

*Heinz Vetschera*

## The Bucharest Ministerial Council

The Ninth OSCE Ministerial Council took place from 3 to 4 December 2001 in Bucharest, the capital of Romania which held the OSCE Chair in 2001. This meeting was, on the one hand, characterized by combating terrorism, and on the other, it was devoted mainly to regional security issues, in particular the events in Nagorno-Karabakh, Georgia, Moldova and South-eastern Europe. The Council adopted a Ministerial Declaration and passed thirteen Decisions.

The following article is, on the one hand, an attempt to summarize the results of the meeting. On the other hand, however, it is also an attempt to uncover the intentions and allusions, but also differences hidden behind the often trite and formalistic phraseology used there. In turn, such empty phrasing is the result of necessary compromises between those states making criticisms and those being criticized. If criticism were expressed too clearly, the criticized states would probably refuse consensus, in which case, however, the problem would no longer be mentioned at all. Clichéd and complicated roundabout wording is often the result of politics as the “art of the possible”, namely dealing with a problem field so that it is addressed in a manner that one just escapes having those involved refuse consensus. This kind of wording can be found in those parts of the documents adopted that are devoted to unresolved regional issues, which often had not so long ago been the cause of armed conflict and since then have at best been frozen, but not solved sustainably. However, they are also to be found in other areas where divergences remain and formulations capable of achieving consensus could only be reached through often vague and cautious language use.

### *The Bucharest Ministerial Declaration*

The Declaration is dominated by the subject of “terrorism”. The Council unanimously condemned all acts of terror and declared that terror could never be justified whatever motivation was behind it. In the fight against terrorism, there is no neutrality.

The ministers declared their determination to protect the citizens of their countries from new threats, but at the same time safeguard the rule of law, individual liberties and the right to a fair trial under the rule of law. They also strengthened their determination to combat organized crime, illicit drug and arms trafficking as well as trafficking in human beings, because all these phenomena weaken security as well as the economic and social structures of states.

Further they welcomed the review of OSCE structures, which, under the Romanian Chairmanship, was undertaken with the goal of increasing the efficiency of the Organization, and they established a working group on OSCE reform that was to report to the next Ministerial Council.

In addition, the Ministerial Council expressed its concern over the persistence of conflicts in various regions that endanger the observance of OSCE principles there and may at the same time threaten peace and stability in the entire OSCE region. In conclusion, it emphasized the OSCE's important role in early warning, conflict prevention, crisis management and post-conflict rehabilitation.

### *The Decisions*

The Decisions following the Ministerial Declaration cover: 1. combating terrorism (including a Plan of Action); 2. further statements by the Ministerial Council; 3. fostering the role of the OSCE as a forum for political dialogue; 4. enhancing the effectiveness of the Human Dimension Meetings; 5. measures against aggressive nationalism, racism, chauvinism, xenophobia, anti-Semitism and violent extremism; 6. trafficking in human beings; 7. equal opportunities for Roma and Sinti; 8. combating violence against women; 9. police-related activities; 10. location and date of the next meeting of the Ministerial Council (Porto, December 2002); 11. OSCE Chairmanship 2003 (Netherlands); 12. conclusion of the negotiations under Article V of Annex 1-B of the Dayton Accords; as well as 13. the reappointment of Ambassador Ján Kubiš as OSCE Secretary General for another three years.

The majority of these Decisions are short and have formal character. This does not mean, however, that the issues behind them have no political relevance. In some of the Decisions, this is a sign that various differences of opinion were cleared up on time. This is the case for Decisions 10, 11 and 13 as well as Decision No. 12, which is essentially limited to an acknowledgement of the conclusion of the negotiations.

In other Decisions, however, this is an indication that problems could not be solved and that therefore the corresponding issues will continue to receive attention from the Ministerial Council. This is true of Decisions 4, 5 and 8 that essentially task the Permanent Council with continuing to deal with these issues as well as, in a similar manner, Decisions 5, 6 and 7 which task the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) in Warsaw with continuing to deal with the issues addressed.

In contrast, Decisions 1, 2, 3 and 9 have been drafted in more detail and will be examined more closely in the following.

