

THE ROLE OF THE ORGANIZATION FOR SECURITY AND CO-OPERATION IN EUROPE IN THE CONFLICT BETWEEN ARMENIA AND AZERBAIJAN IN NAGORNO-KARABAKH

Júlia Solans Rodríguez | Bachelor Thesis | Rafael Grasa Hernández

UAB
Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona



Introduction

Aims of this study:

1. Description and analysis of the development and evolution of the OSCE's role in the peace process of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict between Armenia and Azerbaijan, focusing on the Minsk Group's peacemaking efforts in the mediation process.
2. Analysis of the main mistakes made in the mediation of the peace process. Study of the effectiveness of the tools and mechanisms applied by the OSCE in the field of peacemaking.



Research questions

- What has been the role of the OSCE in the peace process of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict since 1992 (the initial date considered)? Who has been leading the mediation attempts in the peace process?
- What has been the role of the international organization in the Nagorno-Karabakh enclave?
- Should it be left to the Minsk Group and the three co-chairs, or it is time for a change of distribution?



Contextual framework

- USSR's dissolution+ emergence of new States.
- Growing necessity of a regional organisation to manage new conflicts.
- Republic of Arsakh: independence *de facto*.
- Negotiations conducted by OSCE. Creation of Minsk Group: co-chairs France, USA, Russia.
- *Four Day War*: reestructuration of borders.
- 2020: last escalation. Humanitarian ceasefire led by Russia.



Conceptual and analytical framework

- Literature review.
- Importance of third actor in conflict mediation when disputants unable to reach an agreement.
- Analysis under the concept of peace-making (concept created by Johan Galtung).



Analysis of the peace-making proposals

Long-lasting solutions, not small compromises.

High secrecy of the peace process

Recognition. Legitimacy

- No attempts to change or transform attitudes in the long term.
- Current format of negotiations: limited. No post-agreement phase of settlement.
- Lack of transparency and clarity, favours both actors to maintain control of the mediation. Example: absence of information in official annual reports of OSCE.
- No spokesperson or public profile to announce progress of mediation. Encouragement of rumours.
- No involvement of the leadership of Nagorno-Karabakh. Narrow process.
- Lack of civil society participation. No effort to build trust between actors.

Conclusions

Failure to fulfill any of its objectives.

Single mediator: more harmonious than tripartite presidency.

Need a change in mediating structures.

Necesity of the recognition of legitimacy of actors.

Recommendations

- Exert pressure on local leaders by international leaders.
- Create incentives and low risks to ensure cost-effective implementation of the agreements.
- Change the format of the mediation. Create perception that "there isn't another option".