

Preface

The chapter on “The OSCE and European Security” in the OSCE Yearbook 2008 provided a comprehensive overview of the state of European security¹ and a precise description of the current position of the OSCE. Not least against the backdrop of the war in Georgia, the conclusions of these in-depth analyses provided little grounds for hope of a rapid and lasting easing of tensions between Russia and the West and the durable overcoming of the crisis of the OSCE. “Business as usual or revitalization of the OSCE?” This was the question that P. Terrence Hopmann posed with regard to the future of the Organization.² The year 2008, Hopmann argued, was “a critical juncture” for the Organization. In the next few years, he went on, it would either further recede or “in the face of current challenges [...] revitalize its role as a central actor in European security”.³ By contrast, the OSCE Yearbook 2009 now presents a number of cautiously optimistic versions of the future.

The decisive break already occurred against the dark background of 2008: At a conference in Evian, France, in October of that year, Russia’s President Dmitry Medvedev returned to the proposal that he had first made in Berlin in June: The conclusion of a legally binding Treaty on European Security, whose negotiation would commence with a pan-European summit. While still at Evian, Nicolas Sarkozy, then President of the European Council, took up Medvedev’s plan and proposed that the OSCE should be the framework for dialogue. On the initiative of the Greek OSCE Chairmanship, the foreign ministers of the OSCE participating States finally met on 28 June 2009 at Corfu for initial informal discussions – and the “Corfu Process” was born. The ministers agreed to begin a structured and focused dialogue on the future of European security in the OSCE context, and with the involvement of other security institutions. The Greek Chairmanship proposed 20 “guiding themes” for discussion at the informal, ambassadorial-level “Corfu Process meetings” that began in Vienna on 8 September 2009.⁴ By so doing, the Chairmanship ensured that the Corfu Process would cover all three OSCE dimensions, and while an emphasis was placed on politico-military topics, this did not occur at the expense of the human dimension. President Med-

1 See Michael Merlingen/Manuel Mireanu/Elena B. Stavrevska, The Current State of European Security, in: Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg/IFSH (ed.), *OSCE Yearbook 2008*, Baden-Baden 2009, pp. 91-117.

2 P. Terrence Hopmann, The Future Impact of the OSCE: Business as Usual or Revitalization? In: *ibid.*, pp. 75-90.

3 *Ibid.*, p. 1.

4 Cf. Corfu Process meetings: Guiding themes, in: *OSCE Magazine* October-November 2009, p. 5.

vedev's plan thus turned out to give an important boost to the OSCE – not least thanks to the initiative of the EU.

The Corfu Process is at the heart of this year's OSCE Yearbook. Six leading experts on European security policy place the proposal of a binding Treaty on European Security at the centre of their considerations: Adam Daniel Rotfeld inquires into the necessity of a new European security architecture. Andrei Zagorski subjects the Russian President's plans to detailed scrutiny, as do Pál Dunay and Graeme P. Herd. Finally, Egon Bahr and Reinhard Mutz discuss the future of détente.

Another momentous event lies just ahead: In 2010, Kazakhstan becomes the first successor state of the former Soviet Union, the first CIS member state, and the first Central Asian country to assume the Chairmanship of the OSCE. When it first announced its candidacy in 2003, Kazakhstan had already set about to become a key actor in the triangle defined by European, Russian, and Chinese power. Kazakhstan was seen as a stable and religiously tolerant multiethnic state with no major domestic conflicts. Nonetheless, it was also clear that the country had considerable deficits in the areas of democratic development and human rights. In 2004, moreover, Kazakhstan aligned itself with Russia's fundamental criticisms of the OSCE. Its application thus initially divided the OSCE participating States into a larger group of supporters and a smaller one of opponents to its candidacy.⁵ Several participating States, among them the USA, feared that a Kazakhstani Chairmanship could endanger the OSCE *acquis* in the human dimension and the independence of relevant institutions, ODIHR in particular. By contrast, the bulk of the OSCE States, including Germany, saw in Kazakhstan's candidacy the prospect of positive effects not only on the domestic political development of Kazakhstan itself, but also on the development of the entire region and its co-operation with Europe. Initially postponed at the Brussels Ministerial Council Meeting in 2006, the decision on the 2010 Chairmanship was finally taken at the Madrid Ministerial Council Meeting in November 2007. The fact that it ultimately went the way of Kazakhstan was above all the result of the promise previously made by the then Kazakhstani Minister of Foreign Affairs, Marat Tazhin, that ODIHR's independence would be preserved and protected. In the current volume, Bulat Sultanov, Director of the Kazakh Institute for Strategic Studies (KazISS), describes Kazakhstan's preparations for the OSCE Chairmanship. In the same chapter, Janne Taalas and Kari Möttölä look back on the achievements of the Finnish Chairmanship in 2008.

