonian nationalists torched over one-hundred shops and houses belonging to Muslims and damaged the mosque and Muslim cemetery in Bitola. Many observers argued that most rioters came from outside the city of Bitola and that the riots had been carefully planned by Macedonian nationalist parties (International Crisis Group, 2001 #566; International Crisis Group, 2002 #596).

The formation of the grand coalition did not prevent the conflict from escalating: NLA fighters took control of villages in north-western and northern Macedonia. The Macedonian government replied by using artillery and helicopter gunships that had been bought from Ukraine in March. The offensive of the Macedonian security forces resulted in a humanitarian crises in the areas under siege.

NLA fighters managed to interrupt the water supply to the Kumanovo region for over two weeks. In June 2001, some 400 NLA fighters took control of the village of Aracinovo, which

12 Legally speaking, there was no need to include Kosovar Albanian politicians in the negotiations, because questions of Kosovo’s external borders fell under the auspices of the Yugoslav government.
is located at the outskirts of the capital city of Skopje. They threatened to launch rocket attacks against the international airport, the main oil refinery and Skopje. Macedonian security forces surrounded Aracinovo by the end of June and prepared a major offensive. Before the attack on Aracinovo could be launched, the Macedonian government and NATO reached an agreement, which allowed NATO troops to evacuate armed NLA fighters from Aracinovo and escort them to NLA-controlled areas.

The Macedonian public could not understand this action. Macedonian media and nationalist politicians heavily criticised the government for caving in to the pressure from NATO and the NLA. Macedonian media and nationalist politicians also argued that US instructors from the private security company Military Resources Incorporated had been involved with NLA fighters in Aracinovo. These accusations were never clearly denied by the US Secretary of State. The Macedonian government and Macedonian media claimed that security forces could have defeated the NLA fighters in Aracinovo easily. The operations of the Macedonian security forces were poorly planned and executed. Many analysts argue that the attempt to retake Aracinovo would have resulted in numerous casualties among Albanians and Macedonian security forces, which would have only worsened the tense security situation in Macedonia (Ordanoski, 2004 #606).

The NATO-organised evacuation only fuelled the widespread belief that the NLA actions were supported by NATO in order to create a greater Albanian state. On the same day of the evacuation, angry protesters, including many members of the security forces, stormed the Parliament in Skopje and damaged government buildings and vehicles.

The European Union and the United States appointed the former French defence minister, Francois Leotard, and James Pardew, a US diplomat with extensive experience in the Balkans, as special envoys for the crisis in Macedonia. The efforts of the two envoys would finally result in the Ohrid Framework Agreement in August 2001.

2.B.2.vi Where did the war activities mainly take place?

The conflict started in the mountainous, forested border region between Kosovo and Macedonia. NLA fighters ambushed military convoys of the Macedonian security forces on their way to western Macedonia. NLA fighters fired at positions of security forces in the predominantly Albanian-inhabited city of Tetovo from the hills surrounding Tetovo. The NLA threatened to target the capital Skopje once it had gained control over the nearby village of Aracinovo. However, there were no major battles within the cities of Tetovo or Skopje. Mob violence against Muslims took place in the cities of Bitola and Prilep, but these incidents did not result in fatalities. Most of the fighting occurred in rural areas.

2.B.3 War end / Peace Process
2.B.3.i Duration

The conflict lasted for seven months between February and August 2001.

2.B.3.ii Final month of violence

The NLA and ANA killed 17 soldiers in two ambushes on military convoys between August 8 and 10. Units of the Ministry of the Interior entered the village of Ljuboten on August 12. Macedonian police forces killed 10 unarmed Albanian civilians and injured over a hundred Albanians during the operation. The Ohrid Framework Agreement put an end to the conflict on August 13. Only 10 days after the signing of the Ohrid Framework Agreement, militant Albanians blew up the monastery in Leshok. The NLA denied responsibility for this act.

Multiethnic police forces started entering formerly NLA-controlled areas in September 2001. There was no organized large-scale violence after the signing of the Ohrid Framework Agreement. However, several violent incidents took place after the signing of the Ohrid Framework Agreement. Macedonian businessmen complained about threats from Albanians in Albanian-dominated regions. Albanian and Macedonian youth clashed on several occasions after the signing of the Ohrid Framework Agreement.

2.B.3.iii Termination of conflict

Macedonian media and politicians claimed that the Macedonian security forces could have cracked down on the Albanian insurgency if the international community had allowed them to do so. Macedonians also believed that the governments of many Western and Islamic countries had provided equipment, training and funding to the NLA.

The NLA maintained the initiative during the conflict. Albanian rebels ambushed military convoys on several occasions. The NLA started the conflict in the border region in neighbouring Kosovo and opened new fronts in the Tetovo, Kumanovo and Skopje regions. The uncoordinated attacks of Macedonian security forces and the shelling of Albanian-inhabited villages increased sympathy for the NLA among Albanians in Macedonia. I would therefore argue that the NLA gained a psychological, if not military, victory in 2001.

2.B.3.iv Did the war parties sign a truce or a ceasefire arrangement?

The Ohrid Framework Agreement encompassed the cessation of hostilities and “[the] complete voluntary disarmament of the ethnic Albanian armed groups and their
complete voluntary disbandment” {American Bar Association and Central European and Eurasian Law Initiative (CEELI), 2004 #178}. The Framework Agreement foresaw the voluntary disarmament of the NLA under the auspices of NATO troops.

NATO Secretary General Lord Robertson and the High Representative for the Common Foreign and Security Policy of the European Union, Javier Solana, travelled several times to Macedonia in the spring of 2001. The EU appointed Francois Leotard as special envoy to Macedonia. Together with the US special envoy James Perdew, they brokered the Ohrid Framework Agreement. Prior to the conclusion of the negotiations in Ohrid, the representatives of the EU, NATO and the United States had put tremendous pressure on the Macedonian government not to declare a state of war and general mobilisation. In addition, NATO troops closely monitored the operations of the Macedonian security forces. The EU, NATO and the US put pressure on the Macedonian government to deter large-scale military operations and the use of heavy artillery against Albanian insurgents and civilians.

2.B.3.vi Did the war parties engage in comprehensive peace talks? Were all relevant parties included in the peace process?

The Ohrid Framework Agreement put an end to the violence in 2001. The heads of the two major Macedonian (VMRO-DPMNE, SDSM) and Albanian (DPA, PDP) political parties signed the Ohrid Framework Agreement. In addition, Macedonian President Trajkovski and the special envoys of the European Union and the United States signed the Ohrid Framework Agreement. The National Liberation Army was not directly involved in the peace talks. Yet the NLA, DPA and PDP had already agreed upon a joint political platform in Prizren, Kosovo in May 2001. The agreement, known as the Prizren platform, had been facilitated by the American OSCE diplomat, Robert Frowick. The agreement called for constitutional changes and the use of the Albanian language in state institutions. The joint platform authorised the DPA and PDP to negotiate with Macedonian political parties on issues of constitutional changes and the modus of the cessation of hostilities in Macedonia.

2.B.3.vii State reconstruction

The peace process had direct implications on the process of state reconstruction after 2001. Issues of constitutional changes regarding the use of the Albanian language, the access to jobs in state institutions and local self-governance were the key issues during the negotiations. The Ohrid Framework Agreement was structured around these issues.

2.B.3.viii Emergence of a dominant party

The four biggest political parties had signed the Ohrid Framework Agreement. The NLA disbanded in 2001, and its leadership formed a political party, the Democratic Union for Integration (DUI). The DUI won a majority of votes from Albanian voters in the 2002 Parliamentary elections and formed a government coalition with the Macedonian SDSM. Thus, all major parties were linked to the Ohrid Framework Agreement. Macedonian
members of Parliament heavily opposed many constitutional amendments, but in the end the major political parties would get enough votes to push constitutional changes through Parliament.

2.B.3.ix Role of charismatic leadership

The political leader of the NLA, Ali Ahmeti, enjoyed a high level of popularity and respect among the Albanian population, while Macedonians regarded him as a terrorist. He supported the Ohrid Framework Agreement, which encompassed the political goals of the NLA.

President Boris Trajkovski tried to conciliate the Macedonian people during the crisis. When the hostilities ended in August 2001, he publicly stated that both sides had made serious mistakes in the past.

2.B.3.x Role of internal veto players

Albanian political actors supported the full implantation of the Ohrid Framework Agreement. The newly-formed Albanian National Army (ANA) opposed the Ohrid Framework Agreement, but unlike the NLA, it did not gain support among Albanians in Macedonia. The NLA launched several attacks against Macedonian security forces after August 2001, but none of them posed a serious threat to the implementation of the Ohrid Framework Agreement.

Many Macedonian party politicians opposed numerous provisions of the Ohrid Framework Agreement, but all major provisions of the Ohrid Framework Agreement were passed in the Parliament. The World Macedonian Congress initiated a referendum campaign against the New Law on Territorial Organisation in 2004, which granted local self-governance to municipalities in Macedonia. The law also stipulated the merger of several municipalities, which made Albanians the major ethnic group in several previously Macedonian-dominated municipalities. The VMRO-DPMNE jumped on the bandwagon when it realised that the referendum was an effective vehicle for Macedonian voters to express their frustration over the SDSM government. The VMRO-DPMNE speculated that a successful referendum would overthrow the SDSM-DUI government, which would have resulted in new elections.

The VMRO-DPMNE won the Parliamentary elections in 2006. It formed a coalition with the DPA and continued to implement the provisions of the Ohrid Framework Agreement. The full implementation of the Ohrid Agreement became a precondition for Macedonia’s integration into NATO and the EU. Thus, populist rhetoric aside, no major political ruling party wanted to interrupt the implementation of the Ohrid Framework Agreement, so they would not be blamed for working against the goal of EU integration.

2.B.3.xi Role of external veto players
No external actors tried to impede the peace process. International organisations brokered the Ohrid Framework Agreement and assisted the government in the implementation. Serbia, Bulgaria, Greece and Albania did not impede the peace process.

2.B.3.xii Root causes

The use of the Albanian language, equal representation in state institutions and local self-governance were featured prominently during the negotiations in Ohrid. These issues are the key components of the Ohrid Framework Agreement. However, the status of Kosovo and the importance of transnational criminal networks were not addressed in the peace talks in Ohrid.

2.B.3.xiv What happened to the losers in the peace process?

All major parties signed the Ohrid Framework Agreement. Macedonian political parties portrayed the Agreement as a treaty, which was forced upon them by external actors. However, the implementation of the Framework Agreement became a precondition for EU membership. The international community persuaded the Macedonian parliament to pass a law in March 2002, which granted amnesty to all NLA fighters, except those who had committed crimes against humanity.

One can argue that the smaller ethnic groups in Macedonia were the losers of the peace process, since the Ohrid Framework Agreement improved the constitutional status of Albanians in Macedonia de facto. The conflict in 2001 showed that violence did pay off. However, the Roma, Serbs and Turks in Macedonia lacked the demographic strength, military equipment and political leadership, as well as the will to challenge the Macedonian state in a violent way.

2.B.3.xiv Recurrence of violence

On several occasions, Albanian militants targeted Macedonian security forces as a result of the arrests of ethnic Albanian criminals. Members of the VMRO-DPMNE-affiliated Lions unit threatened and attacked Albanian civilians and members of other political Macedonian parties in 2001 and 2002.

---

13 The dispute between the Macedonian government and Greece over the use of the name Macedonia became a crucial issue in 2008. Greece blocked an expected invitation by NATO to Macedonia to join NATO. Greece also made clear that it would not accept a new EU member calling itself the Republic of Macedonia. While ethnic Macedonians do not want the name of their country to be changed, the Albanian population is more indifferent toward the official name of the Republic of Macedonia. The unresolved name dispute with Greece resulted in the downfall of the government coalition between the VMRO and the DPA. It remains to be seen whether Albanian parties will condone a stalemate in terms of Macedonia’s bid towards EU integration on account of the unresolved name dispute with Greece.
Several interethnic acts of violence took place as well after the signing of the Ohrid Framework Agreement. Macedonian protesters clashed with police forces during protests against the New Law on Territorial Organisation in the summer of 2004. There were fistfights and gunfights between members of the DPA and DUI during electoral campaigns and on election days. Such incidents were isolated. There was no organised large-scale violence after the signing of the Ohrid Framework agreement. The government downplayed such isolated incidents.

