

DECEMBER 2024



WRITTEN BY

NIA HENRY

EDITED BY

ANNE-SOPHIE CUBERT

SUPERVISED BY

BELÉN PADRÓN SALINAS

Introduction

The Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) is an international body focused on maintaining stability, peace, and democracy across Europe and surrounding regions (OSCE, n.d.-a). Established in 1975 through the Helsinki Final Act, the OSCE originated as a multilateral forum where East and West could diplomatically engage during the Cold War (OSCE, n.d.-b). While initially focused on fostering dialogue and confidence building, the OSCE had evolved into addressing a broader range of security issues (OSCE, n.d.-c, p. 1). Its structure now includes 57 member states spanning Europe, Central Asia, and North America, making it the world's largest regional security organisation (OSCE, 2018b). Unlike other international security organisations, the OSCE lacks enforcement power, operating instead on consensus-driven decision-making (Russell, 2021). This unique structure is both an asset and a limitation, as the requirement for consensus allows inclusivity but can also hinder swift action, especially when member states with conflicting interests struggle to reach an agreement (European Court of Auditors, 2022, p. 47).

Europe's recent history is marked by periods of significant instability, making conflict prevention a critical priority for European security (NDICI, 2021, p. 3). The dissolution of the Soviet Union, conflicts in the Balkans, the ongoing war in Ukraine, and the periodic tensions which involve NATO and Russian interests illustrate the region's volatility (Masters, 2023). As these dynamics evolve, the need for an organisation like the OSCE, which can proactively address potential conflicts and act as a stabilising force, becomes evident. The OSCE's approach emphasises a broad view of security that encompasses political, military, economic and human rights dimensions, recognising that sustainable peace requires not only the absence of war but also the presence of democratic stability, respect for human rights and economic cooperation (OSCE, n.d.-h).

This paper examines the OSCE's multifaceted role in conflict prevention and European security, analysing its methods, achievements and limitations. By critically evaluating its tools—such as field missions, election monitoring, and arms control initiatives—this essay determines the OSCE's effectiveness in maintaining stability in a diverse and politically fragmented region. Through this exploration, this essay will shed light on the unique challenges the OSCE faces, particularly in a geopolitical landscape where consensus is difficult to achieve and security threats continue to evolve. Ultimately, this analysis will provide insights into the OSCE's capacity and potential to shape European security.

1. The OSCE's Framework for Conflict Prevention

The OSCE's mandate for conflict prevention reflects its broad commitment to stability, with an explicit focus on anticipating and addressing tensions before they escalate into open conflict (OSCE, 2018a). This preventive approach, rooted in the Helsinki Final Act, aligns with the OSCE's goal of building and maintaining peace through cooperation among member states (Evers et al., n.d.). Unlike other security organisations that may use force, the OSCE's primary tools are diplomatic, relying on consensus and shared commitments to principles of sovereignty, territorial integrity, and human rights (Evers et al., n.d., p. 73). This mandate is inherently challenging, requiring the OSCE to address highly politicised issues while avoiding direct intervention. Consequently, while the OSCE is often well positioned to intervene early, its effectiveness can be constrained by the need to balance national interests and maintain impartiality, particularly in regions with complex historical grievances.

The OSCE's approach to conflict prevention is grounded in the principle of "comprehensive" security, which integrates three main dimensions: politico-military, economic, environmental, and human rights aspects (OSCE, 2018b). This broad perspective acknowledges that security is not solely a military matter; instead, it encompasses political stability, economic well-being, environmental sustainability, and respect for human rights.

Firstly, the politico-Military Security dimension involves arms control, border security, and reducing military tensions. The OSCE promotes transparency and cooperation to reduce the risk of unintended military escalation (OSCE, 2014). Secondly, the economic-Environmental Security dimension encompasses economic disparity and environmental challenges, including resource scarcity, are recognised as potential sources of conflict. The OSCE supports economic development and environmental policies that mitigate resource competition and promote shared prosperity (OSCE, 2017). Lastly, the human security dimension focuses on democratic governance, minority rights and human rights, and is critical in preventing internal conflict and promoting social stability (OSCE, 2005). By linking human rights with security, the OSCE aims to address the root causes of tension, though the politically sensitive nature of human rights work can create friction among states with differing views on sovereignty and internal governance.

