POLITICAL AND DIPLOMATIC ASPECTS OF THE 2001 MILITARY CONFLICT IN MACEDONIA

Isak SHERIFI, Fati ISENI

Faculty of Philosophy, University of Tetova, Tetovo, Republic of North Macedonia
Faculty of Law, Mother Teresa University, Skopje, Republic of North Macedonia
Isak.sherifi@unite.edu.mk
Fati.iseni@unt.edu.mk

Abstract

The paper "Political and Diplomatic Aspects of the 2001 Military Conflict in Macedonia" examines the political and diplomatic dimensions of the 2001, armed conflict in the Republic of Macedonia, focusing on its causes, the progression of the crisis, and the process of reaching a political resolution. The study analyses interethnic tensions, challenges regarding the political and institutional integration of Albanians, and the roles played by local political actors and the international community in managing and resolving the conflict. Particular attention is given to the negotiation process and international mediation specifically the roles of the European Union, the United States, NATO, and the OSCE. The paper also focuses on the Ohrid Framework Agreement of August 13, 2001, which established the political and institutional foundation for ending the conflict and initiating a new process of reforms. The paper also analyzes issues related to political representation, the use of the Albanian language, decentralization, the rights of communities, and their integration into state institutions. It further examines NATO's role in creating conditions for stabilization, as well as the demobilization process of the National Liberation Army and the post-conflict period.

Keywords: 2001 conflict, diplomacy, Ohrid Agreement, NATO, peace negotiations.

Introduction

The 2001, armed conflict in the Republic of Macedonia stands as one of the most significant political and security-related events in the country's history since its declaration of independence. The escalation of violence throughout 2001 brought to the fore long-standing problems in interethnic relations, specifically between Albanians and Macedonians. The conflict was not merely an armed confrontation; it was also a profound political and institutional crisis that required a resolution through dialogue and political compromise.

At the center of these developments were demands for fairer political and institutional representation, broader use of the Albanian language, the decentralization of power, and the safeguarding of community rights. Faced with an escalating situation, diplomatic intervention by the international community became increasingly important. The European Union, the United States, NATO, and the OSCE became actively engaged in preventing further escalation of the conflict and in creating conditions for a political solution.

The negotiation process between the local parties and international mediators led to the signing of the Ohrid Framework Agreement on August 13, 2001. This agreement marked a turning point in bringing the conflict to an end and established a new framework for the development of inter-ethnic relations and the reform of state institutions. The agreement in question also serves as the foundation for achieving political and legal equality for Albanians and other ethnic groups living there, regardless of the extent to which it has been fully or partially implemented in recent years. Consequently, analysing the role of diplomacy and political actors in 2001 is essential for understanding not only the conclusion of the conflict but also the political transformations that followed. International diplomacy has also played a significant role in the processes unfolding within the borders of the Republic of North Macedonia, advancing these processes, managing unnecessary crises which arose from delays and the sidelining of the demands of citizens living and contributing to this multi-ethnic state and intervening when necessary. In this paper, I will examine the efforts of both the domestic

Albanian political factor and the international community, through their presence whenever the situation required it, they managed to avert a much broader and unpredictable conflict by engaging in negotiations and participating directly in agreements that were absolutely essential. The European Union deployed its diplomats to mediate talks between the parties involved in the conflict. The setting of conditions, aimed at facilitating Macedonia's integration into European structures, served as an additional factor that motivated the Macedonian government and Albanian representatives to engage in dialogue.

The 2001 Conflict: Its Development And Political Resolution

The escalation of violence in 2001 resulted from a combination of political, social, and inter-ethnic factors. Issues regarding the representation of Albanians in state institutions, the incomplete implementation of equality principles, the use of the Albanian language, and demands for decentralization were among the factors that had created persistent tensions. In this context, the emergence of armed groups and the escalation of clashes transformed the political crisis into an armed conflict.

Developments on the ground compelled the government and political parties to seek a solution that would halt the violence while preserving the state's territorial integrity. Simultaneously, Albanian political representatives insisted that any solution must include concrete changes to the political and institutional system. This situation necessitated a negotiation process in which both local and international actors would play interconnected roles.

Negotiations for a political settlement intensified during the summer months of 2001. Participants included representatives of state institutions, leaders of Macedonian and Albanian political parties, and representatives of the international community (Robert Bideleux and Ian Jeffries, 2007). The primary objective was to reach a political compromise that would end the conflict and establish mechanisms for addressing interethnic issues through institutional channels. In this process, the role of President Boris Trajkovski and the leaders of the main political parties was significant. Political representatives had to contend with considerable pressure from their respective publics, while international mediators worked to bring the parties' positions closer together and to prevent the return of violence.