2.B.3.xvi Change in economic structure

There was no change in the economic structure after the cessation of hostilities in August 2001.

Section 3: External variables – military intervention and democracy promotion

3.A External Intervention

3.A.0 Additional section: Preventive missions in Macedonia

3.A.0.i Additional section: On what grounds were international actors – UN, NATO and EU as well as numerous NGOs – active in Macedonia long before there were any signs of an outbreak of violence?

United Nations

The United Nations operated two military missions in Macedonia between 1992 and 1999. The United Nations deployed the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) in Macedonia. The mission was mandated to monitor Macedonia`s borders with the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and Albania. The mission had to report any developments that could harm confidence and stability in Macedonia. The mission also monitored interethnic relations and human rights. The mission comprised 700 troops, 35 military observers, 26 civilian police monitors, 10 civil affairs staff, 45 administrative staff and several local interpreters. The mission comprised a Nordic composite battalion consisting of soldiers from Denmark, Norway, Finland and Sweden. The United States contributed 350 personnel to UNPROFOR. It was the first time in the history of the United Nations that a preventive force was deployed to a country where a conflict had not yet erupted. UNPROFOR troops mediated several border incidents. (Department of Public Information 1996; United Nations Security Council 1992)(American Bar Association and Central European and Eurasian Law Initiative (CEELI), 2004 #178@49; U.S. Department of State, 2008 #581).
The UNPROFOR mandate also covered Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina, where the United Nations had stationed over 37,000 military personnel. The United Nations replaced the UNPROFOR missions in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Croatia with the United Nations Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina (UNMBIH), the United Nations Confidence Restoration Operation in Croatia (UNCRO) and subsequently the United Nations Transitional Administration for Eastern Slavonia, Baranja and Western Sirmium (UNTAES) in 1995.

In March 1995 the United Nations Preventive Deployment Force (UNPREDEP) became UNPROFOR’s successor in Macedonia. The mandate and structure of the mission remained the same. The United Nations reinforced the UNPREDEP mission with 350 additional troops in 1998, when UNPREDEP focused on monitoring the border region between Macedonia and Kosovo. By the end of the mission UNPREDEP encompassed 1,100 military personnel and 203 international and civilian staff. The mission was terminated in late February 1999 when China vetoed the extension of the mandate for another six months. Although the other members of the United Nations Security Council feared a spillover from the conflict in Kosovo, China insisted that a renewal was not necessary anymore due to the alleged improved security situation of Macedonia. (United Nations Department of Public Information 1999; United Nations Security Council 1995, 1998).

UNHCR

The UNHCR was active in Macedonia beginning in 1992. The Macedonian government had requested help from the United Nations to deal with tens of thousand of Bosnian refugees. After the outbreak of the Kosovo crisis in 1998 the UNCHR increased its mission in Macedonia. Over 300,000 refugees left Kosovo for Macedonia. The Macedonian government was not able to provide humanitarian aid to the refugees from Kosovo. Many of the refugees found shelter in Albanian households. The UNHCR provided assistance for the internally displaced persons of the 2001 conflict {United Nations, 2007 #655}.

UNDP

The UNDP became active in Macedonia in 1997. It promoted projects in the areas of democratic governance and poverty reduction. After the conflict in 2001 UNDP focused on assisting the Macedonian government in meeting its development priorities in the areas of decentralisation and good governance, economic development, crisis prevention and the environment {United Nations, 2006 #656}.

NATO

In order to demonstrate its military determination and to deter the Yugoslav government from continuing military operations in Kosovo, NATO conducted two military exercises in Macedonia in the summer of 1998.

Macedonia became the host of two NATO operations in October 1998 when the Kosovo crisis escalated. NATO launched operation Eagle Eye after the NATO-Kosovo Verification Mission Agreement. Operation Eagle Eye had three goals. First, it verified the activities of Yugoslav security forces through use of unarmed NATO aircraft. Second, it assessed the security
situation in Kosovo. Third, it reported to the North Atlantic Council and the OSCE. As part of operation Eagly Eye NATO set up the Kosovo Verification Co-ordination Centre (KVCC) in the northern Macedonian town of Kumanovo. The Centre liaised between the OSCE, NATO air verification and the Kosovo Protection Force. The verification flights ended on 24 March 1999 (Regional Headquarters Allied Forces Southern Europe 2002).

Macedonia also hosted operation Determined Guarantor, which comprised an extraction force of 2,300 troops. The mission of the extraction force was to evacuate members of the OSCE Kosovo Verification Mission (KVM) from Kosovo or Serbia in case the personal safety of the OSCE personnel was endangered. The extraction force would later form the nucleus of the Kosovo Protection Force (KFOR). NATO deployed the Allied Command Europe Rapid Reaction Corps (ARRC) to Macedonia in early 1999. Over 12,000 NATO troops were stationed in Macedonia during the Kosovo War. NATO troops contributed humanitarian assistance during the refugee crisis in Macedonia between March and June 1999 (Veltri, 2007 #658).

Macedonia became a Communications Zone (COMMZ), which made it a logistical hub for the international military presence in Kosovo. NATO soldiers were based at the Skopje airport. Seventeen of the 39 participating nations in Kosovo, which contributed troops to KFOR, had so-called National Support Elements (NSE) in Macedonia. Macedonia was of crucial importance for supplying NATO operations in Kosovo with personnel and equipment due to its geographical position. Pristina Airport in Kosovo was too small to handle all the needed supplies for KFOR. NATO could not ship personnel and equipment through Serbia or Montenegro for political reasons. Due to the poor state of the infrastructure in Albania, Macedonia was the only option for providing NATO in Kosovo with needed supplies. The important port of Salonika in Greece was only a few hours away from Kosovo. KFOR’s REAR operated a branch for Civil-Military Cooperation (CIMIC), which funded the refurbishment of schools and the reconstruction of bridges and roads in Macedonia (NATO Headquarters Skopje 2008). NATO created the NATO Headquarter Mission Skopje through the merger of the headquarters of KFOR REAR and Operation Amber Fox in April 2003 (NATO Headquarters Skopje, 2008 #659).

CSCE/OSCE

Spillover Monitor Mission to Skopje

The CSCE launched the Spillover Monitor Mission to Skopje in September 1992, which became the longest serving field mission. The mission was supposed to monitor developments at the borders of Serbia and establish contacts with the Macedonian government, political parties and ordinary citizens. The mission consisted of only eight international and three local staff members. The Permanent Council of the OSCE renewed the mandate of the Spillover Monitor Mission on an annual basis. The Permanent Council enhanced the OSCE missions in Macedonia and Albania due to the crisis in Kosovo (CSCE 1992; Organization for security and Co-operation in Europe Permanent Council 1998; OSCE Spillover Monitor Mission to Skopje 2007).

High Commissioner on National Minorities
The High Commissioner on National Minorities (HCNM), Max van der Stoel, became active in Macedonia in the early 1990s. Van der Stoel conducted 35 visits to Macedonia between 1993 and 1998. The HCNM conducted fact finding missions to Macedonia. Van der Stoel focused on issues with the use of the Albanian language in media and education. He issued reports and recommendations to the OSCE and the Macedonian government. {Ackermann, 2000 #12@143; CSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities, 1995 #681}

Van der Stoel played a key role in meeting the demands of the Albanian population for a tertiary education in the Albanian language. Albanians had already established an illegal Albanian language in the town of Tetovo in the early 1990s, which led to several violent clashes in Tetovo resulting in the death of one Albanian protester. As early as 1995 Van der Stoel proposed the establishment of a private, trilingual university in Tetovo, which would conduct courses in the Albanian, Macedonian and English languages. The HCNM and the Council of Europe elaborated detailed plans for a private University in Tetovo, which would adhere to international academic standards and accommodate the demands of the Albanian population for higher education in the Albanian language. The work of the HCNM and the Council of Europe resulted in the establishment of the South East European University, which opened in October 2001.

South East European was funded by international organisations and bilateral aid agencies. It was supposed to take students from the illegal University of Tetovo, which would have resulted in the dissolution of the University of Tetovo. However, the leadership of Tetovo University wanted to continue operating. Tetovo University finally became a state university in 2004. However, it could not compete with SEE University in terms of funding and teaching quality. SEE University, which is usually referred to as Van der Stoel University rather than its official name, became a success story in Macedonia. SEE University offered a curriculum based on international standards and attracted students from abroad {South East European University, 2007 #682}.

After the outbreak of the conflict in 2001 Max van der Stoel made the following statement:

“For years I have been stressing that the situation there is fragile and that the multi-ethnic State had wobbly foundations. But people were focused on other developments in the region - Bosnia, Kosovo, Serbia, Montenegro - and were apparently not able to pay attention to an urgent, yet not so obvious, danger in Macedonia. In Macedonia itself, the need for dialogue on inter-ethnic issues did not get the necessary attention. Only when the pots began to boil did the cooks run into the kitchen” {Jakobsson Hatay, 2005 #564}.

European Union

The European Union has been active in Macedonia since the early 1990s in the areas of humanitarian aid. Between 1993 and 1996 the European Commission Humanitarian Aid Office (ECHO) provided 45 million Euros to assist Macedonia with sheltering over 60,000 refugees from Bosnia-Herzegovina. It provided another 46.75 million Euros between 1998 and 2000 when over 300,000 refugees Kosovo fled to Macedonia. ECHO channeled another 3.15 million Euros to Macedonia for humanitarian aid for internally displaced persons.
Macedonia has maintained contractual relations with the European Union since 1995 when the country became eligible for funding from the PHARE and OBNOVA programs. Macedonia and the European Union signed cooperation and trade agreements in 1997. These programs are aimed at the strengthening of public institutions, the promotion of the adoption of the Acquis Communautaire and the promotion of economic and social cohesion. From 1995 until 2000 Macedonia received 180 million Euros from the PHARE and OBNOVA programs, which were replaced by the CARDS program in 2001 (see chapter 4) (Mission of the European Union to the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia 2006a).

The European Commission opened the Office of the Resident Envoy in Macedonia 1998, which was upgraded to a permanent Delegation of the European Commission in 2000 (Mission of the European Union to the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia 2006b). Political relations between the European Union and Macedonia intensified after the signing of the Stabilisation and Association Agreement. By signing this agreement Macedonia became part of the Stabilisation and Association Process (SAP), which provided the political and legal framework for assisting the Western Balkan countries on their way to membership in the European Union. The Stabilisation and Association Process provided trade concessions, economic assistance and contractual relationships. Annual progress reports assessed the state of political and economic reforms in Macedonia {Council of the European Union, 2001 #196} (see Chapter 3).

Macedonia was also covered by the EU Monitoring Mission in former Yugoslavia (EUMM), which had its headquarters in Sarajevo. About 120 international staff observed political and security developments, interethic relations and refugee returns in Albania, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, Macedonia, Montenegro and Serbia. The EUMM was launched on 22 December 2000 as successor of the European Community Monitor Mission (ECMM), which had been active in the former Yugoslavia since 1991 (Council of the European Union 2008).

**NGOs**

International relief NGOs like Doctors Without Borders, Mercy Corps, Catholic Relief Services and Care International channeled aid into Macedonia from 1992, when Macedonia had to deal with its first refugee crisis, which went almost unnoticed in Western media. Over 60,000 refugees from Bosnia-Herzegovina fled to Macedonia as result of the war in Bosnia-Herzegovina. The Macedonian state could not accommodate the refugees from Bosnia and international donors channeled humanitarian aid through international and indigenous NGOs {Macedonian Centre for International Cooperation, 2003 #266}.

In addition to humanitarian NGOs which provided humanitarian relief and services several advocacy NGOs emerged in the early 1990s. NGOs like the Open Society Instituted and the Macedonian Helsinki Committee worked on issues such as the rule of law, public reforms and human rights. Both humanitarian and advocacy NGOs conducted projects on the improvement of interethic relations in Macedonia. Bilateral donors like USAID and SIDA became the main donors of NGOs in the 1990s.

