

4.1. “Ensuring Stability in Europe: The CSCE Contribution”

Address to the 39th General Assembly of the
Atlantic Treaty Association
Athens, 1 October 1993

Mr. Chairman,
Distinguished delegates,

(. . .)

In 1989/1990 few have realised the depth of revolutionary change not only for Central and Eastern Europe but for the whole CSCE area and, indeed, for the whole World. The challenges of this change are no reason for despair; but there are many reasons for realism and resolved action. We can cope with the new problems if we build on the synergy of our efforts. The role of parliamentarians and public organizations is crucial. Without their active and critical involvement it will be impossible to re-establish what we need today more than anything else: The credibility of international action for our citizens.

Mr. Chairman,

The problems on the agenda of the CSCE and every component of the European structures have common roots. They stem from the transition from the old to the new era in Europe.

As a kind of miracle the revolutions of 89, 90, 91 were almost without bloodshed and peaceful. Now we are faced with turmoil and upheaval – and worse: For the first time in decades we are witnessing terrible wars on our continent.

Public sentiments have gone from the euphoria of change, through disappointments with its pains and difficulties to frustration over the futility of efforts to cope with the new problems. Instead of redoubling our efforts sterile criticism of the UN, of NATO, of WEU, of the European Community and of the CSCE seems to be the order of the day. All transatlantic and European institutions have thus one common problem: to prove their vitality and relevance in dealing with the new challenges.

While criticism is well deserved it should be constructive. CSCE participating states are convinced that ongoing change can and must be managed. There is no master plan for this endeavour. In the light of serious threats to peace and security in several parts of the CSCE area we will pursue a strategy of active diplomacy. Our guide in these efforts is the ultimate vision of a just and lasting peaceful order in Europe. Human rights, democracy, the rule of law, market economies, social justice, solidarity are the beacons on our bumpy road. In this period of fundamental change, vision is more important than strategy.

Distinguished Delegates,

The right diagnosis of our problems is useful. The Europe of ethnic strife, the Europe of bloody wars and down-trodden values is “de frozen”. Ethnic hatred and intolerance, backed by historical rivalries and prejudice are again proliferating. At the bottom of it is transition itself, economic difficulties and pains of democracy building.

While it is relatively easy to agree on a diagnosis it takes time and effort to settle on the right course of action and to start it. This sounds almost like business as usual but, as you know, it is not. It implies for all of us fundamental, dramatic change. And this is true for all elements of our European and transatlantic structures; it is true for each and every CSCE participating State; and it is even true for the individual citizen in the CSCE area.

The CSCE was and is faced with particular challenges of change. Until 1990 the CSCE was really a conference, a body for negotiation and exchange of views. Now active involvement is asked for. The CSCE had to create operational instruments making the CSCE capable of contributing actively to the solution of the new problems.

The European institutional architecture has to be adjusted to the requirements of new stability. Furthermore, any viable political strategy for new stability must take into account the multidimensional character of our risks and challenges. They relate to the human dimension, including the problems of migration, to economic transformation, the degradation of the environment as well as military potentials. The establishment of a qualitatively new stability in Europe is not possible without addressing these problems in their mutual interrelationship. One-issue-approaches will fail. CSCE policy and action is built on the premiss of complexity, on a comprehensive concept of security. Such a comprehensive approach cannot be successful without institutions that mutually reinforce one another, each with its own area of action and responsibility.

There is a danger that one of the negative effects of the conflicts would be serious fragmentation of European security. To prevent it our stability-building strategy must aim at making security really indivisible. The CSCE has declared that the security of each country is inseparably linked to that of all the others. This principle – as the conflicts show – is far from being fully consolidated.

A strategy of stabilisation cannot be based on a passive approach to conflicts in the CSCE area, wherever they occur. Neutralising their negative impact on the European area of stability and containing them within a manageable scope will not work.

The truth is that none of these conflicts can be isolated and none must be left alone. They should be solved with the help of all the members of the CSCE community; but it is also true that they can only be solved with the participation of conflicting parties and not just for them.

Among the CSCE community there should be no “faraway countries of which we know nothing”. Some problems may be peripheral geographically but all of them are central to European stability. Therefore we need the readiness of all participating

States to support stability throughout the CSCE area. The concept of indivisible security must remain credible as one of our essential targets.

The Swedish Chairman-in-Office is making a specific effort to integrate fully into the CSCE community the Central Asian states and the states of the Caucasus region. This is a necessary and longterm investment for a lasting peaceful order.

