

OSCE

9

Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy
at the University of Hamburg / IFSH (ed.)

OSCE Yearbook 2003

Yearbook on the Organization for Security and
Co-operation in Europe (OSCE)

osce

2003



Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft
Baden-Baden

OSCE Yearbook

founded by Dieter S. Lutz †
in 1995

Volume 9 – 2003

Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy
at the University of Hamburg / IFSH (ed.)

OSCE Yearbook 2003

Yearbook on the Organization for Security and
Co-operation in Europe (OSCE)

Edited by the IFSH in co-operation with

Jonathan Dean, Ambassador ret., Union of Concerned Scientists,
Washington

Pál Dunay, Course Director, Geneva Centre for Security Policy, Geneva

Victor-Yves Ghebali, Graduate Institute of International Studies, Geneva

Adam Daniel Rotfeld, Secretary of State, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of
Poland, Member of the National Security Council, Warsaw

Andrei Zagorski, Deputy Head, Moscow Office of the Konrad Adenauer
Foundation, Moscow

Editor-in-Chief: Ursel Schlichting, Hamburg

Editorial Staff: Kim Bennett, Hamburg
Graeme Currie, Hamburg



Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft
Baden-Baden

Bibliografische Information Der Deutschen Bibliothek

Die Deutsche Bibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.ddb.de> abrufbar.

Bibliographic information published by Die Deutsche Bibliothek

Die Deutsche Bibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data is available in the Internet at <http://dnb.ddb.de>.

ISBN 3-8329-0744-0

1. Auflage 2004

© Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, Baden-Baden 2004. Printed in Germany. Alle Rechte, auch die des Nachdrucks von Auszügen, der photomechanischen Wiedergabe und der Übersetzung, vorbehalten. Gedruckt auf alterungsbeständigem Papier.

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically those of translation, reprinting, re-use of illustrations, broadcasting, reproduction by photocopying machine or similar means, and storage in data banks. Under § 54 of the German Copyright Law where copies are made for other than private use a fee is payable to »Verwertungsgesellschaft Wort«, Munich.

In Memoriam

Dieter S. Lutz

Contents

<i>Jaap de Hoop Scheffer</i> Preface	13
<i>Ursel Schlichting</i> Foreword	15
I. States of Affairs – Affairs of State	
<i>OSCE: Developments and Prospects – Focus on the Future of the OSCE</i>	
<i>Daan W. Everts</i> The Future of the OSCE	23
<i>Adam Daniel Rotfeld</i> Does the OSCE Have a Future?	31
<i>Dieter Boden</i> Whither the OSCE?	43
<i>Edwin Bakker/Bert Bomert</i> Challenges for the OSCE – A Dutch Perspective	51
<i>Wolfgang Zellner</i> Asymmetric Security in Europe and the Tasks of the OSCE	61
<i>Stanley R. Sloan/Heiko Borchert</i> The Soft-Power Solution: US-European Relations in and beyond Europe	75
<i>Gudrun Steinacker</i> The Role of the OSCE as a Regional Security Organization in Combating International Terrorism	89

The OSCE States: Their Interests and Commitment

Zhanylzhana Dzhunusova
Kazakhstan and the OSCE 97

Ihor Lossovsky
The Activity of the OSCE from a Ukrainian Perspective 107

II. Responsibilities, Instruments, Mechanisms and Procedures

Conflict Prevention and Dispute Settlement

Christiane Jaenicke
The OSCE Presence in Albania –
Raison d’Etre and Future Plans 125

Uta Zapf
Relations Running Hot and Cold:
The Reopened OSCE Mission in Minsk and Its
Political Prospects 139

Claus Neukirch
The OSCE Mission to Moldova 149

Volker Jacoby
The OSCE Mission to Georgia 163

Peter Burkhard
The OSCE Office in Baku 171

Jorma Inki
The Closure of the OSCE Assistance Group to Chechnya:
A Defining Moment for the OSCE? 181

The Human Dimension and Democratic Development

'Abd al-Hakeem Carney

Analysing Political Islam:

The Need for a New Taxonomy

199

Claude Cahn

The Politics of Expulsion:

Europe and Efforts to Regulate the Roma

209

Building Co-operative Security

Lamberto Zannier

A New Focus on Borders

225

Andreas Heinemann-Grüder

The OSCE and Security-Sector Reform

237

Jan Peter Fladeboe

Finalizing the Dayton Peace Accords:

The Concluding Document of the Negotiations under

Article V of Annex 1-B of the General Framework Agreement

for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina

249

Pál Dunay

Either Bring the Adapted CFE Treaty into Force or

Do Not – But Face the Consequences

259

Economic Transformation and the Containment of Emerging Risks

Gianluca Rampolla/Annica Carlsson

The Sustainable Use and Protection of Water –

A New Field for the OSCE's Work

in Promoting Security and Stability

291

Walter Kemp

Breaking the Crime-Conflict Nexus:

A Challenge for the OSCE

301

III. Organizational Aspects

OSCE Institutions and Structures

Christian Möller

Press Freedom in the OSCE Area and the
Activities of the OSCE Media Representative 323

Frank Evers

A New Think-Tank for the OSCE and Central Asia:
Establishing the OSCE Academy in Bishkek 337

External Relations and Influence

Thomas M. Buchsbaum

East Asian Security:
Can the OSCE's Experience Be Helpful? 349

Michael Merlingen/Rasa Ostrauskaitė

The International Socialization of Post-Socialist Countries:
The Role of the OSCE and the Council of Europe 365

Ingo Peters

The OSCE, NATO and the EU within the "Network
of Interlocking European Security Institutions":
Hierarchization, Flexibilization, Marginalization 381

Heiko Borchert/Daniel Maurer

Co-operation, Rivalry or Insignificance?
Five Scenarios for the Future of Relations
between the OSCE and the EU 403

Annexes

Tenth Meeting of the Ministerial Council Porto, 6 and 7 December 2002	421
- Porto Ministerial Declaration	422
- OSCE Charter on Preventing and Combating Terrorism	425
- Declaration on Trafficking in Human Beings	428
- Statements by the Ministerial Council	431
- Decisions of the Porto Ministerial Council Meeting	442
Forms and Forums of Co-operation in the OSCE Area	457
The 55 OSCE Participating States – Facts and Figures	459
OSCE Conferences, Meetings and Events 2002/2003	477
OSCE Selected Bibliography 2002/2003	491
Abbreviations	503
Contributors	507

Preface

The Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) – and its forerunner the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE) – has worked hard over the past 30 years to overcome the political antagonisms that divide people in our part of the world. The work has been tackled not only by governments, but also by people from all walks of life: non-governmental organizations, unions and associations, academics and numerous other groups and individuals.

Germany, like the Netherlands, has been a staunch supporter of the OSCE's work and efforts from the outset. The Organization and its participating States have come a long way following the upheavals that shook Europe during the nineties. Germany, more than any other participating State, has experienced these changes, this transformation of the political climate that culminated in the fall of the Berlin Wall and the subsequent reunification of the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic.

The Netherlands now holds the OSCE Chairmanship for the first time. It is the Chairmanship's responsibility to ensure the co-ordination and continuity of OSCE policies as well as to keep abreast of political developments both internationally and within the Organization.

Many important topics figure on the OSCE agenda for 2003 and beyond. From this wide spectrum of concerns, I would like to highlight two issues: terrorism and the fight against various forms of trafficking. The first issue has topped the international agenda since 11 September 2001. Only a comprehensive approach will suffice given the complex and global nature of terrorism. At the same time, fighting terrorism must not be allowed to undermine our citizens' fundamental human rights.

The Netherlands sees the second issue – trafficking in human beings, small arms and light weapons and drugs – as a clear example of a new threat to security and stability in the 21st century. Trafficking not only causes human misery, it undermines both national economies and political systems. It is therefore important for the OSCE to develop a strategy to address these new threats, as was decided upon in Porto last December. This strategy must be the result of our joint efforts, governments and civil society alike. And it is up to us to make it work.

In June 2003, the first Annual Security Review Conference was held in Vienna. This conference marked the start of a process that will hopefully come to serve as a valuable instrument for monitoring the extent to which the participating States fulfil their security commitments.