This comprehensive framework allows the OSCE to tackle conflicts in a multifaceted way, acknowledging that a balance of military, economic, and human development sustains peace; but achieving this balance across member states with varying priorities and political systems can lead to disagreements over what constitutes a security threat and the best approach for addressing it. For this reason, diplomacy and dialogue are central to the OSCE's conflict prevention strategy, serving as the primary means for addressing tensions without

escalation (OSCE, n.d.-d). The OSCE leverages its status as a forum for dialogue between the West and East, particularly between NATO-aligned countries and Russia (Remler, 2019). This role has been both essential and challenging; the OSCE's commitment to inclusivity makes it a rare platform where divergent political interests can converge, yet the need for unanimous consent can dilute its actions (OSCE, 2024b). Despite these limitations, the OSCE's commitment to diplomacy is significant in a landscape where regional tensions frequently risk boiling over. Through ongoing dialogue, the OSCE cultivates trust and transparency, fostering a culture of communication that can be a stabilising force even when formal agreements are elusive (OSCE, n.d.-g). The OSCE employs several preventive tools and mechanisms that aim to identify, mitigate, and manage conflicts before they escalate.

Firstly, the OSCE's early warning system is designed to detect signs of emerging conflicts and alert member states to potential threats (OSCE, 2024a). This tool draws on a combination of intelligence from field operations, diplomatic missions, and local sources and allows the OSCE to monitor developments in politically fragile areas (OSCE, 2024a). Still, the early warning system faces limitations, particularly when geopolitical pressures prevent member states from fully engaging in pre-emptive actions or when political sensitivity restricts access to information.

Secondly, the mediation efforts by the OSCE intend to facilitate peaceful negotiations between conflicting parties (OSCE, n.d.-d). The OSCE's mediators work in highly politicised settings, such as Ukraine, Nagorno-Karabakh, and Moldova, where local and international stakes are high. Although OSCE mediation has had some success in reducing tensions, its reliance on consensus and its limited enforcement power mean that mediated agreements are often voluntary, which can hinder long-term resolution (OSCE, n.d.-d). The OSCE's role as a neutral party remains vital, though its effectiveness is frequently contingent on the willingness of conflicting parties to reach a compromise. Lastly, when conflicts reach a critical point, the OSCE deploys crisis management tools to prevent further escalation and manage on-the-ground conditions. This can involve ceasefire violations and maintaining a line of communication between opposing forces (OSCE, n.d.-d, p.18). Although such missions provide valuable insights and help de-escalate tensions, the OSCE's crisis management capabilities are limited by its lack of enforcement power.

2. Conflict Prevention Initiatives and Mechanisms

The OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities (HCNM) was established to address ethnic and minority issues that could potentially escalate into violent conflict (OSCE, n.d.-h). The HCNM's primary role is to identify, assess and mitigate inter-ethnic tensions in member states, working quietly and diplomatically to manage disputes before they become

entrenched conflicts (OSCE, n.d.-h). This focus on pre-emptive action shows the OSCE's unique role in intervening on sensitive issues that many states might otherwise avoid, such as language rights, citizenship laws, and political representation for minorities (OSCE, n.d.-e). Nonetheless, the HCNM operates without enforcing capacity, meaning its recommendations often rely on the goodwill and cooperation of the host country, which can vary widely depending on the political climate and the specific nature of the minority issue.

The HCNM has played a significant role in the Baltic States, where it aided in managing the tensions involved ethnic Russians after the Soviet Union's dissolution (Zaagman, 1999). By facilitating dialogue and advising on policies related to language and citizenship, the HCNM's efforts helped divert escalations that could have drawn in external powers (OSCE, n.d.-h). In North Macedonia, the HCNM was instrumental in defusing ethnic tensions between Macedonians and the Albanian minority, aiding in the draft of policies that promoted integration and social cohesion (OSCE, n.d.-g). These interventions emphasise the HCNM's value in fostering stability through targeted diplomacy but also underscore its limitations, as success heavily depends on the willingness of states to implement recommendations that may challenge domestic policies.

The Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) serves as the OSCE's primary institution for promoting democratic values, human rights, and the rule of law, based on the belief that democratic institutions contribute to long-term peace and stability (OSCE, n.d.-f). ODIHR's initiatives include training programs, legal advice, and support for civil society organisations that can act as checks against authoritarian governance. However, this mission often places ODIHR in tension with some member states that view external involvement in domestic governance as an infringement on sovereignty. Balancing the promotion of democratic standards with respect for national autonomy is a continuous challenge; in certain regions, ODIHR's efforts are perceived as externally driven, which can limit their effectiveness.

ODIHR's election monitoring is among the OSCE's most visible and impactful conflict prevention tools, as it provides transparency in electoral processes that might otherwise be marred by corruption or manipulation (OSCE, n.d.). In states with fragile democracies, ODIHR's presence can bolster public confidence in election results, thus reducing the likelihood of post-election violence. Despite this, ODIHR's election observations have sometimes been criticised by member states as biased or politically motivated, particularly when finding challenges to the legitimacy of incumbent governments.