Mr. Chairman,

The CSCE is adjusting its *modus operandi* to these new requirements. The Helsinki Document of July 1992 and the Stockholm Decisions of December 1992 constitute landmark decisions shaping the new CSCE. While strengthening its tried and tested basis the aim is to increase CSCE ability for concerted action. Now we have instruments with which the participating States can contribute to new stability. The CSCE has extended its traditional function of dialogue to political consultation and concrete and common action.

Let me briefly outline the main areas of new and sustained effort within the CSCE.

The strengthening of the human dimension is crucial in itself and for all our other efforts. Human rights, democracy and the rule of law are the heart of the CSCE. We have a broad spectrum of high standards and norms in this area, including minority rights. But agreeing on standards is relatively easy; implementation is – for all of us – an unending task.

In a co-operative way CSCE States try to improve the implementation of human dimension obligations. The first Human Dimension Implementation meeting, which has just opened in Warsaw, will evaluate how the participating States respect their commitments. Where help and support is needed it should be provided. The frank discussion of problems can also serve as an early detector of potential conflicts. In Warsaw we will also review CSCE implementation mechanisms. With some streamlining and simplification they would become more efficient.

I would like to underline in this context the role of the CSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights in Warsaw. With a small staff and a small budget the ODIHR provides very efficiently for the administrative back up without which concrete action in the human dimension area would not be possible.

The CSCE continues also to develop its common standards in this field. One area of particular importance is an elaboration of the relationship of territorial integrity, self determination and minority rights. Perhaps it will be possible to address this crucial issue for European stability in the framework of a code of conduct that is being negotiated in the CSCE Forum for Security co-operation.

The CSCE continues to play an extremely useful role in dealing with military aspects of security. It is true that having liberated Europe from the omnipresent confrontation the traditional military threats do no longer exist. But huge military potentials are still in place. They are a potential source of threat. That includes the uncontrollable use or spread of weapons even in small quantities.

Striving for new stability we have to take very seriously that several CSCE participating States continuously indicate the lack of sufficient security guarantees. Again this is an area where single-issue-approaches will not succeed. Each new step must contribute to the overall security and stability of the new democracies in Central and Eastern Europe and beyond. We can and must develop a system of co-operative security for all and it must be done with a CSCE-framework.

Against this background the CSCE Forum for Security Co-operation is negotiating new agreements relating to military potentials and threats. The underlying philosophy is to avert abuse of military power within and between states. One can expect a series of new agreements in this field coming out from Vienna. The first four dealing with

- military contacts
- defence planning
- conventional arms transfer
- stabilising measures in crises situations could be adopted by the CSCE Council in Rome in December.

The Forum for Security Co-operation is negotiating also two major projects which would substantially consolidate an all European security system. Decisions on these projects could be taken by the Budapest Summit Meeting of the CSCE in the Fall of 1994.

Negotiating the so-called harmonisation has turned out to be rather difficult. The endeavour to establish a common denominator of arms control obligations for all CSCE States has raised very complex questions. If the yardstick is the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe, new arrangements must not undermine the treaty itself. Further the two security approaches of the past, that of alliance-type and that of neutrality-based national independence, created differences of defence structures and perception. But they can be accommodated and this would certainly contribute to the establishment of a single European security order.

The most ambitious and far reaching project is the Code of Conduct guiding relations of states in the field of security. This document should constitute the quintessence of the efforts pursued at the Forum which is to prevent the abuse of force both internally and externally. It will strengthen the foundation of common rules, standards and norms on which any system of co-operative security must be based. The validity of the concept of indivisible European security would be further strengthened if one could agree in the Code of Conduct on action to be taken in cases of non-compliance.

The CSCE tries to develop and make use of innovative tools of preventive diplomacy and crises management. It is actively involved in mediating and peace building efforts in several crises situations and conflicts: In former Yugoslavia and in the Caucasus area. In the Baltic states, Estonia and Latvia, the CSCE is actively engaged in conflict prevention. By now the CSCE has deployed four long-term missions in the field.

These missions turned out to be important stabilising factors – to mention only their roles in the prevention of the spill-over of conflict to the former Yugoslav Republic of

Macedonia or in the establishment of a framework for dialogue between the Estonian authorities and the Russian speaking population in Estonia.

The CSCE presence is of an undisputedly stabilising nature in such areas as Moldova. In Georgia the CSCE has concentrated its efforts on South-Ossetia while the UN has the leading role concerning Abkhazia. The CSCE plays the leading role in trying to end the conflict centred on Nagorno Karabakh.