The OSCE has come a long way. But in the current climate of change, reforms are needed that will prepare the Organization for the challenges

ahead. Administrative reforms are therefore more than an internal organizational matter: They are dictated by the ever-changing international political landscape. It is our common goal to make the OSCE as effective as possible.

The OSCE is known for its comprehensive concept of security. Security is more than arms control and smoothing over political differences. In the last instance it is about people: giving people the protection they need to live their lives in dignity. Our primary concern is thus with the provision of security to individuals, minorities and socially vulnerable groups. Without due regard for human rights and economic and environmental development, it will be impossible to achieve lasting peace and sustainable security. The Organization's practical experience of making such connections at field level – something of which it can certainly be proud – demonstrates that the OSCE is permanently working at the cutting edge of conflict management. This is clearly the OSCE's unique selling point compared to other international organizations.

We in the OSCE must continue our efforts, impelled by the joint commitments of all participating States. The OSCE has always made a point of collaborating closely not just with governments and international institutions, but also with the various groups and organizations that constitute civil society, with non-governmental organizations and with the academic world. This 2003 Yearbook is once again proof of the scope of activities of institutions like the Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg (IFSH) and the active stand they take in the OSCE region. The book contains a wealth of information and analysis bearing on a wide range of issues related to our work.

We are grateful for the valuable contribution that institutions such as the IFSH make to the never-ending efforts to establish and maintain peace and security in our part of the world. Their contribution not only benefits academic discourse in this area, but also, and more importantly, it enhances the ongoing political and public debate on this important matter in Germany and elsewhere in the OSCE region.

Foreword

Two years ago, the foreword to the OSCE Yearbook began by asking, “is the OSCE going through a crisis?” To anyone who has been following the discussions of recent months – within the OSCE, but also among academics, politicians and the interested public – it is clear that most observers would answer this question with a “yes”. The general impression is of a long-term and extremely serious crisis.

At first glance, several indicators seem to support this view: EU and NATO enlargement means that powerful actors, maybe even rivals, are penetrating ever more deeply into an area in which the OSCE was, until recently, the only organization with responsibility for security and stability. This is true despite the fact that Vienna has long been seen above all as a staging post on the road to Brussels. The EU and NATO will soon have members that until recently still hosted OSCE missions – something that is not easy to square with the standard image of an EU country, especially in view of EU states’ claims that they possess adequate democratic and constitutional mechanisms for the resolution of conflicts (e.g. those involving minorities) and do not need to rely on the OSCE and its institutions, such as the High Commissioner on National Minorities. Moreover, the EU has begun to take on civilian conflict-management tasks, thereby entering a field that has until now been the OSCE’s core area of activity.

The OSCE’s field missions have generally received high praise for their active and frequently successful engagement in areas such as post-conflict rehabilitation – and hence also the prevention of further conflicts – and are universally acknowledged to be the Organization’s key comparative advantage. But even these have now come in for criticism and have even been condemned as superfluous by several states – the accusations ranging from interference in internal affairs and geographic imbalance, to the claim that the OSCE’s practical work focuses too much on the human dimension. Some states have even argued that OSCE missions are a stigma that stands in the way of their integration into the West. The fact that the critics include the Russian Federation must be seen as a serious problem given that Russia was long one of the Organization’s strongest supporters. Recently, Russia has not only displayed decreasing interest in the OSCE, but has become one of the Organization’s sharpest critics. It now belongs to the group of countries that question the value of the Organization as a whole.

Finally, the unilateralism that is currently in fashion – and appears to go hand in hand with a tendency towards seeking military solutions to security problems – threatens to undermine the OSCE’s fundamental commitment to multilateralism and to conflict management through non-military means.

Perhaps our opening question should therefore be rephrased as “does the OSCE have a future?” Have the developments listed above rendered the Organization superfluous? Are the tasks it performs being gradually taken over by other organizations?

But even this – apparently pessimistic – question is not new, as Adam Daniel Rotfeld notes in his contribution to the current volume. That in itself is cause for optimism: For the question of the OSCE’s future that we have made the central topic of this Yearbook is no longer primarily posed – as Rotfeld also notes – by the Organization’s critics, but above all by its defenders. As a result, we may hope to find well thought-out, factually based, creative and properly “forward-looking” answers.