Several NGOs focused solely on conflict prevention. Search for Common Ground, the Ethnic Conflict Resolution Project and the Nansen Dialogue Center became active in Macedonia from the mid 1990s. The former head of the CSCE Mission to Macedonia, Robert Frowick, was the founding director of the Macedonian branch of Search for Common Ground. These
NGOs worked on the grass root level and conducted dialogue projects between different ethnic groups in the areas of journalism, the environment and youth {Ackermann, 2000 #12}.

3.A.0.ii Additional section: Was there some previous (possibly remorseful) experience that the international organisations could rely on regarding spill-over effects? Was there institutional learning? Had some of the international representatives/envoys/experts been involved in similar cases before?

There was certainly institutional learning within the European Union, NATO and the OSCE. The conflicts in Croatia, Bosnia-Herzegovina and Kosovo had shown that an early involvement by external actors was key to preventing an escalation of violence.

The OSCE, United Nations and the European Union had already been involved in the former Yugoslavia since the early 1990s. Yet, the Macedonian case differs from the previous engagement in the former republic of Socialist Yugoslavia in several ways: First, the European Union had established the Common Security and Foreign Policy (CFSP), which was headed by Javier Solana (Schneckener 2001). The CFSP allowed the European Union to approach the Macedonian government as a unitary actor. It also allowed for better coordination with the United States.

The Macedonian government wanted to join NATO and the European Union. The Partnership for Peace and the Stabilisation and Association Process (SAP) were already being planned in order to promote the long-term integration of Macedonia into these two organisations. In contrast to Serbia or Croatia during the 1990s, the Macedonian government was very susceptible to external pressures. It was not interested in being isolated from the West. Macedonia had the long-term prospect of joining the European Union and NATO.

Macedonia was not an isolated problem. As mentioned earlier, a large-scale war in Macedonia would have endangered the supply of the international protection force in Kosovo. A conflict would have worsened relations between UNMIK and Kosovar-Albanian leadership on the one hand and UNMIK and Serbia proper on the other.

As I will show in the following section, the European Union, United States, NATO and OSCE could rely on envoys and special representatives who had both extensive work experience in the area of crisis management as well as work experience in the Balkans and other crisis areas like Somalia. I do not argue that the area expertise of the international envoys was decisive. Rather, the envoys and special envoys knew what would happen if the conflict in Macedonia would have escalated.

The special envoy of the United States, James H. Pardew, had served as served as Director of Foreign Intelligence and Chief of Current Intelligence, Army General Staff, from 1988 to 1992. He also participated in Operation Restore Hope in Somalia. He was part of the US-American negotiation team during the Dayton Peace Talks. He was in charge of the military

---

14 It is often overlooked that both the United States and the European Union misjudged the political problems in the former Yugoslavia in the late 1980s and early 1990s although accomplished area experts had held high-level positions. For example, the former National Security Advisor, Brent Scowcroft, had written his PhD thesis on Socialist Yugoslavia, while Secretary of State Lawrence Eagleburger had been US Ambassador in Belgrade for many years.
train and equip programme for Bosnia from 1996 to 1999. He was also special advisor for the Balkans to the US-President and the Secretary of State during the war in Kosovo {U.S. Department of State, 2005 #1125}.

Lord Robertson of Port Ellen served as Defence Secretary of the United Kingdom between 1997 and 1999 before he succeeded Javier Solana as NATO Secretary General in August 1999. As Defence Secretary of the United Kingdom and NATO Secretary General, Lord Robertson gained expertise with crisis management in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Kosovo {NATO, 2004 #1118; NATO, 2004 #1118}.

Javier Solana was responsible for NATO activities in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Kosovo in his role as the Secretary General of NATO between 1995 and 1999. The European Union appointed Solana as High Representative of the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and the Western European Union in late 1999 {Council of the European Union, 2008 #1119}.

Francois Leotard had served as Minister of Defence in France between 1993 and 1995. He had been a member of an international commission, which investigated the massacres in Srebrenica. The European Union appointed Leotard as a special envoy for Macedonia in June 2001. He was succeeded by Alain le Roy in October 2001 {Council of the European Union, 2008 #1120}.

Alain le Roy, who was the Special Representative of the European Union in Macedonia from October 2001 until November 2002, had held several posts for the international administrations in Bosnia and Kosovo in 1995 and 1999. He was also the National Coordinator for political and security related issues for the Stability Pact for Southeast Europe {Council of the European Union, 2008 #1121}.

Soren Jessen-Petersen served as Special Representative of the European Union in Macedonia between February and July 2004. He had dealt with refugee questions and the implementation of the Dayton Agreement as a high senior official in the UNHCR in the 1990s {Council of the European Union, 2008 #1122}.

Before taking on the position of EU Special Representative in Skopje in July 2004, Michael Sahlin had already served as Swedish ambassador to Macedonia and Yugoslavia from 2000 until 2001. He gained experience regarding crisis management issues as a member of the Swedish Ministries of Defence and Foreign Affairs during the early and mid-1990s. Sahlin served as the Special Representative to Macedonia until October 2005 {Council of the European Union, 2008 #1123}.

Sahlin was succeeded by Erwardn Fouéré, who had led the European Commission Delegation to Slovenia. Fouéré was appointed head of the OSCE Section in the Directorate General for External Relations between 1998 and 2002. In this capacity, he was also responsible for the relations of the European Union and the Council of Europe {Council of the European Union, 2008 #1124}.

Ambassador Robert Frowick was the first head of the OSCE mission in Macedonia in the early 1990s. The OSCE Chairman-in-Office Mircea Geoana appointed Frowick in early 2001 as his personal advisor. Frowick took on the ungrateful job of brokering an agreement between the NLA and the two Albanian political parties, which allowed the Albanian Political
Parties to represent the NLA during talks with their Macedonian counterparts. When the so-called Prizren-Agreement was leaked to the press the Macedonian government and the representatives of the European Union and NATO claimed that Frowick had acted without their knowledge {OSCE Spillover Monitor Mission to Skopje, 2007 #661}.

The President of the Constitutional Council of France and former Minister of Justice, Robert Badinter, headed the Arbitration Commission of the Peace Conference on the former Yugoslavia from 1991 until 1993. The so-called Badinter Commission assessed whether the former Yugoslav republics met the criteria for international recognition. Robert Badinter advised the participants of the Ohrid Agreement talks on drafting the Ohrid Framework Agreement. Badinter introduced the so-called double majority (or Badinter principle), which means that laws which directly affect ethnic minorities can only be passed in the parliament when a majority of the representatives of the affected ethnic group votes for them. Badinter had also advised other states in Central and Eastern Europe on minority issues {United Nations, #1126}.

3.A.1.i-ii When did the international intervention officially start?

The European Union and NATO started exercising pressure on warring parties in Macedonia in March 2001 when their representatives, Javier Solana and Oscar Robertson, visited the country on several occasions. The European Union and the United States appointed special envoys to broker the Ohrid Framework Agreement, which was signed in August 2001. At the beginning of the diplomatic involvement, the conflict between the NLA and Macedonian security forces had only lasted for a few weeks. Thus, the international community became active in Macedonia at a very early stage.

3.A.1.iii Did the intervention have a clear mandate?

The annexes of the Framework Agreement created the legal framework for the involvement of external actors. The OSCE and the European Union were invited to assist the Macedonian state in selecting and training police officers from ethnic minorities in order to increase staff for existing security forces. Moreover, the OSCE was expected to develop measures to enhance interethnic relations in Macedonia and the media sector and to observe elections. NATO was invited to assist in “[the] complete voluntary disarmament of the ethnic Albanian armed groups and their complete voluntary disbandment” (Framework Agreement, 2001 #594).

Macedonia constituted a special case since the major external actors, who were later in charge of the implementation of the Framework Agreement, were already on the ground before the outbreak of the conflict in 2001. The OSCE operated a small spill-over mission in Macedonia. The European Commission had opened an office in Skopje in 1996. NATO troops had been deployed to Macedonia since 1998 as part of the international extraction force for OSCE observers in Macedonia, and would later constitute the nucleus of the Kosovo Protection Force (KFOR). Since 1998, NATO used the Skopje airport and an army outpost in Tetovo to supply KFOR with military equipment and other goods.
The pre-war operations of international organisations in Macedonia laid the groundwork for the quick intervention in 2001. Moreover, after a decade of diplomatic, military and humanitarian involvement in the former Yugoslavia, international organisations could take advantage of the expertise of numerous staff members, who had gained work experience there. Thus, Macedonia offered very favourable conditions for an external intervention. International organisations supplemented each other in Macedonia, which is why Macedonia is often cited as a successful application of the concept of interlocking institutions.

3.A.1.iv De facto lead nations or lead organisations

NATO, the EU, the OSCE and UNHCR were active in Macedonia in 2001. There was no de facto lead nation or lead agency. The concept of interlocking institutions worked very well in the case of Macedonian.

3.A.1.v Which states pushed for the intervention; which states vetoed an intervention? Was the intervention hotly debated beforehand – internally as well as publicly?

The international community acted in a remarkably cohesive way. The United Nations Security Council adopted resolutions 1345 and 1371 unanimously. Resolution 1345, which was adopted in March 2001, condemned the violence against the Macedonian state by Albanian extremists and reaffirmed its commitment to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Republic of Macedonia. Resolution 1371, which the Security Council adopted on 26 September 2006, welcomed the signing of the Ohrid Framework Agreement and welcomed the efforts of the European Union and the OSCE to contribute to the implementation of the Ohrid Framework Agreement. Even China, who had vetoed the renewal of the UNPREDP mission to Macedonia in 1999, supported these resolutions (United Nations Security Council 2001a, b). However, the operations were not mandated by the United Nations.

The relations between Macedonia and Greece were very strained on account of the unresolved dispute over the constitutional name of the Republic of Macedonia, which had even resulted in an economic embargo against Macedonia during in 1994 and 1995. However, the Hellenic Greece backed the Macedonian government during the crisis. Greece supported Macedonia’s call for a UN mandated international protection force, which should have included troops from Russia (MIA News Agency 2001).

There were debates in several media that the decision by NATO to send 3,500 troops to Macedonia to collect voluntarily surrendered weapons was premature. Commentaries warned against another open-ended international commitment in the Balkans and compared Macedonia to the situations in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Kosovo (Beeston 2001a, b). Many journalists, country experts and even NATO pointed to the issue of disarmament and drew parallels to Somalia and Northern Ireland, where measures to disarm warring parties had failed (Richburg 2001).

The ruling Labour government faced strong criticism by the Conservatives in the wake of the death of a British soldier. Sapper Ian Collin’s car was hit by a concrete block thrown from a
bridge by Macedonian youth only a couple of days after the beginning of Mission Harvest. after the end. The Conservatives requested the Labour government to clarify the role of British troops in Macedonia (The Independent 2001).

Four hundred ninety-seven of 636 members of the German Parliament backed the proposal by the German government consisting of the Social Democratic Party (SPD) and the Green Party. However, 24 Social Democrats and Green members of the German parliament voted against the government proposal. The German government could only send troops to Macedonia, because the majority of the members of parliament of the opposition parties supported the sending of troops to Macedonia (Deutscher Bundestag, 2001 #633). This outcome embarrassed the ruling government coalition. In order to avoid another embarrassing outcome, then Chancellor Gerhard Schröder asked for a vote of confidence when the German Parliament decided over the issue of supporting the War on Terror in military terms in November 2001. The leadership of the Social Democrats pushed hard on their members of parliament, who initially intended to vote against Germany’s participation in the War on Terror (Ilse 2001; Schwarz 2001).

Russia supported an international intervention in Macedonia; however, Russia’s President Putin doubted that the NLA would voluntarily surrender their arms. Putin stated in an interview: "The essential task is not to collect arms. The essential task is to create the conditions in which peace can be established and a halt made to the destruction of cultural monuments, massacres and terrorist actions, so that . . . political issues are resolved by political means and not by force of arms." Like the Macedonian government, Russia described the NLA as a terrorist organisation with its origins and supporters in Kosovo (Tsukanova 2001).