OSCE field missions, including Special Monitoring Missions (SMMs), are deployed to areas of tension where they provide on-the-ground information, foster dialogue, and facilitate local

conflict resolution (Umland, 2021). These missions operate on the principle of impartiality and are usually invited by the host country, although this restricts the OSCE's capacity to intervene unilaterally in volatile situations (Umland, 2021). Their neutral presence can help create an environment conducive to peace negotiations, while their reports serve as critical resources for international actors. However, security concerns, restricted access, and host country sensitivities limit field missions, and they often face constraints that limit their operational reach and effectiveness.

The OSCE's SMM in Ukraine has been essential for documenting ceasefire violations and monitoring developments in the eastern regions affected by the conflict (OSCE, 2022). Despite these efforts, the SMM's limited access and mandate restrict its ability to influence the conflict's trajectory, illustrating the limitations of monitoring without enforcement power. In Georgia and Moldova, OSCE missions have sought to mediate post-Soviet territorial disputes (Umland, 2021). These cases demonstrate the OSCE's commitment to maintaining dialogue in drawn-out conflicts, though they also accentuate the organisation's limited ability to achieve definitive resolutions when larger geopolitical interests are at play.

The Vienna Document is a cornerstone of the OSCE's efforts in arms control, facilitating transparency and military cooperation among member states (OSCE, n.d.). It requires member states to share information about their military capabilities and activities, as well as to notify other members of major exercises and troop movements. By requiring participating states to provide annual data on their military forces, it fosters a level of transparency that helps mitigate the risks of accidental escalation or misinterpretation of military manoeuvres. In doing so, the document functions as a preventative measure, reducing the chances of minor incidents leading to broader conflicts (OSCE, n.d.). While the Vienna Document establishes an invaluable framework for arms control, its voluntary nature limits its enforceability (OSCE, n.d.). This is particularly evident in the strained relations between Russia and NATO-aligned states, their mutual suspicions have led to selective adherence to its provisions. Instances of non-compliance or reduced transparency erode the document's effectiveness, highlighting the broader challenge faced by the OSCE: fostering security cooperation in an environment where major powers are usually at odds.

Despite these challenges, the Vienna Document is integral in the OSCE's conflict prevention toolkit. Its mechanisms for transparency and communication are necessary in a world where misinformation and miscommunication can quickly escalate tensions. Moreover, it sets a precedent for how regional organisations can promote norms of transparency and trust building, even when binding obligations are politically unattainable.

Conclusion

This article has examined the OSCE's multifaceted role in conflict prevention and European security, analysing its methods, achievements and limitations. The OSCE remains an essential actor in European conflict prevention and security. Its broad and inclusive approach—incorporating politico-military, economic, environmental, and human rights dimensions—sets it apart as a regional organisation that understands security as a multifaceted objective. By fostering dialogue, supporting human rights, and advocating for transparency, the OSCE provides a unique platform for addressing security risks that no other organisation addresses in the same manner. However, the OSCE's reliance on consensus limits its agility and effectiveness, particularly when addressing politically sensitive issues or high-stakes conflicts where member states' interests diverge.

The OSCE's practical initiatives, from field missions to arms control measures, are prime examples of its commitment to peace building through non-coercive means. But, as demonstrated in areas like Ukraine, Georgia, and Moldova, the OSCE's interventions are often constrained by the need for enforcement capabilities. The Vienna Document and the HCNM have helped mitigate tensions, yet their influence wanes when geopolitical tensions complicate transparency and cooperation. Furthermore, the ODIHR's work in election monitoring and democratic support not only underscores the organisation's dedication to long-term stability, but it also reveals the challenges of balancing universal democratic principles with respect for state sovereignty.

While the OSCE's consensus-driven, inclusive approach may limit its effectiveness in rapid response, it ensures a sustained and diplomatic platform for dialogue between diverse member states. As Europe continues to confront traditional and emerging security threats, the OSCE's role in conflict prevention and security will be crucial, albeit contingent on its ability to adapt, mediate and maintain its relevance in a dynamic and polarised political landscape.