In the chapter on the OSCE participating States, Dennis Sandole from George Mason University explicates and evaluates US foreign policy in the post-Bush era. Lithuania's ambassador to the OSCE, Renatus Norkus, looks at the role of the Organization from the point of view of his country, which will assume the Chairmanship in 2011. Astrid Sahn, the German Director of

5 Cf. Margit Hellwig-Bötte, Kazakhstan's OSCE Chairmanship – The Road to Europe? in: *OSCE Yearbook 2008*, cited above (Note 1), pp. 175-186, here: pp. 177-178.

the Johannes Rau Minsk International Education Center, considers the potential for future co-operation between Belarus and European organizations, and Elena Kropatcheva analyses the domestic political situation in the Ukraine, five years after the “Orange Revolution”.

In the section on the work of the OSCE in individual countries, the Head of the OSCE Presence in Albania, Robert Bosch, introduces an OSCE project to protect women from domestic violence. Ulrich Heider illuminates military aspects of the work of the OSCE Mission to Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Marcin Czapliński from the OSCE’s Conflict Prevention Centre (CPC) relates the evolving tasks of the OSCE Mission in Kosovo. Retired General Bernard Aussedat discusses the prospects for settlement of the conflict over Transdnistria, while Tim Potier, an expert in international law, concerns himself with the conflict in Nagorno-Karabakh. Alexandre Keltchewsky gives an appreciation of ten years of the OSCE Centre in Astana and Alice Ackermann, also from the CPC, describes OSCE mechanisms for early warning, conflict prevention, and crisis management.

The restructured chapter on “Comprehensive Security: The Three Dimensions and Cross-Dimensional Challenges” pays heed to the fact that, in the face of new threats and risks, the boundaries between the three dimensions of the OSCE’s activity have increasingly become blurred and many challenges can only be managed in a manner that is cross-dimensional. The chapter opens with a contribution by Frank Evers, who focuses on the highly controversial topic of election observation. Aaron Rhodes, former director of the International Helsinki Federation for Human Rights (IHF), pleads for better protection of human rights defenders in the participating States and Hans-Joachim Heintze, an expert in international law at Ruhr University in Bochum, discusses whether de facto regimes are bound by human rights norms. Lorenz Barth from Germany’s Permanent Mission to the OSCE analyses the Ministerial Decision on Strengthening the Rule of Law. Herbert Salber, Director of the CPC, and Alice Ackermann jointly present the OSCE Border Security and Management Concept. Stephan Hensell, meanwhile, concerns himself with co-operation and competition between international actors in the field of police reform in the Balkans.

In the chapter on organizational aspects of the OSCE, its institutions and structures, Oleksandr Pavlyuk takes a look at the ten-year history of the OSCE Platform for Co-operative Security. Anna Ekstedt considers co-operation between the OSCE and the Council of the Baltic Sea States (CBSS) in combating trafficking in human beings.

Our Foreword this year comes from the pen of the Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Hellenic Republic, George A. Papandreou. As always, the editors and the editorial board would like to express their thanks to all the authors who have contributed with their dedication, expertise, and experience to the OSCE Yearbook 2009.

In January 2009, Prof. Victor-Yves Ghebali, a leading researcher in the field of international organizations and a globally acknowledged OSCE specialist, died. As a long-term international co-editor of the OSCE Yearbook, he supported the editorial board and editors in countless ways over the years; we are also grateful to him for many clear-sighted and often critical contributions to the OSCE Yearbook. In 2001, for instance, he called for honest and open-minded efforts in “Coping with the Russian Malaise”. He was equally sceptical and constructive in his engagement with “The Reform Process of the OSCE” (2002). And in 2005, he took up the hot potato of “Election and Election Monitoring Standards at the OSCE”. These are just a few examples of his outstanding body of work. In this volume, Wolfgang Zellner pays tribute not only to this *oeuvre*, but also to Victor-Yves Ghebali the man. In their contribution, Daniel Warner, Marianne von Grünigen, Andrei Zagorski, and Vesna Marinkovic review his life and work.

The Russian initiative to revitalize the pan-European security dialogue has also led to the resuscitation of the OSCE. Merely the fact that serious dialogue is once again taking place is a bonus. The OSCE is currently the only forum for multilateral security dialogue in Europe in which Russia participates as an equal. Whether the process launched by President Medvedev will lead to Moscow’s desired goal of a legally binding Treaty on European Security remains to be seen. But the new dynamism that the European security dialogue has gained under the catchy label of the “Corfu Process” can nonetheless be evaluated positively. Another significant development is the revival of arms control, a key component of co-operative European security, that can also be expected to occur within the framework of the new security dialogue. The Corfu Process therefore represents, in particular, an upgrading of the OSCE’s politico-military dimension, which is one of Russia’s central concerns. The more strongly the governments of the participating States identify, in the course of the Corfu Process, with the OSCE as a forum for European and transatlantic security dialogue, the greater will be the scope for the Organization’s specialized structures and institutions. At this point in time, the resumption of security dialogue in the OSCE context is definitely more important than structural reform.