3.A.1.vi Capacities of the Intervention

3.A.1.vi Assessment of coordination between different nations and organisations

The coordination of different organisations worked very well in the case of Macedonia, for two reasons. First, the number of troops in Macedonia was very low. 3,500 troops participated in Operation Essential Harvest. The successor operation, Amber Fox, included only 700 troops. The next operation to start, Allied Harmony, encompassed only 450 troops. These missions were much smaller than the UN and NATO operations in Croatia, Bosnia-Herzegovina and Kosovo.

Second, most participating nations were already familiar with conditions on the ground in Macedonia, which served as a logistical area for KFOR in Kosovo.

Third, the missions in Macedonia operated under very confined mandates. Operation Essential Harvest was only tasked to collect and destroy weapons and ammunition that had been voluntarily turned over to the National Liberation Army. The troops were neither allowed to use force to collect and destroy weapons nor to intervene in fights between the National Liberation Army and Macedonian security forces. The task of the troops operating under operation Amber Fox was to protect international observers, who were overseeing the
implementation of the Ohrid Framework Agreement {NATO Headquarters Skopje, 2008 #659}.

The mandate of the new mission, operation Allied Harmony, was a slightly new one. Allied Harmony started on 15 December 2002 and lasted until 31 March 2003. The mission consisted of 450 troops who had the task to observe measures in former crisis areas aimed at maintaining links with local authorities, populations and international organisations.

Operation Allied Harmony was followed by Operation Concordia, the first military mission of the European Union. Yet, NATO was still active in Macedonia after the termination of its military missions. NATO created the NATO Headquarter Mission Skopje (NHQS) through the merger of the headquarters of KFOR REAR and Operation Amber Fox in April 2003. The NATO Headquarters in Skopje consisted of about 180 military and civilian personnel. It advised the Macedonian government on security sector reforms (NATO Headquarters Skopje 2008).

The mission remained the same. Operation Concordia made use of NATO assets and capabilities {Council of the European Union, 2003 #624}.

Operation Concordia terminated on 10 December 2003. It was the last military operation in Macedonia, which was to be succeeded by a police mission. The EU police mission Proxima started on 15 December 2003 {Council of the European Union, 2003 #625}.

Operation Proxima terminated on 14 December 2005. The European Union decided to deploy a small police advisory team (EUPAT) in Macedonia. EUPAT was comprised of about 30 international police advisors. Besides the headquarters in Skopje, EUPAT operated an office in the Ministry of Interior {Council of the European Union, 2005 #626}. EUPAT was supposed to monitor and advise the Macedonian police at the middle and senior management. EUPAT ended on 14 June 2006 {Council of the European Union, 2005 #627}.

In conclusion, I want to emphasise that the mandates of the military and police missions by NATO and the European Union were not robust. Yet, these missions never had to enforce peace with military power.

The missions had clear exit strategies. The mandates of the missions were adjusted; however, the troops and police forces were tasked to intervene in fights between Albanians and Macedonians. The downsizing of the number of military troops, police forces and observers happened in a continuous and smooth way. There were no bigger clashes between Albanian insurgents and Macedonian security forces after the deployment of international troops. One can only speculate on what would have happened in case of continued fighting between Albanians and Macedonians.

Many humanitarian NGOs operating in Macedonia since the refugee crisis in 1999 were not satisfied with the work by the United Nations Office for the Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA). During the crisis in 2001 22 NGOs\(^\text{15}\) formed the International NGO Council in order to better

\(^{15}\) Action Against Hunger (AAH), ACTED, American Refugee Committee (ARC), Anatolian Development Foundation (ADF), CARE, Caritas France, Caritas Germany, Catholic Relief Services (CRS), Danish Refugee Council (DRC), European Perspective, Handicap International (HI), International Rescue Committee (IRC), InterSOS, Malteser Hilfsdienst, Mercy Corps International (MCI), Movimiento por la Paz, el desarme, y la libertad (MPDL), PRONI Institute of Social Education, Search for Common Ground, Shelter Now International (SNI), Solidarities, World Vision International (WVI).
coordinate their activities, to exchange information on security and to better foster cooperation between international and local NGOs. The International NGO Council represented international NGOs to both international organizations and all levels of the Macedonian government. It was a very uncommon move that international NGO decided to organize them on their own.16

3.A.1.vii Stated objectives of the intervention.

3.A.1.viii Exit strategy

3.A.1.viii Additional section: Causes for the influence of international actors

Additional questions from case study evaluation: Where did the EU, NATO and also the US gain their critical leverage from? Was it from their strength in numbers and military power or rather from the fact that the Macedonian government, including representatives of the Albanian minority, was eager to join the EU and NATO and generally affiliate itself with the West? Was there consensus between the Macedonian majority and the Albanian minority on the desire for EU accession and Western integration?

As far as I can tell, neither NATO nor the European Union threatened the Macedonian government with the use of military action. However, the Macedonian government was well aware that NATO had intervened in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Kosovo. The political elite knew that NATO and the European Union would not allow massive military action against the NLA, which would have claimed the lives of civilians. NATO, the European Union and the OSCE had personnel stationed in Macedonia, who monitored fights between the NLA and Macedonian security forces. Macedonian security forces were held off from using heavy force against Albanian civilians.

A factor that should be taken into account was the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY). The establishment of the ICTY did not prevent mass human rights violations and atrocities during the conflicts in Croatia, Bosnia and Kosovo. Hardly any culprit was sentenced in the 1990s. However, by 2001, the ICTY had sentenced several indictees for crimes against humanity. They (ICTY) had also indicted the President of Yugoslavia, Slobodan Milosevic, during the Kosovo conflict in 1999. The Serbian government extracted Milosevic to The Hague in June 2001. The ICTY started collected information on war crimes at an early stage of the fighting in Macedonia. The Office of the Prosecutor issued a warning to all warring parties in Macedonia emphasising that Macedonia felt under the jurisdiction of the tribunal. ICTY started collected information on war crimes at an early stage of the fighting in Macedonia {International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, 2001 #1127}.

16 Interview with Dimitar Spasenovsi (International NGO Council).
There was a consensus between the Macedonian and Albanian population and leadership regarding integration into the European Union and NATO. This consensus allowed the European Union, the United States and NATO to operate a carrots and sticks policy. The international community made clear to the NLA and Albanian political parties that the territorial integrity of Macedonia would not be disputed.

Albanians did suffer from grievances in Macedonia; however, the situation was far better than the situation of Albanians under Milosevic in neighbouring Kosovo or even the situation of ethnic minorities in Greece, the Slovak Republic or the Baltics. Macedonian Albanians were also aware that their living standards were much higher in Macedonia than in Albania.

Finally, the Macedonian security forces were poorly equipped and trained. They were not able to defeat the National Liberation Army during the beginning of the conflict and to stop the spread of NLA fighters in other regions. The ruling VMRO-DPMNE party and the Ministry of Interior promulgated that Macedonian security forces could have crashed down the insurgency easily if NATO troops had not prevented them from doing so. They could blame NATO and the European Union for their own shortcomings.

3.A.1.viii Additional question: Can the termination of the short-lived conflict be attributed solely to the de-escalation efforts of NATO in the village of Aracinovo? Why did all parties agree to the evacuation, especially the NLA?

An escalation of the fights in the Albanian populated area of the village of Aracinovo could have resulted in an escalation of the conflict throughout Macedonia. The Macedonian security forces agreed to the evacuation because they understood that they could not retake Aracinovo without heavy losses. The security forces said that they would take Aracinovo in a couple of hours, but after three days of poorly coordinated and poorly executed attacks on Aracinovo, the offensive had reached a stalemate.

The NLA had shown that it was in position to threaten the capital Skopje, the airport and the only oil refinery in Macedonia. Sooner or later Macedonian security forces would have entered Aracinovo, which would have resulted in heavy losses on both sides. The evacuation offered the opportunity for retreat in an organized manner and to regroup in other places in Macedonia. In addition, NLA fighters were able to take their arms with them.

3.A.2.i International election Monitoring

The OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) monitored Parliamentary and municipal elections in 2002, 2005 and 2006. The OSCE also monitored the referendum on the adoption of the new law on territorial boundaries in 2004. The NGO MOST and other NGOs mobilised supporters to monitor the elections. The findings were made public.
3.A.2.v-vi Was the mandate ‘robust’? Did interveners enforce peace with military power?

To be added

3.A.2.vii Concrete measures that were performed by the external actors

NATO launched its first mission, Operation Essential Harvest, in Macedonia on 26 August 2001, which lasted for one month.

The troops had the task of collecting, transporting and destroying 3,300 weapons, which the NLA had declared to surrender voluntarily. In addition to the 3,300 weapons, NATO planned to destroy 600 mines, hand grenades and explosives, 1,100 rounds of ammunition for mortars and other support weapons and 110,000 rounds of small arms ammunition. In addition, KFOR troops seized over 2,000 weapons and 150,000 rounds of ammunition in Kosovo.

The collection of weapons was of political rather than military importance. The NLA had declared to voluntarily surrender their weapons and to disband. In turn, the Macedonian parliament passed the first set of laws to implement the Ohrid Framework Agreement during the weapon collection.

Hundreds of thousands of weapons were looted from army deposits in Albania in 1997. Due to the conflicts in Croatia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, and Kosovo, weapons were easily available on the black market. Many of the surrendered weapons were obviously out of date. The Macedonian media which were allowed by NATO to observe the collection process and many Macedonia politicians described the collection process as a political joke, which NATO had imposed upon Macedonia in order to protect the NLA (Dnevnik, reference to follow)

Even NATO soldiers participating in the mission admitted that most of the weapons were not usable. Canadian soldiers, for example, called the collected weapons “useless junk” (Taylor, 2001 #636). Prime Minister Ljubco Georgievski described the NATO numbers as “laughable and humiliating for Macedonia” (reference to follow). The Macedonian government estimated the number of weapons to be at 70,000, a number supported by Saferworld and BICC.

Yet, officials of NATO and the European Unions insisted that the collection resulted in the weakening of the military potential of the NLA. NATO Secretary General Lord George Robertson explained the rationale behind the collection process in an address to the Macedonian Parliament: “I know you will have heard other very much higher figures, but I have to be quite blunt and say we believe our estimates are right . . . it is not only the quantity but also the quality of weapons that is important. Judging by the first days of the operation, we believe that the so-called NLA is delivering its promise on both accounts . . . once these weapons and ammunition are collected and destroyed, the so-called NLA will have been disarmed as an organisation and will disband. This will be a major step in restoring your country's stability and return to normalcy. Without the so-called NLA operating using violence for political purposes you have the chance to safeguard your democratic institutions, to work towards reconciliation and to rebuild your country . . . The mission of Task Force Harvest is thus complementary to the political process of restoring peace and stability while at
the same time raising the standard of civil rights and freedoms in your country. The political reforms contained within the framework document will also better prepare you for further integration into the European mainstream” [NATO, 2001 #623].

Operation Essential Harvest was succeeded by Operation Amber Fox, which ran from 27 September 2001 until 14 December 2002. Operation Amber Fox was mandated to protect observers from the European Union and the OSCE, who monitored the implementation of the Framework Agreement and the re-entry of security forces of the Republic of Macedonia in former crisis areas.

NATO-led operation Allied Harmony started on 15 December 2002 and lasted until 31 March 2003. The mission had to observe measures in former crisis areas aimed at maintaining links with local authorities, populations and international organisations. The task force also advised the Macedonian government on security sector reforms and cooperated with NATO structures in Kosovo and Albania on issues of border security.

Operation Allied Harmony was followed by Operation Concordia, the first military mission of the European Union. Yet, NATO was still active in Macedonia after the termination of its military missions. NATO created the NATO Headquarter Mission Skopje (NHQS) through the merger of the headquarters of KFOR REAR and Operation Amber Fox in April 2003. The NATO Headquarters in Skopje consisted of about 180 military and civilian personnel. It advised the Macedonian government on security sector reforms (NATO Headquarters Skopje 2008).

The mission remained the same. Operation Concordia made use of NATO assets and capabilities. The European Union estimated the costs of the mission to be at 4.7 million Euros [Council of the European Union, 2003 #624].