It appears that the “great” questions of the past – the questions of giving the OSCE a legal basis, of giving it precedence over other security organizations, the question of competition versus co-operation and co-ordination – are now all either of secondary importance or have already been answered. OSCE decisions will thus not become legally binding for the foreseeable future. A hierarchization of security organizations with the OSCE at the top has now also been excluded – not only as a result of political developments, but explicitly in the Charter for European Security. Co-operation and co-ordination with other organizations that share “responsibility” for security and stability, democracy, the rule of law, and human rights have become a matter of course – so much so that it is now possible to dismiss the “competition and duplication” and “inefficiency and waste” that continue to exist alongside the expected and hoped-for synergies as “natural wastage” and “unavoidable everyday occurrences”, as Ingo Peters does in his contribution to this volume. Although enhancing co-operation and co-ordination remains as important as ever, it now appears to be something that is not only feasible but is desired by all parties. Consequently, the problem of inter-institutional co-operation between European security organizations can be said to be largely solved.

The events of 11 September 2001 have also played a not inconsiderable role in bringing the frequently abstract, time- and energy-consuming debates and discussions of principle on legal personality and hierarchization, “repoliticization” and “revitalization” to an abrupt end. The new focus is on concrete, acute, urgent problems that require decisive – and collective – action.

The real question should therefore not be whether the OSCE has a future, but what sort of a future it will have. What will its concrete tasks be? How will it be able to carry them out in practice? What powers and capabilities will it require? What areas should the OSCE engage in? Should it narrow its focus or diversify? Limit or expand its activities? Should it (or will it be forced to) restrict its work to certain regions and countries, or will it retain its pan-European focus? And, as important as ever: What shape will the division of labour between international organizations take in practice in view of the “new threats to security” and the “challenges of the 21st Century”?

The current volume reflects the OSCE's comprehensive spectrum of long-established, newly assumed and potential future tasks and areas of engagement. The Organization's traditional involvement in conflict prevention and crisis management, democratization and the promotion of human rights and the building of co-operative security has now been joined by – above all – its role in combating terrorism, where the Organization has a role to play, for example, as a result of its assumption of tasks in the areas of border monitoring and border security. Further contributions to this year's Yearbook deal with the OSCE's role in security-sector reform, its growing involvement in environmental matters, such as the protection of vital natural resources (and, through that, the prevention of environmental conflicts) and its commitment to media freedom and the protection of persecuted journalists. New and urgent topics include a consideration of Islam as an integral part of the cultures found between Vancouver and Vladivostok and organized crime and its role in acute or "frozen" conflicts – something that sheds a whole new light on these conflicts.

Facing as many threats and dangers, urgent issues and tasks requiring attention as it does, Europe cannot afford to ignore an actor as experienced as the OSCE, especially one that has come to focus so strongly on its operational activities and work in the field. A premium should therefore be placed on the Organization's practical experience, even if this is occasionally seen in terms of "niche activities", and the OSCE itself described – in my opinion, degradingly – as a "niche organization".

The OSCE is still the most inclusive security organization in the Northern hemisphere. It looks set to retain this position in the long term, even if the number of states that belong to no other (Western) organization has declined and will continue to do so in the years to come. The OSCE also remains the organization with the most comprehensive concept of security, one that includes not only the politico-military, but also the economic-environmental and the human dimensions. The view that only an approach of this kind is adequate to deal with contemporary security challenges has won general acceptance in the past decade following the unexpected outbreak of new types of conflict and the equally unexpected (at least in terms of their extent) appearance of new threats. At the same time, the recognition has also grown that no single organization is capable of managing all the tasks that need to be dealt with.

For the OSCE, this means continuing along familiar paths whilst simultaneously taking on new tasks in perhaps unfamiliar areas. Of course, within this, the Organization needs to strive for a new balance between the dimensions and in the geographical distribution of its activities. Although this is not one of the more urgent of the Organization's many tasks – no one seriously doubts the importance of the OSCE in promoting human rights or deny the differences between participating States in terms of democratic and constitutional practice – it is unavoidable in order to ensure the continued sup-

port of a large and important section of OSCE States – as well as to promote fairness and to reduce complacency on the part of the Organization’s other participating States.