The Role Of The International Community

The international community played a significant role in managing the crisis and creating the conditions for reaching a political agreement. The European Union and the United States appointed special representatives to mediate the dialogue, while NATO and the OSCE contributed to establishing security conditions and supporting the peace process.

In this context, the EU and the US engaged François Léotard and James Pardew as international mediators in the negotiation process. Their task was to assist the parties in finding an acceptable compromise and in reconciling the positions of the main political parties.

NATO played an essential role in creating the conditions for establishing peace and stability in the Republic of Macedonia. Specifically, NATO together with the EU, the OSCE, and the Macedonian side, contributed to the implementation of a series of important, complementary reforms and confidence-building measures, with the primary objective of supporting broad political agreements and establishing peace. At the request of the Republic of Macedonia, for the first time in its history, NATO deployed a high-level civilian representative, directly involved in addressing the conflict and the crisis (Paul Latawski, Martin Smith, 2003). Meanwhile, the EU and the US dispatched "facilitators" James Pardew and François Léotard, tasked with re-harmonizing an inter-party agreement among the main parliamentary political parties in the Republic of Macedonia.

At this conference, Solana remarked: "I would like to thank all the political leaders who reached this agreement", (Mitrevska, 2009).
George Robertson stated: "We have come here as friends of your country, at the request of your government, to assist in overcoming this crisis. I wish to emphasize that, with the help of the two Western representatives, significant progress will be achieved" (Sherifi, Dezintegrimi i Jugosllavisë-Kosova 1990-2008, 2016). He further noted that 95 percent of the issues had already been resolved, leaving only 5 percent of the points still in dispute.
While François Léotard, James Pardew, and Pieter Feith were able to lay the foundations and outline potential solutions, it was only natural that Robertson and Solana would finalize the agreement. This time, the agreement that paved the way for the crucial talks in Ohrid involved an extraordinary, at times almost unbelievable series of meetings at the Aleksandar Palace Hotel in Skopje.
NATO and EU teams moved back and forth between rooms, striving to persuade the Albanian and Macedonian sides to set a date for negotiations on an acceptable political agreement. The Ohrid Agreement was a major achievement; it granted ethnic Albanians greater rights and local self-governance, all while preserving the fundamental unity of the state.

The 2001 Conflict In Macedonia In The Context Of Diplomacy And International Relations

Due to Macedonia's geographical and geostrategic position serving as a logistical base for peacekeeping operations in Kosovo and for the full resupply of NATO forces the international community became indirectly involved in resolving the conflict between the armed forces of the KLA (UCK) on one side and the Macedonian military forces on the other. Numerous diplomats were stationed in Skopje with the aim of finding a solution acceptable to both parties involved. The team's engagement with the KLA was limited to seeking a voluntary resolution to the political crisis and the withdrawal of the KLA independent of any political agreement as the KLA was not to have a direct role in the negotiations. The NATO team was led by Pieter Feith, who served as the personal representative of Lord Robertson; also present were two EU representatives, Stefan Lehne and David Slinn (Laity, 2009). Among the diplomats who continued to visit Macedonia were the EU High Commissioner for National Minorities, Max van der Stoel; the Greek Foreign Minister, George Papandreou; the Bulgarian Prime Minister, Ivan Kostov; and the French Foreign Minister, Hubert Védrine. The Bulgarian Prime Minister stated: "I am here to express support for the Republic of Macedonia." All these visits were intended to encourage Macedonia to persist in resolving the issue with the NLA (UÇK), which was steadily growing stronger (Laity, 2009). Efforts to resolve the conflict continued through frequent visits, ultimately culminating in the Ohrid Agreement.