Operation Concordia terminated on 10 December 2003. It was the last military operation in Macedonia. The EU police mission Proxima started on 15 December 2003. Operation Proxima was aimed at monitoring, mentoring and advising the Macedonian state in the “consolidation [of] law and order, including the fight against organized crime, focusing in sensitive areas,’’ the implementation of reforms in the Ministry of Interior, the creation of a border police, the implementation of confidence building measures for the Macedonian police within the population and the improvement of the cooperation between the police forces of Macedonia’s neighbouring states. About 150 international police officers were divided between regional headquarters in Skopje, Tetovo, Gostivar, and Struga [Council of the European Union, 2003 #625].

Operation Proxima terminated on 14 December 2005. The European Union decided to deploy a small police advisory team (EUPAT) in Macedonia. EUPAT comprised about 30 international police advisors. Besides the headquarters in Skopje, EUPAT operated an office in the Ministry of Interior. During the first six months EUPAT had an operating budget of 1.5 million Euros, in addition to the salaries and insurance fees of the police officers, which were covered by the contributed states [Council of the European Union, 2005 #626]. EUPAT was aimed at bridging the end of Operation Proxima and CARDS projects with similar objectives. The Council Joint Action 2005/826/CFSP of 24 November 2005 also stated that EUPAT could use the equipment of the Proxima Mission. EUPAT was supposed to monitor and advise the Macedonian police at the middle and senior management. EUPAT ended on 14 June 2006 [Council of the European Union, 2005 #627].
3.A.3 Military aspects of the intervention

3.A.3.i-iii Troops, personnel and resources

NATO launched its first mission, Operation Essential Harvest, in Macedonia on 26 August 2001, which lasted for one month.

Belgium, Canada, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, The Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Turkey and the United States provided over 3,500 troops to Operation Essential Harvest. The United Kingdom was by far the largest contributing country and was the lead nation of the mission. About 1,800 British troops participated in operation Essential Harvest. France and Germany contributed about 500 soldiers each, Greece 350, Canada 200, Turkey 150, and Spain and the Czech Republic 120 each.

Operation Essential Harvest was succeeded by Operation Amber Fox, which ran from 27 September 2001 until 14 December 2002. Germany, France and Italy provided most of the 700 troops. Germany was the lead nation, which was the first time that the Federal Republic of Germany led an international military mission.

NATO-led operation Allied Harmony started on 15 December 2002 and lasted until 31 March 2003. The mission consisted of 450 troops, who had the task to observe measures in former crisis areas aimed at maintaining links with local authorities, populations and international organisations.

Operation Allied Harmony was followed by Operation Concordia, the first military mission of the European Union. Yet, NATO was still active in Macedonia after the termination of its military missions. NATO created the NATO Headquarter Mission Skopje (NHQS) through the merger of the headquarters of KFOR REAR and Operation Amber Fox in April 2003. The NATO Headquarters in Skopje consisted of about 180 military and civilian personnel. It advised the Macedonian government on security sector reforms (NATO Headquarters Skopje 2008).

The mission remained the same. Operation Concordia made use of NATO assets and capabilities. The European Union estimated the costs of the mission to be at 4.7 million Euros {Council of the European Union, 2003 #624}.

Operation Concordia terminated on 10 December 2003. It was the last military operation in Macedonia, which was to be succeeded by a police mission. The EU police mission Proxima started on 15 December 2003. The total strength of the mission in terms of international personnel was about 200. Virtually all member states of the European Union as well as the
acceding or candidate countries contributed personnel to the mission. Iceland, Norway, Switzerland and the US also seconded police officers to the mission {Council of the European Union, 2003 #625}.

Operation Proxima terminated on 14 December 2005. The European Union decided to deploy a small police advisory team (EUPAT) in Macedonia. EUPAT comprised about 30 international police advisors. Besides the headquarters in Skopje, EUPAT operated an office in the Ministry of Interior. During the first six months EUPAT had an operating budget of 1.5 million Euros, in addition to the salaries and insurance fees of the police officers, which were covered by the contributed states {Council of the European Union, 2005 #626}. EUPAT was aimed at bridging the end of Operation Proxima and CARDS projects with similar objectives. The Council Joint Action 2005/826/CFSP of 24 November 2005 also stated that EUPAT could use the equipment of the Proxima Mission. EUPAT was supposed to monitor and advise the Macedonian police at the middle and senior management. EUPAT ended on 14 June 2006 {Council of the European Union, 2005 #627}.

OSCE

The Permanent Council of the OSCE upgraded the Monitor Mission to Skopje both in tasks and personnel. Only a dozen international and local observers worked for the OSCE Mission to Skopje during the 1990s. The OSCE added more staff to the mission in March and June 2001, when it reached a staff amount of 21. The Permanent Council continued increasing the number of staff. By September 2001, 210 international staff were working for the OSCE; 72 confidence-building monitors, 60 police advisers and 17 police trainers were working for the OSCE {OSCE Spillover Monitor Mission to Skopje, 2007 #661}.

3.A.3.iv Coordination between the different nations and organisations that provided troops

Compared to Bosnia-Herzegovina and Kosovo, the military and police missions in Macedonia encompassed only a rather small number of soldiers. The missions operated under very confined mandates. Macedonia was also a very small country that did not pose logistical challenges to the NATO and EU missions in Macedonia.

There were no major conflicts of interest between NATO, OSCE and the European Union. The concept of interlocking institutions worked very well in the Macedonian case.

3.A.3.vi Additional question: Was there a security democracy trade-off, in the sense that the Macedonian elites agreed to fulfill the demands of the Albanian minority/the NLA by signing the Ohrid Framework Agreement in exchange for security and a cessation of violence? Did violence pay off here?

There was certainly a trade-off, although I would prefer to characterise this trade-off as an exchange of security for better access to state resources. Albanians took up arms in order to gain better access to the state resources rather than making Macedonia a genuinely inclusive
state. The motivation was ethnic not civic. The Albanian parties did not fight for the rights of other ethnic communities in Macedonia.

The Macedonian elites had refused to meet many of the demands of the Albanians for over a decade. The Ohrid Framework Agreement aimed at transforming Macedonia into a truly multiethnic state that would grant access to state institutions to all ethnic groups. In this regard, violence did certainly pay off. Yet, one can ask whether this outcome could have also been achieved without violence. It should not be forgotten that several countries in Eastern Central Europe and the Baltics had much more discriminatory policies toward ethnic minorities in practice than Macedonia. The European integration process forced these countries to improve the status of ethnic minorities. I argue that the conflict and the Ohrid Agreement accelerated a process that would have happened in ten or fifteen years anyway.

3.A.3.vii Additional question: Could it be foreseen that UNPREDEP would leave Macedonia due to diplomatic recognition of Taiwan? Was there an alternative to this outcome?

The newly elected VMRO-DPMNE government decided to establish diplomatic relations with Taiwan. This move can be attributed to greed on the one hand, because Taiwan had promised economic aid, and the lack of political experience on the other. The VMRO-DPMNE became a governing party for the first time in 1998. The Social Democrats (SDSM) opposed the recognition of Taiwan. Relations with China normalised over the following years. The Macedonian President, who was a member of the Social Democrats, refused to accredit the diplomats from Taiwan. The newly elected SDSM-DUI government revoked the recognition of Taiwan in 2002.

3.A.4 Intrusiveness

3.A.4.i-ii Did interveners assume legislative power for a certain time? Did intervener decisively shape the new constitution?

The intervening entities did not exercise legislative power in a direct way. However, representatives of the European Union, the OSCE and the United States drafted the constitutional changes, which featured prominently in the Ohrid Framework Agreement. The interveners did not assume executive powers, and they did not directly shape economic policies.

NATO, the OSCE and the European Union facilitated and monitored the implementation of the Ohrid Framework Agreement. They exercised extensive pressure upon ruling elites
because the implementation of the Ohrid Framework Agreement became de facto linked to
the fulfilment of the Copenhagen Criteria.

3.A.4.iii-iv Did interveners assume executive power? Did intervener decisively
shape economic policies in any way?

The interveners did not assume executive power. The tasks of the military missions and later
European police forces was to monitor, mentor and advise Macedonian state institutions.
Interveners did not participate in executive policing.

The European Union shaped economic policies of the Macedonian state through the
Stabilisation and Association Process. The signing of the Stabilisation and Association
Agreement (SAP) coincided with the outbreak of the conflict in Macedonia. Macedonia`s bits
towards meeting the accession criteria of the European Union were coupled with the
implementation of the Ohrid Agreement.

3.A.4.v Did interveners participate in executive policing?

3.A.4.vi Level of intrusiveness

The international community was very resolute regarding the new law on territorial
organisation.

The new law aimed at transferring the competencies for public services, local economic
development, culture, local finances, education and health care from the national to the
municipal level. Therefore, the law would have upgraded the status of the Albanian-populated
areas in western Macedonia.

The World Macedonian Congress came up with the idea of holding the Law on Territorial
The main Macedonian opposition parties, especially the VMRO-DPMNE, supported the
World Macedonian Congress in obtaining the required 150,000 signatures required by the
constitution for a referendum to take place. The VMRO-DPMNE and major parts of the
Macedonian media argued that the redrawing of existing municipal borders would lead to new
conflicts between Albanians and Macedonians, which would ultimately result in the
dissolution of Macedonia across ethnic lines.

Why did the Macedonian opposition parties and the Macedonian media call for a referendum
against the new Law on Territorial Organisation of the Local Self-Government? I argue that
the following five reasons were decisive:
First, Macedonians feared that Albanians would use their additional competencies to discriminate against Macedonians in Albanian-dominated municipalities. The largest opposition party, VMRO-DPMNE, argued that the new law offered too many opportunities for municipalities to cooperate. Albanian-dominated municipalities would cooperate with each other in areas like health or education. This cooperation would finally result in the establishment of a de facto autonomous region in western Macedonia and the ultimate break-up of the country along ethnic lines.

Moreover, opposition parties argued that the new law would make it very difficult to change municipal boundaries. Thus, once smaller Macedonian-dominated municipalities were merged with bigger Albanian municipalities, there would be no chance to change municipal borders anymore.

The second reason for supporting the referendum was related to issues of nationalism and the weak Macedonian identity. Resistance was big to grant Albanians additional rights. This problem became visible in the case of the capital Skopje, to which, according to the new law of decentralisation, several smaller Albanian villages would be added, thereby increasing the share of Albanians in Skopje to over 20 per cent. In this case, Albanians would be entitled to address state authorities in the Albanian language.

Third, the Macedonian opposition parties of VMRO-DPMNE wanted the referendum to be a vehicle for voters to express their discontent over the ruling government coalition. Thus, VMRO-DPMNE hoped that a successful referendum would tackle the legitimacy of the government, result in the break-up of the government coalition and lead to new elections.

Fourth, supporters of the referendum, as well as prominent members of NGOs, argued that the government parties (SDSM, DUI, LDP) agreed upon the new Law on Territorial Organisation of the Local Self-Government in the Republic of Macedonia by violating basic democratic principles. The Law on Territorial Organisation of the Local Self-Government in the Republic of Macedonia was a key component of the Ohrid Framework Agreement. Paradoxically, the way it was created contravened against the Ohrid Framework Agreement.

According to the Framework Agreement, “the development of local self-government is essential for encouraging the participation of citizens in democratic life, and for promoting respect for the identity of communities” (Framework Agreement 2001). Furthermore, “the revision of the municipal boundaries [should] be effectuated by the local and national authorities with international participation.”

However, representatives of local municipalities were not adequately consulted, and many objections were ignored. Moreover, human rights activists claimed that the citizens’ concerns were ignored by their democratically-elected representatives. Instead of confronting the concerns of large parts of the population, human rights NGOs argued that the government parties reduced the whole issue of decentralisation to its interethnic component. Thus, government parties and Albanian opposition parties openly or indirectly argued that a successful referendum and delays in decentralisation might lead to the outbreak of violence (Helsinki Committee for Human Rights 2005, RFL/RL 2004a). The Helsinki Committee for Human Rights also criticised the involvement of foreign actors (who conveyed the same
message). Nationalists from the World Macedonian Congress and the VMRO-DPMNE repeatedly argued that the government violated basic democratic principles.17

Finally, the proponents of the referendum took advantage of technical arguments regarding the new Law on Territorial Organisation of the Local Self-Government in the Republic of Macedonia. Experts on local government argued that many newly-created municipalities were not viable. The attachment of small villages to bigger towns would hamper their economic development. The opposition parties and public administration experts argued that territorial decentralisation was in accordance with fiscal decentralisation. Critics of the new law argued that poorer municipalities would not receive sufficient funds to finance their new competencies.