### *Combating Terrorism*

Decision No. 1 is devoted to the main topic of the meeting, combating terrorism. The participating States “resolutely condemn the barbaric acts of terrorism that were committed against the United States on 11 September 2001”, which they describe as “an attack on the whole of the international community, and on people of every faith and culture”. “These heinous deeds, as well as other terrorist acts in all forms and manifestations, committed no matter when, where or by whom, are a threat to international and regional peace, security and stability.” The participating States make the commitment not to yield to terrorist threats but to combat them by all means. “This will require a long and sustained effort, but they take strength from their broad coalition, reaching from Vancouver to Vladivostok.”

In this Decision, the participating States commit themselves to “bilateral and multilateral co-operation within the OSCE, with the United Nations and with other international and regional organizations, in order to combat terrorism in all its forms and manifestations, wherever and by whomever committed”. In addition, they pledge themselves to become parties to all twelve United Nations conventions and protocols related to terrorism as soon as possible. Moreover, they express their expectation that the Bishkek International Conference on Enhancing Security and Stability in Central Asia, to be held on 13 and 14 December 2001, can render a substantial contribution to global anti-terrorism efforts and promise the Central Asian partners their support in countering external threats related to terrorism. Finally, the Ministerial Council adopted the Bucharest Plan of Action for Combating Terrorism.

#### *The Bucharest Plan of Action for Combating Terrorism*

The OSCE’s contribution to the worldwide fight against terrorism is based on its special characteristics, its strengths and its comparative advantages:

- its comprehensive security concept linking the politico-military, human and economic dimensions,
- its broad membership,
- its experience in the field and
- its expertise in early warning, conflict prevention, crisis management, post-conflict rehabilitation and building democratic institutions.

In addition, many counter-terrorism measures fall into areas in which the OSCE is already active and proficient such as police training and monitoring, legislative and judicial reform as well as border monitoring.

The *goal of the Action Plan (Chapter I)* is to “establish a framework for comprehensive OSCE action to be taken by participating States and the Organization as a whole to combat terrorism, fully respecting international law,

including the international law of human rights". With this, states are at the same time warned not to misuse the necessary fight against terrorism as a pretext to suppress human rights. The Plan seeks to

- expand existing activities that contribute to combating terrorism,
- facilitate interaction between states, and,
- where appropriate, identify new instruments for action.

*Chapter II* defines the framework of *international legal obligations and political commitments* which is based on the corresponding United Nations conventions and United Nations Security Council resolutions as well as the relevant OSCE documents, including the Summit Declarations from Helsinki to Istanbul. The participating States commit themselves to become parties to all twelve United Nations conventions and protocols relating to terrorism by 31 December 2002, if possible, and to participate constructively in the negotiations at the United Nations on a Comprehensive Convention against International Terrorism and an International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism, with a view to their early and successful conclusion. The ODIHR is, on request by participating States, to offer assistance and advice on the ratification of international instruments, in close co-operation with other organizations.

The participating States agreed to use the Forum for Security Co-operation (FSC) to strengthen their efforts in combating terrorism through the implementation of all relevant measures agreed by the OSCE, in particular the Code of Conduct on Politico-Military Aspects of Security, which contains the commitment to exchange information on measures to combat terrorism, and the Document on Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALW). The Security Dialogue might serve as a suitable basis for regular consultations within the FSC. The follow-up conference on the Code of Conduct and the SALW workshop, both of which were to take place in 2002, could further enhance the application of these documents in combating terrorism.

*Chapter III* deals with *preventive action against terrorism in the OSCE area*. Although no circumstance or cause can justify acts of terrorism, at the same time, there are various social, economic, political and other factors, including violent separatism and extremism, which engender conditions in which terrorist organizations are able to recruit and win support. The OSCE's comprehensive approach to security provides comparative advantages in combating terrorism insofar as these factors are addressed by all relevant OSCE instruments:

- *Institution building, strengthening the rule of law and state authorities* whereby the ODIHR can contribute through its assistance in building democratic institutions and strengthening administrative capacity, local