Bibliography

Burkhalter, D., Lamberto, Z., Aebi, A., Eischer, A., Grass, F., Hänggi, H., Hempel, D., Law, D., Lüber, H., Lutterbeck, D., Quinn, P. & Wohlfeld, M. (2014). 20 years of OSCE Code of Conduct on Politico-Military Aspects of Security.. Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe Office of Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (OSCE). <https://www.osce.org/files/f/documents/8/4/128961.pdf>

European Court of Auditors. (2022, May 31). Cohesion and NextGenerationEU: concord or clash?. ECA Journal, 1. https://www.eca.europa.eu/lists/ecadocuments/journal22_01/journal22_01.pdf

European External Action Service (2021, December 22). NDICI- Global Europe – Thematic Programme on Peace, Stability and Conflict Prevention. https://international-partnerships.ec.europa.eu/system/files/2022-01/mip-2021-c2021-8985-peace-stability-conflict-prevention-annex_en.pdf

Evers, F., Kahl, M., & Zellner, W. (2005, July 22). The Culture of Dialogue: The OSCE Acquis 30 Years after Helsinki. Centre for OSCE Research (CORE). <https://www.osce.org/files/f/documents/a/4/16108.pdf>

Martin-Hurtado, R. (2017, September 6). Reaping the security benefits of greening the OSCE economies. UNECE. <https://www.osce.org/files/f/documents/6/5/355721.pdf>

Masters, J. (2023, February 14). Ukraine: Conflict at the Crossroads of Europe and Russia. Council on Foreign Relations[DP1]. <https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/ukraine-conflict-crossroads-europe-and-russia>

Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE). (2022, February 21). OSCE Special Monitoring Mission to Ukraine (SMM) Daily Report 40/2022 issued on 21 February 2022. www.osce.org.

Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE). (n.d.). Ensuring military transparency – the Vienna Document. OSCE. <https://www.osce.org/fsc/74528>

Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE). (2005). OSCE HUMAN DIMENSION COMMITMENTS, 1(2).

<https://www.osce.org/files/f/documents/f/d/16363.pdf>

Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE). (2018a). Conflict prevention and resolution. | OSCE. Osce.org.

<https://www.osce.org/conflict-prevention-and-resolution>

Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE). (2018b). Who we are. | OSCE. Osce.org.

<https://www.osce.org/who-we-are>

Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE). (2022, February 21). OSCE Special Monitoring Mission to Ukraine (SMM): Daily Report 40/2022 issued on 21 February 2022. OSCE.

<https://www.osce.org/special-monitoring-mission-to-ukraine/512683>

Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE). (2024a). Early warning and early action. OSCE.

<https://www.osce.org/secretariat/107485>

Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE). (2024b, September 13). Respect for democratic principles more important than ever in times of polarisation and conflict, OSCE human rights office says. OSCE.

<https://www.osce.org/odihr/575994>

Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE). (2005, November 29). Election Observation – A Decade of monitoring elections: the people and the practice. OSCE.

<https://www.osce.org/odihr/elections/44207>

Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE). (n.d.-b). History. | OSCE.

<https://www.osce.org/who/87>

Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE). (2014, November 13). Mediation and Dialogue Facilitation in the OSCE Reference Guide.

<https://www.osce.org/files/f/documents/b/0/126646.pdf>

Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE). (n.d.-c). National minority issues. OSCE.

<https://www.osce.org/national-minority-issues>

Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE). (2003, December 2). OSCE STRATEGY TO ADDRESS THREATS TO SECURITY AND STABILITY IN THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY.

<https://www.osce.org/files/f/documents/d/0/17504.pdf>

Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE). (n.d.-d). OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights. OSCE.

<https://www.osce.org/odihr>

Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe Office of Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (OSCE). (2001, September 1). Quiet Diplomacy in Action: The OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities. OSCE..

<https://www.osce.org/files/f/documents/6/7/78633.pdf>

Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE). (n.d.-e). What we do. OSCE.

<https://www.osce.org/what-we-do>

Remler. P. (2019, August 1). Russia and Cooperative Security in Europe: Times Change, Tactics Remain. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

<https://carnegieendowment.org/research/2019/08/russia-and-cooperative-security-in-europe-times-change-tactics-remain?lang=en>

Russell, J. (2021, November 19). William Ian Russell. BMJ, 375 (2838).

<https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n2838>

Umland, A. (2021, June 17). Achievements and Limitations of the OSCE's Special Monitoring Mission to Ukraine. Sceeus Reports on Human Rights and Security in Eastern Europe No. 3, 2021.

<https://sceeus.se/en/publications/achievements-and-limitations-of-the-osces-special-monitoring-mission-to-ukraine/>

Zaagman, R. (1999, January 1). Conflict Prevention in the Baltic Area: The OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities in Estonia, 1993-19991. Helsinki Monitor, 10(3), 30-44.

<https://doi.org/10.1163/157181499x00203>