Mayors argued that the decentralisation of power and competencies would be happening but a decentralisation of costs. However, citizens would blame local politicians for problems caused by the new Law on Territorial Organisation of the Local Self-Government in the Republic of Macedonia. Or as a mayor put it: “If teachers are not paid, they are not going to protest in Skopje anymore, but in front of my office.”18

The referendum campaign gained momentum during the summer of 2004. Thousands of Macedonians protested against the new law. Several protests resulted in violent incidents; a demonstration in the southern town of Struga resulted in more than 40 injured police officers. Opinion polls suggested that a clear majority would vote against the new Law on Territorial Organisation. However, in order for a referendum to be valid, the constitution required voter participation levels of 50 per cent of eligible voters in Macedonia.

The ruling government coalition remained very silent on the referendum issue until a few weeks before the scheduled election day in early November. The government understood that the easiest way for the referendum to fail was to avoid the voter threshold of 50 per cent. The government launched a public relations campaign to do so. The motto of the campaign was “some questions do not deserve an answer.”

3.B Diplomacy, normative pressure and persuasion

3.B.1.i Was there important diplomatic or peer pressure or other forms of social persuasion involved in the democratization process?

Diplomatic pressure was applied in the democratisation process, and the failed referendum campaign in 2004 is a case in point. The implementation of the Ohrid Framework Agreement and Macedonia’s fragile security situation were recalled into question in 2004, when the World Macedonian Congress, a nationalist diaspora organisation, initiated a referendum campaign against the new law on territorial organisation, a key component of the Ohrid agreement.

18 Interview with Toni Kocevski (mayor of the municipality of Vratnica in western Macedonia)
Senior Western politicians became actively involved in persuading the Macedonian electorate not to vote on election day. Within a few weeks, Romani Prodi, US Undersecretary of State, Marc Grossman, Donald Rumsfeld and Britain’s minister for European Affairs, Dennis McShane, visited Macedonia and explained to Macedonian politicians, as well as to the Macedonian public, that a successful referendum would seriously hamper Macedonia’s aspirations to join NATO and the European Union.

Dennis McShane even went so far as to remove his watch from his wrist during a press conference. He then moved the watch hands of his watch back and forth while explaining that a successful referendum would constitute a huge backlash for Macedonia’s bid towards EU membership. This gesture was heavily criticised in the Macedonia media, resulting in additional public approval for the referendum campaign.

Three days before the scheduled date of the referendum, the US government recognised Macedonia under its constitutional name. The Macedonian Government celebrated with a massive party on the main square in Skopje. The government explained that the US decision to recognise Macedonia under its constitutional name displayed international support for Macedonia, which would not be jeopardised by the referendum. Indeed, only 26 per cent of voters went to the polls on election day, which made the referendum invalid.

3.B.1.ii Verbal pressure, interaction, persuasion and external approval

Representatives of international organisations put verbal pressure on the Macedonian government to refrain from the use of large-scale military retaliation against the attacks of the National Liberation Army. They also persuaded the government to not declare a state of war, give the order for general mobilization or to provide arms to civilians. The international envoys communicated to the National Liberation Army that they would not support the partition of Macedonia and the creation of a Greater Kosovo. Domestic decision-makers were persuaded by external actors.

Representatives of the international community praised the signing and implementation of the Ohrid Framework Agreement, though there were instances when they made clear in drastic ways that the political elite could not afford not to implement the Ohrid Framework Agreement.

Domestic decision-makers sought the approval of the international community. It was the idea of the Macedonian government to provide troops to the international missions in Afghanistan. The Macedonian government wanted to show that it was a reliable partner in international politics.

19 An official of the US Embassy in Skopje explained to me that the United States wanted to recognise Macedonia under its constitutional name in order to thank Macedonia for its military support to the US operations in Afghanistan and Iraq. Macedonia deployed some 50 soldiers in Afghanistan and Iraq respectively. While the military impact of Macedonia’s troops in Afghanistan and Iraq was clearly negligible, the decision to provide troops was very much appreciated by the US government. Macedonia had also signed an impunity agreement with the US on the International Criminal Court.

20 In order to celebrate the decision of the United States Government to recognise Macedonia under its constitutional name, the government extended the opening hours of pubs on the Friday and Saturday before election day. Thus, some journalists have argued that the failure of the referendum was due to the lack of sober voters.
The US State Department approached the Macedonian government regarding the contribution of troops for the war in Iraq. The United States indicated that a contribution of troops could result in the recognition of Macedonia under its constitutional name. The Macedonian government looked for a strong supporter in the name dispute with Greece. Indeed, the Bush administration recognized Macedonia under its constitutional name in November 2004.

3.C Modes of interaction between internal and external players

3.C.1.i Preferences of interveners

The preferences of the interveners were threefold. First, they wanted to avoid an escalation of the conflict. The international envoys pressured the Macedonian government not to declare a state of war and to refrain from the use of heavy force against the Albanian insurgents. A large-scale conflict in Macedonia would have endangered the supply of the troops in Kosovo. A conflict would have also worsened the political situation in Kosovo and relations with Serbia.

Second, the international organisations involved in the conflict made clear from the outset that there would not be territorial solutions to the conflict. The international envoys worked towards constitutional changes, which should enhance the constitutional status of non-Macedonian ethnic groups. It was clear that the Albanian group would benefit from the new constitution.

Third, the international community effectively coupled the implementation of the Ohrid Framework Agreement with the EU enlargement process. The EU and NATO offered the prospect of full membership.

3.C.1.iii Preferences of state elites and rural/provincial elites

There are no significant cleavages between state and regional elites. Macedonia was a small and highly centralised country, where municipalities had only minor opportunities in policy making. Regional elites were linked themselves to the bigger political parties, which made decisions in the capital, Skopje.

Regardless of ethnicity, all state elites shared one common goal: membership in the European Union. In order to fulfil the EU accession criteria the government had to fully implement the Ohrid Framework Agreement. Yet, the preferences of state elites were dependent on their role of governing or opposition parties. The nationalist VMRO-DPMNE signed the Ohrid Framework Agreement in August 2001 and began implementing the agreement together with its ruling coalition partner, the Albanian DPA. VMRO-DPMNE and DPA lost the
parliamentary elections in 2002. The SDSM and the newly formed DUI formed a governing coalition.

The DPA accused the DUI of not representing the interests of the Albanian population. Elections in Albanian-populated areas resulted in ballot stuffing and violent clashes and a shootout between followers of the DPA and DUI, in 2002 and 2006. An armed Albanian force controlled the village of Kondovo in the Skopje region for several months in 2004. The armed forces would finally leave the village after mediation efforts by international organisations. Many observers argued that the DPA had staged the occupation of Kondovo just to show that it was also able to control armed Albanians.

The VMRO-DPMNE argued that the new reforms ran against the interest of the Macedonian people. The VMRO-DPMNE promoted a referendum campaign against the new law on territorial organisation. A successful referendum would have stalled the implementation of the Framework Agreement and put the fragile peace on brink. A successful referendum would have enabled the VMRO-DPMNE to force early elections.

The VMRO-DPMNE won the parliamentary elections in 2006. It refused to form a governing coalition with DUI, which had won the majority of the Albanian votes. Instead, it formed a governing coalition with the DPA, the second largest Albanian party. DUI threatened the government that its exclusion from the government might result in a new violent conflict. DUI boycotted parliament. The government coalition between VMRO-DPMNE and DUI dissolved in April 2008. After the new election, the VMRO-DPMNE eventually formed a government coalition with DUI, a move which the VMRO-DPMNE had resisted since 2002.

In short, when state elites were part of coalition governments they implemented the Framework Agreement.

3.C.1.iv Under what constraints do the interveners operate?

NATO, the European Union and the OSCE did not face real economic, political, normative, military or time constraints. All major political parties wanted to join the European Union, which provided huge leverage to interveners. The NLA officially disbanded in 2001 and formed a political party in 2002.

3.C.1.v-vi Under what constraints do the state elites interact with the interveners? 
Under what constraints do the peripheral elites interact with the interveners? 
Was there a bargaining between “interveners” and state elites with regard to the type of regime?

The concept of peripheral or rural elites does not operate in the case of Macedonia. The main constraint regarding the interaction of state elites with the interveners were diverging understandings regarding the speed and scope of the implementation of the Ohrid Framework
Agreement. There was no bargaining between interveners and state elites regarding the type of regime. The Ohrid Framework Agreement clearly outlined the design of the political reforms to be undertaken, which were coupled to the process of EU integration and fulfilling the EU accession criteria.

Simply put, the Albanian political parties wanted to achieve the full implementation of the Ohrid Framework Agreement as soon as possible, whereas the nationalist VMRO-DPMNE pretended to object to many stipulations of the Ohrid Framework Agreement in order to win votes among its Macedonian constituencies.

According to my assessment, the overall interaction between interveners and state elites was largely cooperative. Yet, there were episodes when the peace process showed both features of co-opted peacebuilding and conflictive peacebuilding. The assessment of the mode of interaction is dependent upon whether we are looking at ruling state elites or state elites who were affiliated with opposition parties.

The two largest Macedonian political parties and the two largest Albanian political parties, signed the Ohrid Framework Agreement in August 2001. The leadership of the disbanded National Liberation Army formed the Democratic Union for Integration (DUI), a political party that, like the other Albanian party, fostered the quick and full implementation of the Ohrid Agreement.

The Albanian political parties promised their Albanian constituencies the quick and full implementation of the Ohrid Agreement. The National Liberation Army had to be disbanded and former Albanian rebels had to surrender their weapons to the NATO troops in Macedonia. Yet, the international community tolerated the fact that the former NLA fighters largely surrendered old and useless weapons. The NLA disbanded and its leadership announced the cessation of fighting with Macedonian security forces.

The Democratic Union for Integration stated that it would restart the violent fight against the Macedonian state in the event that the Framework Agreement was not fully implemented. This was particularly the case during the referendum campaign against the new law on territorial organisation in 2004. The DUI also threatened to use the violence when it was not included in the new government in 2006. The DUI had won the majority of the Albanian votes in the 2006 parliamentary elections, yet the Macedonian VMRO-DPMNE opted for a government coalition with the DPA. The VMRO-DPMNE and the DPA had already formed a government coalition between 1998 and 2002.

Representatives of the international community strongly recommended a coalition government between the VMROP-DPMNE and the DUI. However, government coalitions were not part of the Ohrid Framework Agreement. From a legal and normative point of view, the international community could not force the VMRO-DPMNE to form a coalition government with the DUI. The VMRO-DPMNE had won the election and it had the right to choose its coalition partner. Yet, for political reasons, it would have been appropriate to form a coalition with the largest Albanian political party. However, the VMRO-DPMNE had made it clear since 2002 that it would not form a coalition government with the DUI.

Yet, the threats of the DUI to start a war again if excluded from the government also showed that they had not internalised the basics of democratic behaviour. The international community could only strongly recommend to the VMRO-DPMNE to form a coalition government with the DUI, it could not afford to allow the DUI to blackmail the VMRO-

An example of the threat of coercion was the referendum episode in 2004. While in opposition, the VMRO-DPMNE endorsed a referendum campaign in order to prevent the implementation of the new law on territorial organisation. The DUI, having formed a coalition government with the Social Democrats, indicated that an interruption of the decentralization process could result in new violence between Macedonians and Albanians. High level officials from the European Union visited Macedonia until 2004, explaining to the Macedonian public that a successful referendum would mean a huge backlash regarding Macedonia’s integration into the European Union. The referendum finally failed due to the low voter turnout.

While in power between 1998 and 2002 and from 2006 onward, the VMRO-DPMNE often criticised the Framework Agreement. Despite its nationalist rhetoric, the VMRO-DPMNE passed the needed laws.