It is important to note, as Wolfgang Zellner does, that “in a certain sense, crises have always accompanied the development of the CSCE and the OSCE”. However, it is also clear that, against the background of the challenges and problems that Europe faces, the question “does the OSCE have a future?” can and must be answered in the affirmative.

The authors featured in the current volume have brought great skill and dedication to bear in producing an exceptionally wide-ranging variety of contributions. They have gone some considerable way towards identifying the new challenges facing the OSCE and working out ways to meet them. The editors would like to thank all of them for their valuable contributions to this – vitally necessary – discussion on the future of the OSCE.

Dieter Lutz, founder of the OSCE Yearbook and the Centre for OSCE Research (CORE) and, from 1994, Director of the Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg (IFHS), died suddenly in January 2003 at the age of 53. This book is dedicated to him.

I.

States of Affairs – Affairs of State

OSCE: Developments and Prospects –
Focus on the Future of the OSCE

The Future of the OSCE

At the beginning of the Dutch Chairmanship of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE), the relevance of the Organization was seriously challenged by several pundits in the security field. The enlargement of both NATO and the European Union entailed a double encroachment upon the traditional preserve of the OSCE. Had the old girl outlived her usefulness, or was there life in her yet? A number of seminars and articles were dedicated to analysing and debating this issue. One quarter of the way through the Dutch Chairmanship, the critical voices went quiet. The war in Iraq was occupying everyone's attention. And there is no *Schadenfreude* in saying that neither the European Union nor NATO can provide the comprehensive security umbrella the OSCE region desperately requires. More than at any time during the last half-century, ordinary citizens – individuals as well as communities – feel threatened as they go about their daily lives. Terrorism – or the fear of terrorism – is a new threat in the region, one that is directly affecting the lives of millions of people within the area. Military solutions alone cannot address these fears. A broad-based agreement is emerging that real, long-term security involves looking into root causes as well, irrespective of whether these are economic, humanitarian, political or of any other nature. For those familiar with OSCE matters, my intention should be clear: to highlight once again the good old OSCE concept of comprehensive security.

Freud in Vienna: The OSCE on the Couch?

In the recent past, the OSCE has often been described as at a turning point – midway between a very successful past and an uncertain future. This has generated a certain amount of self-reflection within the OSCE, if not self-doubt. Some have even referred to an identity crisis. But while this may be fitting, given the Organization's seat in the birthplace of psychology, I have always considered such talk to be overdoing things. Nevertheless, as the Dutch took over the presidency on 1 January 2003, it was certainly high time to face this matter head on and to help determine where the OSCE as an organization was standing and where it was heading. One could say that the OSCE, having brought about near-miracles, is the victim of its own success. To put it bluntly, and with only slight exaggeration, I would dare to say that the Berlin Wall would not have fallen without the OSCE, certainly not as early as 1989. And without the networks of Helsinki Committees, the various people-to-people links, and the OSCE's advocacy work on human-rights is-

sues, the political landslide that took place overnight in 1989 would have certainly been more violent and bloody than it turned out to be.

The big question staring the OSCE straight in the face is this: After the successes of the past, is there any role it can play in the future? The environment has changed drastically. Half of the OSCE participating States will soon be members of the EU, while many of them and some others will shortly join the growing ranks of NATO members. Even those who remain outside will be brought into the orbit of the EU and NATO to some extent through Stabilization and Association Agreements, Partnership for Peace arrangements and other forms of co-operation. It is clear that the area is shrinking in which the OSCE is the only player in the game. But are there any problems that still require an organization like OSCE? This only begs the next set of questions, namely, what is the OSCE for? What is so special about it? Why is it better equipped to tackle some problems than other existing international organizations? Or can the non-governmental structures created through the OSCE, the famous Helsinki networks, keep the flame burning?

Back to Basics: The Determining Features of the OSCE

Before answering these questions, I would like to return to fundamentals. What really is the core of the OSCE? What makes it different and distinctive? Four unique features spring to mind:

Breadth of Participation

The *first* factor is of course the Organization's broad circle of participants. From Vancouver to Vladivostok, fifty-five states in all participate in the OSCE. There is no other forum in the region with that kind of inclusivity. There is also no other international security organization that so clearly defines security as a co-operative responsibility. Security, as defined by the OSCE, is interdependent and indivisible. All OSCE participating States are stakeholders in each other's security and in the security of Europe. Only by co-operating can crises be prevented. The underlying assumption is that co-operation brings benefits to all, while the insecurity of one state can affect the well being of the rest: The Three Musketeers translated into the field of international security.