For several months the CSCE was the only international body continuously monitoring developments and trying to prevent human rights abuses on the spot in Kosovo, Sanjak and Vojvodina. The deplorable decision by the Belgrade authorities not to prolong the Memorandum of Understanding for this Mission has led to suspension of its work in the area. In line with the relevant decisions of the UN-Security Council I would hope that this decision will be reconsidered. Some CSCE participating States are particularly well placed to make this point directly vis-à-vis the political leaders in Belgrade.

The CSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities, the former Foreign Minister of the Netherlands Mr. van der Stoep, started his work only in January of this year. His activities in this highly difficult area are based on CSCE principles and commitments and his mandate is to work in confidence. By now the High Commissioner is trying to defuse a number of tensions involving national minority issues from the Baltics to the Balkans. I could not refer to any better testimony for the efficiency of his work than the readiness of all states concerned to co-operate closely with the High Commissioner.

Peaceful settlement of disputes assumes particular relevance in the present circumstances of change in Europe. The framework of the CSCE provides a unique opportunity to give impetus to this CSCE commitment. The CSCE Convention on Conciliation and Arbitration agreed upon by the CSCE Foreign Ministers in December 1992 in Stockholm has been signed by 30 CSCE participating States. Now early ratification is of essence to make this very modern and flexible legal instrument operative.

It is a common view in the midst of CSCE that better co-ordination with other organizations must be ensured. CSCE can make a meaningful contribution to new stability as one of several European and transatlantic institutions. The explicit decision of CSCE heads of state and government in 1992 that "CSCE may benefit from resources and possible experience and expertise of existing organisations such as EC, NATO and the WEU" was a landmark in this area. A further positive signal is the framework agreement concluded between the CSCE and the Secretary General of the UN that takes account of the role of the CSCE as regional arrangement under Chapter VIII of the UN-Charter.

By establishing close links among the existing organizations one will ensure developing the full potential of peaceful means for conflict prevention including patient persuasion, mediation and conciliation. At the same time close co-operation between these institutions ensures the necessary continuity of conflict management starting with early warning and ending with enforcement action, when necessary. This continuum will

increase the credibility of conflict prevention strategies and the chances of success for peaceful means. We must have bodies good at quiet diplomacy and consensus building. There should definitely be a body capable of ordering and managing large scale peacekeeping and enforcement. There should be a body with the organisational and military capability of forceful response.

They are all there; we only have to develop the will to use our possibilities. Let us end our complaints about a multi-institutional system. A variety of bodies with specialised roles is a strength and not a weakness.

Mr. Chairman,

This brief description of current CSCE activities shows that the CSCE concentrates on preventive tasks and crises containment. Some call it the low spectrum of crisis management.

The development of this CSCE-role takes place by exploiting its assets acquired over the past years. The CSCE is a body with a high degree of political legitimacy through its broad membership, the consensus principle for decision making and its demanding standards. It offers a comprehensive approach, linking closely human rights, arms control and conflict prevention. Showing flexibility and the ability to tune quickly its priorities to the changing circumstances CSCE has undergone fundamental structural change – more than any other European institution.

But further change, further development are necessary. The British Foreign Secretary was right, when he stated some days ago that “CSCE in its new role is still an infant”. CSCE structures must be simplified and improved to contribute to a visible CSCE identity. Without infringing upon the consensus principle decision making procedures have to be adjusted to the necessities of operative action. The potential has just been tapped for mutually reinforcing support of and from other international institutions, including NATO.

Distinguished Delegates,

There is a large and demanding CSCE agenda that will contribute to new stability. But international bodies have no life of their own. They are tools and instruments in the hands of their member States. If national governments find them useful the institutions and organizations have a chance of achieving their goals. The duty of the international bodies and their representatives is to demonstrate their potential capabilities.

The CSCE will use the opportunity offered by the Rome meeting of its Council of Ministers exactly two month, from now. This meeting should serve not only to add new tools to the CSCE inventory. It should increase the prospects for progress where they are applied and awareness of the availability of the CSCE for such action.

Important meetings have been put on the NATO agenda, too. The CSCE should profit from the Alliance contribution to European stability. Undoubtedly there is complementarity of roles and a considerable field of co-operation. The principle is

agreed upon. We must now build on that in a pragmatic way. At this crucial point we cannot allow for old thinking. The new sense of stability lies in ensuring the direction of change and not in slowing it down.

The change that we are undergoing resembles a **controlled** chain reaction. Let us control the side effects and use the full energy of change for building new stability. The CSCE can make a contribution to this difficult process. But it needs an impulse of new energy and resolve.

Thank you for your kind attention!