The Prizren Agreement

Following the emergence of the military formation known as the National Liberation Army (NLA), the international community intensified its efforts to influence Albanian political entities, aiming to ensure they played an active role in steering this group toward a political resolution of the conflict and away from a military path. In this context, through the mediation of the U.S. Ambassador to the OSCE, Robert Frowick, a political plan was drafted. Its primary objective was to moderate extreme positions and prevent any further escalation of the situation both among the Albanians and on the Macedonian side. This document was signed on May 22, 2001, in Prizren by three key Albanian political representatives: Ali Ahmeti, in his capacity as the political representative of the NLA; Arben Xhaferi, leader of the Democratic Party of Albanians (DPA); and Imer Imeri, leader of the Party for Democratic Prosperity (PDP). The

document became known as the Prizren Agreement. The signing of the Prizren Agreement by the political and military leadership of the Albanians in Macedonia was a move that was not well-received by the Macedonian government (Arifi, 2016). Through this agreement, Albanian political leaders aimed to establish a common platform for action, defining the key directions for state reform and emphasizing the need to build a democratic, inclusive, and multi-ethnic society.

The "Prizren Agreement" document states: "Albanian leaders in Macedonia, conscious of the historic moment the Republic of Macedonia is undergoing, agree to act in concert based on a broad national and social consensus, a consensus intended to reform the Republic of Macedonia so that it may become a democratic state for all its citizens and all its national communities", (Danaj, 2008).

Former President Gligorov described the Prizren Agreement as follows: "I can only interpret the event that took place in Prizren and the explicit objectives stated there as a prelude to transforming our country into a binational state, with the ultimate goal of detaching the Republic of Macedonia and uniting it with Kosovo, or, alternatively, realizing the long-standing idea of creating an Albanian state in the Balkans", (Danaj, 2008).

The Ohrid Framework Agreement And The Role Of The International Community In Its Realization

The culmination of the diplomatic process was the signing of the Ohrid Framework Agreement on August 13, 2001. The Agreement represented a political compromise between the parties and established the foundation for ending the armed conflict and initiating a broad process of political and institutional reforms. It aimed to safeguard the unitary character of the state while simultaneously creating mechanisms for the fairer representation of communities and their greater participation in public institutions. Key issues addressed included the use of languages, proportional representation within state institutions, decentralization, and the strengthening of local democracy. A primary significance of the Ohrid Agreement was that it shifted the resolution of inter-ethnic issues from the realm of armed conflict to that of institutions and political dialogue. In this way, the Agreement established a new framework for coexistence and cooperation among communities.

The Agreement was signed by representatives of state institutions and leaders of the major political parties, such as Mr. Arbër Xhaferi and Imer Imeri [signed the agreement]; the agreement was also signed by the Head of State, Boris Trajkovski, and the American mediator James Pardew. In this instance, three documents were signed, which are referred to as:

The annexes are an integral part of the Framework Agreement.

Meanwhile, NATO spokesperson Yves Brodeur stated: “The political agreement is not the end of the road, but the beginning of a process that must lead to a permanent solution to this crisis” (Sherifi, Dezintegrimi i Jugosllavisë-Kosova 1990-2008, 2016).

The signing of the Ohrid Agreement entailed the protection of the Albanian ethnic group, as well as linguistic equality in regions with an Albanian majority and in areas where Albanians constitute 20% of the population (Shabani, 2014).

The involvement of the USA, the EU, NATO, and the OSCE was crucial for guaranteeing the process and for creating the necessary conditions for the implementation of the agreement. The EU and the US represented by James Pardew and François Léotard, who were directly involved in addressing the conflict and the crisis, were tasked with facilitating a renewed agreement among the main parliamentary political parties in the Republic of Macedonia; however, it was only natural that Robertson and Solana would ultimately finalize this agreement.

At this conference, Solana stated: “I would like to thank all the political leaders who reached this agreement.”

Meanwhile, George Robertson remarked: “We have come here as friends of your country, at the request of your government to assist in overcoming this crisis. I would like to emphasize that, with the help of the two representatives of the West, significant progress will be achieved; he further emphasizes that 95 percent of the issues have already been resolved, and only 5 percent of the contentious matters remain” (Mitrevska, 2009).
In this context, the Ohrid Agreement can be considered one of the most significant political moments in the history of post-war Macedonia. It did not alter the unitary character of the state, but it brought about important changes in how institutions function and in the relations between communities. On August 27, 2001, the demobilization and surrender of weapons by NLA (National Liberation Army) fighters began. In the autumn of 2001, as the NLA was being demobilized and initial steps were taken toward the resocialization of these now-former NLA fighters Ali Ahmeti called upon political parties to establish a Coordinating Body, with the aim of ensuring they were as well-prepared as possible for the upcoming parliamentary elections (Sherifi, Tranzicioni politik dhe konfliktet në ish Jugosllavi, 2020). One of the most important lessons from the conflict and its aftermath is the significance of ongoing dialogue between ethnic groups. Dialogue helps build trust and mutual understanding, making it possible to address sensitive and complex issues. An approach based on discussions and negotiations can minimize tensions and promote coexistence.