The Peer Review

The *second* feature – not often mentioned, yet distinctive to the OSCE – is that it is a platform for what I would call “peer review”. By this I mean that states engage in mutual “self-examination”. It is the only forum that I know where a domestic issue, problem or question concerning the state of democ-

racy or human rights in a country is a matter for all members to review, examine and act on. Such a situation is unthinkable for those who have been raised with the traditional diplomatic concept of non-interference – something that has often been used to hide the effects of bad governance. It is maybe fair to say that this peer review is the most fascinating aspect of the OSCE: an organization that allows domestic developments to be scrutinized or at least reviewed by other members or – as they are officially known – participating States.

The Moscow mechanism is a good example of such a peer-review process. During the Dutch Chairmanship, this mechanism was set in motion for only the second time (the first time was in 1992 over Croatia). Ten participating States expressed their concern over the response by the Turkmen authorities to an attempt to kill President Niyazov. The number of arrests and the treatment of those arrested, as well as the response of the Turkmen government to a request for information, which was perceived as inadequate, led to the invoking of the Moscow mechanism. Without going into details, and making no pretence that all problems have been ironed out since then, it is fair to say that the mechanism has brought the issue into the open, giving a fair chance to both parties to raise their concerns and to engage in critical dialogue that can be continued both within the OSCE and in other international forums.

Comprehensive Security

A *third* distinguishing feature of OSCE is its “comprehensive concept of security”, as mentioned in the introduction to this contribution. Security is more than arms control, conflict prevention, crisis management and the settling of political differences. Without due regard for human rights and economic and ecological development, no sustainable security, no lasting peace can be reached. In OSCE terms, we talk about three dimensions, all of which are directly related to the security situation. They are the politico-military dimension, the economic-environmental dimension and the human dimension. The interdependence among these three dimensions has since been widely recognized by other international agencies, such as NGOs. The derogatory distinction between “hard” and “soft” security topics has not been heard for some time. September 11 and other terrorist strikes, as well as resource-related conflicts such as that over water in the Ferghana Valley have brought the message home: Seemingly “soft” subjects can have violent consequences when not dealt with properly.

Field Presence

The *fourth* distinctive feature of OSCE is its operational presence in the field. The Organization’s missions in almost 20 countries are its eyes and ears and

one of its best-known assets, offering hands-on expertise and assistance where they are most needed. The OSCE field missions are often described as the Organization's front line. They give it an active presence in countries that require assistance, and are the vehicle through which political decisions are translated into action. Their work addresses all phases of the conflict cycle: early warning, preventive diplomacy, conflict management and post-conflict rehabilitation. In each and every phase, human rights form an integral part of their work. Every field mission has its own specific mandate, but no field mission's mandate can ignore human rights advocacy.

Challenges Ahead: Old ...

Having looked at the OSCE's history and its defining features, I now want to consider if there are any challenges in 2003 that require the special attention of this unique organization. This question forces us to consider the present and future security landscape, including possible security threats and challenges.

For starters, I think it is only fair to acknowledge that, despite the successful past of the OSCE and its predecessor, the CSCE, not all the problems of the past can be consigned to the history books. Some old problems are still awaiting a solution. These include conflicts resulting from the break-up of the former Soviet Union that, despite being frozen for a while, still pose a serious threat to overall security. An example is provided by the ongoing negotiations on the settlement of the political status of Transnistria within Moldova. There also continue to be legitimate concerns with regard to democratic developments and human rights in various parts of the OSCE world. The increasing concentration of media ownership in established democracies such as Italy, or the recent regression of human rights and democracy in Central Asia following the promising start that had been made in the nineties, are just two areas where the OSCE needs to continue its work. Comprehensive security is a work in progress. It is never finished.