- and central government and parliamentary structures, the judiciary, ombudsman institutions etc.;
- *Promoting human rights, tolerance and a multi-culturalism* whereby the participating States, the Permanent Council, ODIHR, the High Commissioner on National Minorities and the Representative on Freedom of the Media are to promote tolerance, co-existence and harmonious relations between ethnic, religious, linguistic and other groups and to provide early warning of and appropriate responses to violence, intolerance, extremism and discrimination against these groups and, “at the same time, promote their respect for the rule of law, democratic values and individual freedoms”. This also includes the development of projects by the Representative on Freedom of the Media aimed at supporting tolerance through the use of the media as well as promoting measures aimed at preventing and fighting aggressive nationalism, racism, chauvinism, xenophobia and anti-Semitism in the media;
  - *Addressing negative socio-economic factors* that undermine security, such as poor governance, corruption, illegal economic activity, high unemployment, widespread poverty and large disparities, demographic factors and unsustainable use of natural resources. The OSCE participating States and the Secretariat will seek to counter these factors with the assistance of the Office of the Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities;
  - *Preventing violent conflict and promoting peaceful settlement of disputes* through more intensive early warning and appropriate response whereby the OSCE is to strengthen its ability to settle conflicts and, in co-operation with the United Nations, the European Union and other international organizations, will increase efforts to find solutions to unresolved conflicts and simultaneously devote itself to the promotion of the rule of law and crime prevention in such conflict zones. Furthermore, the OSCE is to make efforts to develop its rapid deployment capability in crisis situations;
  - *Strengthening national anti-terrorism legislation*, in particular, by implementing all the obligations the participating States have assumed under relevant conventions and protocols as well as the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime. ODIHR, on request by interested participating States, is to offer technical assistance/advice on the implementation of international anti-terrorism conventions and protocols as well as on the compliance of this legislation with international standards and to facilitate contacts between national experts to promote exchange of information and best practices on counter-terrorism legislation;
  - *Supporting law enforcement and fighting organized crime*. In view of the close connection between terrorism and transnational organized crime, illicit trafficking in drugs, money laundering and illicit arms trafficking,

the participating States committed themselves to taking the necessary steps to prevent in their territory illegal activities of persons, groups or organizations that instigate, finance, organize, facilitate or engage in perpetration of acts of terrorism or other illegal activities directed at the violent overthrow of the political regime of another participating State. The participating States agreed to afford one another assistance in providing information in connection with criminal investigations or criminal extradition proceedings relating to terrorist acts. The OSCE Secretariat is to assist the participating States, on their request, *inter alia* through measures to combat trafficking in human beings, drugs as well as small arms and light weapons, and will undertake efforts to assist in facilitating increased border monitoring, where appropriate, and reinforce its existing police-related activities in conflict prevention, crisis management and post-conflict rehabilitation;

- *Suppressing the financing of terrorism.* The participating States committed themselves to taking measures, within the framework of the United Nations Convention on the Suppression of Financing of Terrorism and United Nations Security Council Resolution 1373 (2001), *inter alia*, to criminalize the wilful provision or collection of funds for terrorist purposes, and freeze terrorist assets as well as providing early response to requests for information by another participating State and relevant international organizations in accordance with their domestic legislation and obligations under international law. Moreover, ways of combating economic factors which may facilitate the emergence of terrorism, economic consequences of terrorism as well as financial support for terrorists are to be examined. The participating States agreed to consider targeted projects for the training of the personnel of domestic financial institutions, *inter alia* on monitoring financial flows and the prevention of money laundering. They also announced that they would participate constructively in the forthcoming negotiations at the United Nations on a global instrument against corruption, with a view to their early and successful conclusion;
- *Preventing movement of terrorists* whereby the participating States will prevent the movement of terrorist individuals or groups through effective border controls and controls on issuance of identity papers and travel documents, as well as through measures for ensuring the security of identity papers and travel documents and preventing their counterfeiting, forgery and fraudulent use. Through the proper application of the exclusion clauses contained in the 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees and its 1967 Protocol, they will ensure that asylum is not granted to persons who have participated in terrorist acts. The participating States will “provide for the timely detention and prosecution or extradition of persons charged with terrorist acts, in accordance with their obligations under international and national law”.

*Chapter IV* deals with *action under the Platform for Co-operative Security and co-operation with other organizations*. Here, firstly, the leading role of the United Nations in the global fight against terrorism is reconfirmed. The OSCE could, however, take on a co-ordinating role for inter- and intra-regional initiatives.

The participating States thus intend to strengthen co-operation and information exchanges with other relevant groups, organizations and institutions involved in combating terrorism. They pledge to strengthen co-operation with the European Union on analysis and early warning and reinforce synergy with the Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe and the Central European Initiative in areas relevant to combating terrorism. Within the OSCE area, the participating States want to promote the dialogue on issues related to new threats and challenges as well as broaden the “dialogue with partners outside the OSCE area, such as the Mediterranean Partners for Co-operation and Partners for Co-operation in Asia, the Shanghai Co-operation Organization, the Conference on Interaction and Confidence-Building Measures in Asia<sup>1</sup>, the Organization of the Islamic Conference, the Arab League, the African Union, and those States bordering on the OSCE area to exchange best practices and lessons learned in counter-terrorism efforts for application within the OSCE area”.