The rather cooperative type of peacebuilding is directly linked to the timing of the conflict. Macedonia signed the Stabilisation and Association Agreement in April 2001 when first clashes had already happened in Tetovo. The three Stabilisation and Association reports by the European Commission monitored the implementation of the Framework Agreement between 2001 and 2002.

3.C.1.vii Role of veto players

The concept of veto players or spoilers is only applicable to a limited extent. All Albanian parties supported the peace agreement. Macedonian political parties applied harsh nationalist rhetoric when criticising the Ohrid Agreement. Yet, they also wanted to join the European Union for which the full implementation of the Framework Agreement was a precondition. None of the main Macedonian political leaders wanted to dispense with being the ruling party. Conflicts over the implementation of the Ohrid Framework Agreement were actually a pretence for conflicts over access to the government.

The nationalist Macedonia VMRO-DPMNE was the ruling political party between 1998 and 2002. The VMRO-DPMNE signed the Ohrid Framework Agreement in August 2001. Politicians of the VMRO-DPMNE criticised the Framework Agreement and tried to delay important laws since 2001. Yet, in contrast to its harsh nationalist rhetoric, the VMRO-DPMNE de facto implemented the provisions of the Ohrid Framework Agreement.

The VMRO-DPMNE turned into a greedy spoiler when it was in the opposition from 2002 until 2006. It endorsed a referendum campaign against a law on territorial organization in 2004. The campaign aimed at stopping the new law and overthrowing the government of the Social Democrats (SDSM) through early elections. Yet, the referendum failed due to a low voter turnout.
In terms of autonomy, the VMRO-DPMNE did not have a “separate agenda from the other groups in the conflict” {Cunningham, 2006 #1137}. As mentioned above, the VMRO-DPME temporarily opposed the Ohrid Framework Agreement when it was in the opposition, but it implemented the Framework Agreement when it was in the government.

The VMRO-DPMNE was not a cohesive party. The late President Boris Trajkovski, who was a member of the VMRO-DPMNE, played a very balancing and moderate role during the conflict in 2001. He opposed the prime minister and interior minister. Former Prime Minister Ljubco Georgievski had to leave the VMRO-DPMNE after internal disputes. He founded a new political party, the VMRO-Peoples’ Party (VMRO-NP).

The VMRO-DPMNE was not in a position to continue the conflict on its own, and therefore it cannot be characterized as a viable party.

3.C.1.viii Role of change agents

The late President Trajkovski played an important role in trying to reconcile former warring parties. It is difficult to find other change agents who supported democratic change. The Albanian political parties fully endorsed the implementation of the Framework Agreement; all political parties wanted to join the European Union. Given the rhetoric and behaviour of the political elites, it is difficult to say that they supported democratic change as such.

Albanian political elites wanted to increase the influence of Albanians on domestic politics rather than allowing all citizens, regardless of ethnicity, to become engaged in democratic processes. Macedonian elites portrayed the implementation of the Ohrid Framework Agreement and the fulfilment of EU conditionality as the price Macedonia would have to pay for EU integration.

3.C.1.ix Costs of adaptation

Party politics

The costs of adaptation for the regime were rather low because the Framework Agreement contained many provisions that Macedonia would have had to meet anyway on its way towards EU membership. The grand coalition of the two biggest Macedonian and the two biggest Albanian parties quickly dissolved after the signing of the Ohrid Framework Agreement. The ruling coalition government of the VMRO-DPMNE and the Albanian DPA lost the parliamentary elections in 2002. The Macedonian SDSM and the Democratic Union for Integration (DUI) formed a government coalition, which was succeeded by a coalition of the VMRO-DPMNE and the DPA after the 2006 elections.

In short, there was a “distribution of costs” to the extent that Albanian opposition parties accused the government of not implementing the Ohrid Framework Agreement as quickly and completely as stipulated in the Agreement. The Macedonian opposition parties accused the government of selling out Macedonian interests, destroying the Macedonian identity and
dividing the country. The main Albanian and Macedonian political parties adjusted their rhetoric depending whether they were in the opposition or were part of government coalitions.

Implementation of the Ohrid Framework Agreement and fulfilment of the European Union accession criteria

The Framework Agreement comprised a set of constitutional changes which changed the Macedonian states. The parliament had to pass laws on the usage of languages other than the Macedonian, symbols of minorities, equal representation in public institutions and decentralization. Many of these provisions resonated with the accession criteria of the European Union. All political parties agreed on the goals of EU membership, which reduced the costs of adaptation.

Criminal prosecution

The International Criminal Tribune for the former Yugoslavia indicted the former minister of Interior, Ljube Boskovski (VMRO-DPMNE), and Johan Tarcuvski, a police officer who worked for the President’s Security Unit for crimes against humanity. The ICTY charged Boskovski and Tarcuvski for being responsible for the killing of seven Albanians and the cruel treatment of numerous other Albanians during an operation in the village of Ljuboten in August 2001 (The International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, 2004 #1135).

The ICTY issued the indictment in December 2004. At this point Boskovski had already been held in custody in Croatia for other charges since August 2004, when the Macedonian parliament had disposed Boskovski’s parliamentary immunity. The VMRO-DPMNE was not a governing party any longer. The prime minister Vlado Buckovski (SDSM) was defence minister between May and August 2001 and an opponent of the hawkish minister Boskovski. Croatia transferred Boskovski to The Hague in early 2005. The trial against Boskovski resulted in his acquittal in July 2008. Tarcułovski was sentenced to a 12-year imprisonment.

The 2006 elected VMRO-DPMNE government supported Boskovski and Tarcułovski with the provision of legal aid. The government opposed the ICTY, yet, in contrast to neighbouring Serbia, the Macedonian government cooperated with the ICTY. The Macedonian public perceived the indictments against Boskovski and Tarcułovski as very biased, because no Albanians were indicted, although Macedonians had suffered from crimes against humanity committed by NLA fighters. Several kidnapped Macedonians were still missing after the conflict in 2001.

3.D Linkage, integration and convergence
3.D.1.i-ii Neighbourhood/Geographical linkage and spill-over effects

In 2001, Macedonia’s neighbours were Albania, Serbia (including Kosovo), Bulgaria and Greece; all of them were democratic states.

When Macedonia declared independence in 1991 it faced hostile neighbours. The Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, consisting of Serbia and Montenegro, recognised the Macedonian people but refused to recognise the Macedonian state until 1996. Bulgaria recognized the Macedonian state, but denied the existence of Macedonian people and the Macedonian language; it considered both to be Bulgarian. Greece claimed to have exclusive rights over the term Macedonia. The name dispute between Greece and Macedonia resulted in an economic boycott by Greece, which had disastrous effects on Macedonia’s economy. Macedonia established good diplomatic relations with Albania.

The name dispute with Greece was put on hold by an interim accord in 1995. The interim accord paved the way for the development of diplomatic relations, although Greece would continue refusing to recognize Macedonia by its constitutional name. Diplomatic relations with the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and Bulgaria normalized in the 1990s.

One can wonder whether the conflict in 2001 would have happened at all if Macedonia’s neighbours had recognized the identity of the Macedonian state and people from the outset. Macedonia defined itself as the nation state of the Macedonian people. The constitution subordinated Albanians and other ethnic groups to the Macedonian majority. The Macedonian government refused to allow the usage of the Albanian language and the display of Albanian symbols in public institutions. One can wonder whether the Macedonians would have taken a more moderate position regarding the establishment of the Albanian-language university in Tetovo in 1994, the display of Albanians flags at public institutions in 1997, and the influx of refugees from Kosovo in 1999, if it had not felt that its neighbours questioned the right of the Macedonian state and nation to exist.

The conflict in 2001 was a spill-over from Kosovo and Southern Serbia, but post-Ohrid developments were not inspired by democratic spillovers. None of the neighbour states support autocrats as such, but nationalist and radical political parties are widely supported by large parts of the electorates in Serbia and Kosovo. Macedonian elites and the mass population did not imitate institutional and legal models from abroad.

Many Macedonians have acquired Bulgarian passports over the past years. They did so in order to benefit from Bulgaria’s membership in visa-free travel regimes.

3.D.1.iii Political diplomatic linkage

Macedonia established good working relations with all Western European states and the United States. Yet, the name dispute with Greece strained diplomatic relations with other Western countries. The decision of the newly elected VMRO-DPMNE government in 1998 to establish diplomatic links with Taiwan resulted in China’s veto of the renewal of the UNPREDP mandate in early 1999. Relations with China normalised over the following years. The Macedonian President, who was a member of the Social Democrats, refused to accredit the diplomats from Taiwan. The newly elected SDSM-DUI government revoked the recognition of Taiwan in 2002.
3.D.1.iv Economic linkage

Companies from Hungary, Greece, the United States, Germany and Britain were the most important investors in 2000 and 2001 {United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, 2004 #1143}. About 60 per cent of Macedonian exports went to member states of the European Union, while the countries of the former Yugoslavia accounted for 25 per cent.

The International Monetary Fund estimates that 500,000 people are living in Western Europe, North America and Australia, who migrated from Macedonia. According to IMF data, remittances accounted for 9 to 18 per cent of the GDP between 2001 and 2005 {International Monetary Fund, 2006 #1139}. According to the World Bank, the diaspora transferred 440 million US-Dollars between 1996 and 2001 and an additional 277 million US-Dollars in 2002 and 2003. The World Bank data shows that over 35 per cent of migrants with tertiary education from Macedonia were active in jobs that only required low level skills {Mansoor, 2007 #1138; Markiewicz, 2006 #1142}.

According to data from the National Bank of the Republic of Macedonia, Macedonia {, 2009 #1140} received 449 million US-Dollars from foreign governments between 1993 and 2001. During the same period, private transfers including remittances totalled 2,157 million US-Dollars while foreign direct investment totalled 1,003 million US-Dollars.

It has to be kept in mind that these are only rough estimations, which contradict official OECD data. It is difficult to find accurate data on the dependence on remittances from the Macedonian diaspora. Qualitative research on selected villages in Macedonia have shown that villages where Albanians constitute the majority are heavily dependent on diaspora...
remittances {European Stability Initiative, 2002 #695; European Stability Initiative, 2005 #1141}. Macedonia was dependent on bilateral and multilateral financial aid.

3.D.1.v Social/cultural linkage

Unlike Slovenia, Croatia, Serbia and Kosovo, Macedonia had no record of public or intellectual protest against a communist regime. The democratisation in the early 1990s was a pacified transition. I do not think that there was a pre-existing affinity between domestic norms and democracy prior to the transition to democracy in the early 1990s and after the signing of the Ohrid Agreement.

While discontent with the communist regime played a role among the political elites in Macedonia, the decisive reasons to declare independence were different: The Macedonian political elites did not want to be part of the Serb-dominated rump of Yugoslavia {Daskalovski, 2005 #1130}.

The Macedonian elites endorsed the involvement of external actors (United Nations, NATO, European Union, OSCE) from the early 1990s onward, because external actors promised security, stability and long-term prospective economic development and visa-free travel. Albanian elites welcomed external actors, because they helped them upgrading the status of the Albanian people in Macedonia. Macedonian and Albanian elites shared an ethnic understanding of citizenship. For both groups, the process of democratization was the means to achieve full membership in the European Union and NATO rather than a goal in itself. In this regard, NATO and the European Union were seen as legitimate actors.

3.D.1.vi Technological/Communication linkage

Unlike other countries of the Communist Block, socialist Yugoslavia had allowed the access to Western TV stations, movies and books as well as travel to Western countries. Migrants from Macedonia were important in disseminating music or fashion trends in Macedonia. The BBC, Voice of America and Deutsche Welle operated Macedonian language radio shows. Teledensity accounted for 37.3% in the year 2000. There were more than 760,000 telephone lines and 200 internet hosts in Macedonia in 2000 {Haralanova, 2001 #1144}.

3.D.1.vi Integration

Since the 1993 Macedonia has been a full member of the United Nations and the Central European Initiative. Macedonia joined the OSCE, the Council of Europe in 1995 and the

3.D.1.vii Civil society linkage

Advocacy groups like Macedonian Helsinki Committee for Human Rights provided data on human rights issues to international NGOs like Amnesty International or Human Rights Watch. Advocacy groups in Macedonia were almost entirely funded by international donors. International donors fostered cooperation between Macedonian NGOs and organizations in the Balkans. Organizations that had already existed in socialist Yugoslavia like trade unions, professional associations or pensioners’ associations, maintained links to counterparts in the other parts of former Yugoslavia [United States Agency for International Development (USAID), 2003 #238].