... and New

Alongside established threats to security, there are a number of new threats and challenges that would seem to justify a continued role for the OSCE. Some of these are completely new, while others have re-emerged like a political "Revenge of the Mummy". These new threats can be grouped in four clusters:

Terrorism

The *first* new threat that has to be mentioned is of course terrorism (and extremism in general). Not only September 11, but also the attack on the Moscow theatre and the Bali bombing have brought the message home loud and clear: Terrorist acts carried out by non-state actors and directly affecting ordinary citizens lives represent one of the most serious new threats to stability and security throughout the OSCE region. In December 2002, towards the end of the Portuguese OSCE Chairmanship, two crucial decisions were taken in Porto in this regard. The adoption of the OSCE Charter on Preventing and Combating Terrorism and the document on the “Development of an OSCE Strategy to Address Threats to Security and Stability in the Twenty-first Century”¹ have prepared the ground for the OSCE to play a role in the fight against terrorism. It would be absurd to imagine that the OSCE should or could be the only international organization to play a major role in this fight. The Organization should define the added value it can bring in terms of its specific experience and expertise. The niche the OSCE seems best suited to fill seems to be in the areas of policing, border security, anti-trafficking and the suppression of terrorist financing. True to the OSCE’s spirit of equality and solidarity, the Organization should be ready to assist all participating States in preventing and fighting terrorism. The OSCE’s traditional concept of common and comprehensive security provides an excellent point of departure. Only a strategy that combines the three dimensions and makes use of all the OSCE’s bodies and institutions will produce the desired results. Given the complex and global nature of terrorism, one-dimensional approaches will not be sufficient. In all its efforts, the OSCE will need to work closely together with other international organizations in accordance with the Platform for Co-operative Security as adopted at the Istanbul Summit in 1999.

Strict adherence to the principles of good governance and democracy will help to protect our societies from the threat of terrorism. The rule of law and the full participation of all citizens in political life are essential in the fight against terror. The only societies that have the strength to challenge the extremists in their midst are those where the right to question is beyond dispute. The fight against terrorism should never infringe the fundamental human rights of our citizens. This would not only be contrary to the basic and timeless principles of the OSCE, it would also make our citizens vulnerable to extremist manipulation of any kind.

Trafficking in Human Beings, Arms and Drugs

The *second* threat that should be mentioned is trafficking. It poses a clear threat to stability and security, both inside and outside the OSCE region.

1 The Documents and Decisions of the Tenth OSCE Ministerial Council are reprinted in this volume, pp. 421-455, here: pp. 425-428 and pp. 443-445.

Trafficking has a wide geographical distribution and is a central element of international crime. Under trafficking we understand the trade in human beings and the illicit trade in drugs and small arms and light weapons. Trafficking in human beings is a particularly repulsive crime and is rapidly becoming a major scourge. Estimates of the total number of victims of this new slave trade in recent years range from 700,000 to four million. Drugs trafficking is a multi-billion dollar business that directly affects the economies of all our countries. It also has a seriously destabilizing impact on our civil fabric. Finally, trafficking in small arms and light weapons also represents a clear and present threat to security. Trafficking does not just cross borders, it also crosses dimensions. It not only causes human misery but devastates national economies and puts undue pressure on political systems. The impact of trafficking across the whole OSCE region is negative and destabilizing. These are, briefly put, the reasons why the Netherlands has proposed that “trafficking” be made a major theme for this year’s OSCE Economic Forum in Prague.

New Minorities

A *third* cluster of new threats and challenges is associated with the emergence of new minorities in several societies, particularly in Western Europe. The social exclusion of minorities may lead to social disruption and instability. Growing tensions and feelings of unease have had their impact on recent elections in the region, including those held in the Netherlands. If national governments do not tackle these issues properly – and, I may add humanely – they may sow the seeds of future crises. This is an area where matters could escalate rapidly. It is a matter of relations between civilizations, cultures and religions. The logical consequence could be the involvement – in an advisory capacity – of the OSCE, specifically through the person of the High Commissioner on National Minorities (HCNM). This could take the form of, for instance, general and specific recommendations on social policies made to national governments. In this way, social disruption and emerging crises could be nipped in the bud. The decision of the OSCE Rome Ministerial Council of 1993, which already invites the HCNM to get involved in combating xenophobia, points in this direction. The mandate of the HCNM has in fact been extended to general matters of non-discrimination.