Conclusion

The 2001 Ohrid Agreement represents a significant diplomatic achievement, which helped to end violence and establish a framework for the rights of Albanians in Macedonia. Some of its key successes include: Institutional Reforms: It promoted the representation of Albanians in state institutions and created opportunities for power-sharing. Improvement of Albanian Rights: The agreement guaranteed the use of the Albanian language and other conditions for cultural and political participation. Stabilization of the Situation: It helped create a calmer environment for dialogue and peace-building efforts. However, its failures are equally significant. These include: Weak Implementation: Many of the envisioned reforms were not implemented as planned, leading to frustration and distrust among Albanians. Ethnic Tensions: Tensions
between ethnic groups persisted, and Macedonian politics often retained a nationalist character, making the full inclusion of Albanians difficult. Political Crises: The repercussions of political crises and social polarization hindered sustainable progress. Analyzing the successes and failures of the Ohrid Agreement, and reflecting on the lessons learned, underscores the importance of dialogue, reform, and coexistence in Macedonia. These elements are essential for ensuring a more stable and peaceful future for all ethnic groups in the country, contributing to the creation of a more unified and harmonious society.
The engagement of European and American diplomacy, alongside the internal Albanian political factor, played a pivotal role in the political and diplomatic consolidation surrounding the National Liberation Army (NLA). This effort was instrumental in securing an international agreement that brought an end to the Albanian-Macedonian conflict and established a solid foundation for a Macedonia that today aspires to join the European Union.
Albanian political entities succeeded in coordinating their efforts, alongside the NLA and the international community, to achieve a long-standing objective: the realization and implementation of fundamental rights for Albanians. This had been a core demand since the drafting of the 1991 Constitution, which failed to recognize Albanians as a constituent element of the state. International actors, through active diplomacy, managed to create the climate necessary for dialogue. Mediators, representing the EU and NATO, helped build trust between the parties and promoted a constructive dialogue. In conclusion, it can be said that the 2001

conflict was an event that yielded important lessons for Macedonia and the Balkan region. While ongoing challenges remain, there are also opportunities for progress toward a more stable future, provided that a commitment to dialogue, reform, and cooperation continues to be a priority.

References

[1] Arifi, F. (2016). Lufta e diplomacisë-Ndikimet e diplomacisë në konfliktin e vitit 2001 në Maqedoni. Shkup: Alma.
[2] Aziri, E. (2004). Organizimi politik i shqiptarëve në Maqedoni. Shkup: Logos A.
[3] Danaj, K. (2008). Kryengritje e pambaruar. Tiranë: Albao.
[4] Golson, R. P. (2007). The Reagan Era from the Iran Crisis to Kosovo. S. B. California: Bloomsbury Publishing.
[5] Laity, M. (2009). Parandalimi i luftës në Maqedoni. Shkup: Fondacioni Instituti Shoqëri e Hapur.
[6] Maksuti, M. (2005). Aspekti juridiko-kushtetues dhe politik i statusit shtetformues të popullit shqiptar në Maqedoni. Shkup: Logos A.
[7] Mitrevska, M. (2009). Parandalimi dhe menaxhimi i konflikteve- rasti i Maqedonisë. Shkup: Bomat grafiks.
[8] Mustafa, F. (2022). Gjeopolitika e Ballkanit e ardhmja e shqiptareve ne Ballkan. Tirane: ALSAR.
[9] Paul Latawski, Martin Smith. (2003). The Kosovo crisis and the evolution of post-Cold War European security. New York: Manchester University Press.
[10] Robert Bideleux and Ian Jeffries. (2007). The Balkans : a post-communist history. New York: Routledge i.
[11] Shabani, M. (2014). Politika ekspansioniste e shteteve Ballkanike ndaj trojeve shqiptare. Ferizaj: Intergraf.
[12] Sherifi, I. (2016). Dezintegrimi i Jugosllavisë-Kosova 1990-2008. Tetovë: Arbëria design.
[13] Sherifi, I. (2020). Tranzicioni politik dhe konfliktet në ish Jugosllavi. Tetovë: Luma graphic.
[14] Tafili, E. (2012). Sfidat e nacionalizmit-Rasti i Ballkanit. Tetovë: Luma graphic.