Political parties were interested in having contacts with other political parties in Europe, a process that was promoted by the German Friedrich Ebert Foundation and Konrad Adenauer Foundation in Macedonia.

3.E.1.i Which events on the international scene shaped the intentions and strategies of the external actors (e.g. regime changes in neighboring states, major international events)? In what ways?

As mentioned in previous subchapters, the conflicts in Croatia, Bosnia-Herzegovina and Kosovo had influenced the policy of the European Union and NATO.

3.F Additional section: Counterfactuals

Questions from the case study evaluation: What would have been the outcome without the massive intervention of NATO and the EU and their preventive commitment? This applies specifically to section 3, the variables on the international intervention. Would a reduced or later presence have caused a more violent and more severe conflict? Or could perhaps a continued UN presence have prevented the escalation of violence altogether? How would the democratisation process have been different without the substantial international presence?

There are various alternatives regarding these possible scenarios:
One must not forget that international organisations were in charge of governing neighbouring Kosovo. An escalation of the conflict in Macedonia would have had several repercussions for security in Kosovo on account of the political and organisational issues. First, the conflict would have worsened the relationship between UNMIK, NATO, and the Albanian population. Albanian fighters would have used Kosovo as a refuge, and volunteers from Kosovo would have joined the Albanian insurgents in Macedonia. Indeed, this was already the case in 2001. Huge numbers of Albanians would have sought refuge in Kosovo, which would have caused another humanitarian challenge for the international community. In addition, the Serbian government would have capitalized on a conflict between the Albanians and the Macedonians. It would have blamed the international community for misunderstanding the danger of Albanian nationalism, and it would have taken a hard line stance regarding Kosovo.

Secondly, NATO was dependent on Macedonia’s infrastructure. NATO needed the airport at Skopje and access to Greece in order to secure regular supplies to the troops stationed in Kosovo. Pristina Airport in Kosovo was too small to handle all the needed supplies for KFOR. NATO could not ship personnel and equipment through Serbia or Montenegro for political reasons. Due to the poor state of the infrastructure in Albania, Macedonia was the only option for providing NATO in Kosovo with the needed supplies. In short, the European Union, the United States, and NATO, had to prevent an escalation of conflict in Macedonia if they did not want to jeopardize the security of Kosovo.

The international community played the role of a scapegoat for Macedonian politicians, who argued that they could have cracked down on the insurgency in a short period, if international organisations had not pressured them to refrain from serious military action. The Aracinovo episode is a case in point. The hawkish minister of the interior, Ljube Boskovski, claimed at the beginning of the offensive to retake Aracinovo, that he would be drinking coffee in the city within 24 hours. However, this was not the case. Observers described the offensive as poorly prepared and coordinated. Poorly planned and executed military operations would have resulted in heavy casualties on both sides. This would have hardened the positions of both Macedonians and Albanians {Ordanoski, 2002 #606}.

In addition, the international envoys took on the undesirable role of mediating between the NLA and the political parties. For example, the OSCE special envoy Robert Frowick proposed that the biggest Albanian political parties and the NLA should agree on a common platform, which would start the process of peace negotiations. The head of the NLA, Ali Ahmeti, and the leaders of the two biggest Albanian political parties, Arben Xhaferi and Imer Imeri, signed the so called Prizren Declaration on May 23rd 2001. The joint document mandated that the PDP and DPA must negotiate a peace treaty on behalf of the NLA. According to the document, Albanian political parties were interested in the territorial integrity of Macedonia. The declaration called for constitutional changes and the designation of the Albanian language as an official language {Rusi, 2002 #685}.

When the agreement became public, the Macedonian government heavily criticised Imer Imeri and Arben Xhaferi for talking with the NLA, which the government labelled a terrorist organisation. Officials of the European Union criticised Frowick’s mediation efforts. The Macedonian government, NATO, and the European Union emphasized that Frowick had not consulted them before negotiating the Prizren document. According to the Guardian “European Union governments were furious with the OSCE ambassador, Robert Frowick…” Mr. Frowick commented that while EU diplomats said the rebels should "get out"; the OSCE
was the only organisation looking for a way in which withdrawal could take place (Thorpe, 2001 #686). After being declared a persona non grata, Frowick had to leave the country. 21

As a result, it can be assumed that without the presence of the European Union, NATO, and OSCE in Macedonia and Kosovo; the international community would have reacted much more slowly. The Macedonian government had planned to declare a state of war in March. It abandoned this plan after pressure from the European Union and the United States. This window of opportunity would have been closed if high ranking Western officials had not visited Macedonia in February and March of 2001. In addition, the European Union, NATO, and OSCE already had organisational structures in place, which were upgraded in the wake of 2001.

The declaration of a state of war would have resulted in the mobilisation of Macedonian soldiers, who were mostly poorly trained and equipped. This would have been in favor of the NLA strategy of calculated civilian victims, which paralleled the tactics of the KLA in Kosovo several years before. KLA fighters attacked Serbian security forces in Kosovo, who would later use heavy arms against unarmed civilians. The KLA was not able – and maybe not even willing – to protect unarmed civilians against Serbian security forces, knowing that civilian casualties would increase public support for the NLA and force Western politicians to intervene in favor of the KLA. The same pattern was already visible during the fighting in Tetovo in March, when Macedonian security forces shelled villages in the hills surrounding Tetovo after being shot at from the hills by NLA fighters.

Could perhaps a continued UN presence have prevented the escalation of violence altogether?

One can wonder whether the conflict in Macedonia would have happened at all, if NATO had not intervened in 1999. The influx of tens of thousands of international troops and civilian staff created a market for forced prostitution in Kosovo and Macedonia. Albanian criminals (who later played a key role in the formation of the NLA) benefited from the trade in prostitution, drugs, and weapons. As a result, Albanian extremists had the financial resources to challenge the Macedonian state. KFOR had been very reluctant to control the border between Kosovo and Macedonia. A continued UN presence at the borders could have compensated for this lack of enforcement. Some of the villages on the border between Kosovo and Macedonia were de facto not under the control of Macedonian state institutions, which offered ideal conditions for the establishment of illegal brothels {Hislope, 2002 #597; Hislope, 2003 #598}.

The conflict in Macedonia started in early 2001 when the NLA detained a television crew for several hours in the border village of Tanusevci. An attempt by the Macedonian police to enter the village resulted in a serious shootout between the police and the NLA. A UN force might have acted as a buffer between the NLA and the Macedonian security forces. UN troops would also have had better access than the Macedonian police or army to mainly Albanian populated regions. From the outset the NLA did not enjoy widespread support from the Albanian population. In contrast, the UNPREDEP enjoyed trust among Albanians and Macedonians alike {Rusi, 2002 #685; Ackermann, 2000 #12}. Albanians might have been

---

21 According to Geral Knaus, Frowick had informed the Macedonian government, as well as NATO and the European Union, about his mediation efforts. However, these actors denied having contact with Frowick. Conversation with Gerald Knaus in June 2001.
more likely to report the presence of NLA fighters or troublemakers to UN forces rather than representatives of the Macedonian security forces. However, this remains very speculative.

How would the democratisation process have been different without the substantial international presence?

The missions of the European Union, OSCE, and NATO, monitored the implementation of the Ohrid Framework Agreement, and assisted Macedonian authorities in the implementation of the agreement. The successful implementation of the Framework Agreement became a precondition for negotiations with the European Union.

The special representative of the European Union and the American ambassador featured prominently in the Macedonian media. Representatives of the European Union, OSCE, and NATO visited Macedonia on a regular basis, and conveyed their opinion on the success of the implementation of the Ohrid Framework Agreement. The support and pressure of the international community was especially needed in the areas of police reforms, decentralisation, and the use of the Albanian language. Macedonian politicians pushed through unpopular reforms in these areas, making clear that these were preconditions for joining the European Union, and blaming the missions of the European Union, OSCE, and NATO for these unpopular decisions.

It is doubtful whether the Macedonian parliament would have passed all of the laws related to the implementation of the Ohrid Framework Agreement without the process being monitored by the international community. It is also questionable whether the NLA would have voluntarily disbanded if NATO troops had not been deployed to Macedonia. NATO troops and international police forces facilitated the re-entrance of multiethnic police forces in former crisis areas.

Finally, the missions of the European Union, OSCE, and many Western embassies kept communication between the governing and opposition parties alive. This applies to the dialogue between ethnic groups as well as within ethnic groups. Meetings between the Macedonian VMRO-DPMNE and the Social Democrats on the one hand, and the Albanian DUI and DPA on the other hand, were regularly arranged by the international community. Representatives of the Macedonian political parties and the international community consider that over 90 percent of the meetings between representatives of the political parties were organised by international organisations or Western embassies.22

Section 4: Development aid and democracy promotion

---

22 Interviews with Petra Andersson-Erhardy (European Union); Damjan Manchevski (Cabinet of the President); Govert Vissert (Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands).
4.A Aid / Democracy financial and technical assistance after the war

4.A.1.i Most important donors

Since the intervention in 2001, the European Union, the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), the Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA), the OSCE, the Soros Foundation, which supports the Fund for an Open Society in Macedonia (FOSIM), and the Protestant Church in the Netherlands, which provides funding for the Macedonian Centre for International Development (MCDS), have been the most important donors.

_A detailed overview on funding levels and funded sectors will follow soon._ There have been several donor trends since Macedonia’s independence in 1991. Human rights organisations, such as the Helsinki Committee for Human Rights, were the first local NGOs to receive funding from international donors. Donors channelled funding towards the improvement of interethnic relations and NGO capacity building. When hundreds of thousands of refugees were expelled from Kosovo to Macedonia, international donors shifted their focus towards humanitarian aid. The goal of donor funding was to create a strong and vivid civil society in Macedonia, which was usually equated with Western-style NGOs.

Since the early twenty-first century, donors have shifted their focus towards the strengthening of state capacity. The EU pre-accession programmes (CARDS, IPA) became the most important funding sources in Macedonia. Bilateral aid agencies, like USAID and SIDA, have also been mainly targeting state institutions since the early 2000s. NGOs can still obtain funding from multilateral and bilateral donors. However, there is a clear shift regarding NGO-state relations. Donors expect NGOs to assist the state in becoming more efficient, effective, and accountable to its citizens. This policy is in contrast to the donor approach in the 1990s when service and advocacy NGOs were promoted as counterweights against the state.

Most aid transfers were provided as project aid. Macedonia was heavily dependent on aid in order to implement reforms in the administration and economy.

4.A.2.i Annual amounts of aid aiming at democracy promotion

See table on Macedonia

4.B Democratic conditionality in the aid sector
4.B.1.i-iv Democratic conditionality

Since 2002 the European Commission has assessed reform processes in Macedonia on a regular basis. Since Macedonia wants to become a full member of the European Union, it has to meet the Copenhagen Criteria, which are not negotiable. The prospect of future membership in the European Union has proven to be a powerful incentive for the Macedonian government to work towards the implementation of the Ohrid Framework Agreement. This has included the implementation of components of the Framework Agreement, which have been highly contested among Macedonians, including the redrawing of municipal boundaries and the enhancement of the constitutional status of the Albanian language.

4.B.1.v Additional section: Deployment of Macedonian soldiers in Afghanistan and Iraq

The deployment of Macedonian troops in Afghanistan and Iraq was not tied to democratic conditionality as such. The Macedonian government approached NATO regarding an involvement in the Afghanistan mission in 2002. The government wanted to show it was a reliable and responsible partner in international politics. It hoped that a deployment to Afghanistan would have positive effects on Macedonia’s bids toward integration in NATO and the European Union.

The US-government approached the Macedonian government regarding participation in Operation Iraqi Freedom. The US-Embassy in Skopje made clear that it would very much appreciate Macedonia’s support, which was rather symbolic, because Macedonia would only provide 50 troops to Iraq. The US-Embassy indicated that the US administration would recognise Macedonia under its constitutional name, which it did in November 2004.
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To be completed.
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