Rich and Poor in the OSCE

The *fourth* cluster of new threats is associated with the growing discrepancy between the two parts of the OSCE world. I am referring to the economic imbalance between those countries that are already part of or are about to join the EU and those that remain outside. Stark differences in economic performance are already evident, and these may be exacerbated over time if we do

not address this imbalance. The risk exists of a dangerous “great divide” developing between those OSCE countries (maybe the bulk of them) that participate in mainstream economic development and those that are left behind. A new – and widening – divide between a massive, powerful EU bloc and the rest, between the “haves” and the “have-nots” will pose real problems, encouraging antagonism, tension and disintegration throughout the OSCE region.

In Short: There Are enough Challenges to Justify the Continued Existence of the OSCE

The conclusion we have to draw is clear: As well as a number of outstanding unresolved challenges from the past, some major new challenges are emerging that require the attentions of an organization structured like the OSCE – and require them in all three dimensions: the politico-military, the economic-environmental and the human. The OSCE’s all-inclusiveness – in terms of geographical coverage, breadth of coverage (the three dimensions), and its focus on both soft and hard security – place it squarely in the centre of any discussions of regional security. This is by no means to suggest that the OSCE is the only player in the game. Far from it: Other international and regional organizations (as already mentioned), national governments and NGOs play an important role, too. Examples of successful intervention, whether in terms of conflict prevention or crisis management, are often those where all actors played their part and were prepared to give way to better-suited players at certain times.

The OSCE can indeed look back on a successful past. But it would be wrong to pretend that no adjustments are needed to procedures or to the way the Organization co-operates with other players in the field of security. Organizations need to develop – to learn from their experience. There is always room for improvement. The OSCE is no different from any other institution in that regard.

The history of the region also shows the need for proper planning and co-ordination among the different agencies on the ground. It is absolutely vital for international actors to work together at the structural level and to make transparent arrangements as to the division of tasks. In comparison with Kosovo, Bosnia and Herzegovina saw far less properly structured co-operation between the main international actors. As a result, there was more parallel activity, duplication and sometimes even rivalry, with consequent time, energy and resource wastages. In Kosovo, the plan from the start was to have one structure, UN-led, in which EU, OSCE and UNHCR (because of the refugee problem in this specific case) would work together. The result was a single structure with an overarching organization and very clearly defined

areas of competence. This made for greater efficiency in post-conflict and rehabilitation work.

The regional imbalance of the OSCE has come in for criticism in the past owing to the fact that the Organization has mainly addressed issues “east of Vienna”: in former Yugoslavia, the Caucasus and now also Central Asia. Issues “west of Vienna” were left largely untouched. Paying more attention to the new challenges I have detailed here would make it possible to redress the geographical balance of the Organization’s work. After all, issues like trafficking, “new minorities” and terrorism affect the whole region. Nevertheless, it has to be said that there can never be an excuse for the OSCE not to act merely out of geopolitical considerations. At the end of the day, the OSCE has to act where the problems are – whether they are in the East or the West.

The same can be said for the other perceived imbalance in OSCE’s work: the imbalance among the dimensions. In the past, the focus was very much on the human dimension, on human-rights issues. As important as this is – and it is certainly not to be belittled – the fact that it received virtually all the OSCE’s attention was often criticized by certain countries in the East as unfair and one-sided. In their opinion, some of their other needs – in the economic and environmental sphere, for instance – were neglected. Having heard these views and acknowledging that some grounds for criticism exist, I would like to be unequivocally clear in this regard. The Netherlands, and therefore the Dutch Chairman-in-Office, remain in the vanguard of countries working for the improvement of the human rights situation world-wide. This means that in no way will any efforts be supported that would undermine the current human-rights focus of the OSCE. In 2003, human rights remain, as far as the incumbent Chairman-in-Office is concerned, firmly on the Organization’s agenda. In other words, worries among the human-rights fraternity that the OSCE may be weakening the intensity of its focus are unfounded. The simple and tragic fact of life is that human rights abuses “west of Vienna” are not of the same order as those to the east of the city where the OSCE has its headquarters. The impact of the latter on security and human dignity is clear and the OSCE has to act true to its mandate. Anything less would be “an insult to ordinary citizens in the OSCE region”.