*Chapter V* offers a view on *follow-up measures*, including the “Bishkek International Conference on Enhancing Security and Stability in Central Asia: Strengthening Comprehensive Efforts to Counter Terrorism”, which then took place in December 2001 in Bishkek (Kyrgyzstan) and, on the one hand, was an opportunity to discuss concrete experiences and best practices among a broad range of participants on the basis of the Action Plan and, on the other, due to the specific security challenges to which this region is exposed, apply relevant provisions of the Action Plan for practical support to participating States in Central Asia, including financial and technical assistance.

Each OSCE body was to prepare a “road map” according to the tasks assigned to it in the Plan of Action for the implementation of these, including a timetable, resource implications and indication of activities requiring further Permanent Council Decisions. On the basis of this information, the Secretariat will prepare an indicative assessment of the administrative and financial implications of the Plan of Action, including the possible need for establishing an anti-terrorism unit or focal point within the Secretariat.<sup>2</sup>

The Permanent Council, acting *inter alia* through the Chairman-in-Office and assisted by the Secretariat, is to continually monitor the implementation of the Action Plan and identify sources which could be used to assist in imple-

---

1 This Conference was established by Kazakhstan at the beginning of the 1990s as a counterpart to the then CSCE and now has similar procedural character.

2 The term “unit” does not indicate a unit designed to intervene, but an administrative “unit”.

menting counter-terrorism measures, including expert teams, and possible additional tasking by the Permanent Council of OSCE field presences.

### *Regional Security Policy Issues*

Decision No. 2 is devoted to regional security policy issues; the *first section* deals with security in South-eastern Europe.

The Ministerial Council welcomed the conclusion of the Framework Agreement on 13 August 2001 in *Macedonia* and the corresponding constitutional amendments on 16 November 2001 and declared its willingness to assist in the implementation of the Framework Agreement and in particular of Annex C, including the programmes on police training and reform, media and inter-ethnic relations. The Ministerial Council reaffirmed that only peaceful political solutions can assure a stable and democratic future for the country and the continuation of the reform processes, which will facilitate the development of closer and more integrated relations with the Euro-Atlantic community of nations, further enhance multiethnic democracy and promote peaceful and harmonious relations among its citizens.

With a view to *Yugoslavia*, the Council declared its readiness to support the development of full democracy and expressed its satisfaction with the progress that has been made in Southern Serbia, in particular on multi-ethnic (i.e. primarily mixed Serbian-Albanian) police training. It also declared its support for “a democratic Montenegro within a democratic Yugoslavia” and thus expressed the preference of the international community for cohesion of the two republics.

With respect to *Kosovo*, the ministers welcomed the elections held on 17 November 2001 as “the beginning of the phase of democratic provisional self-government in accordance with the constitutional framework” and called upon “those elected and all ethnic communities to participate in full responsibility in this process”. With this wording the Ministerial Council expressed, on the one hand, the at least declarative preference for the continuation of the constitutional status of Kosovo as a part of Yugoslavia and, on the other, its disapproval of the stance of those groups and parties who are boycotting the elected Parliament.

On *Bosnia and Herzegovina*, the Council declared its explicit support for the democratically elected authorities at the state and entity level (i.e. Croat-Muslim Federation and the Republika Srpska) and called on them to make further progress, in particular with regard to strengthening state institutions, the return of refugees and displaced persons and the creation of a single economic space whereby the Council also expressed criticism that there were still shortcomings in these areas. Furthermore, the Council declared the OSCE’s willingness to assume the tasks of the United Nations International Police Task Force (UNIPTF). However, this offer was later overtaken by



events when the EU undertook to establish its Police Mission which would become operational in 2003.

With regard to *Albania*, the ministers first commended the parliamentary elections of 2001. Furthermore, they called on the authorities to implement the recommendations contained in the ODIHR final report on the elections as well as on the political opposition to participate fully in the political process. Here too, the latter expresses criticism of those parties who boycotted the parliamentary decision-making process.

With regard to *Croatia*, the Council welcomed progress made up to then in implementing democratic and economic reforms and offered further support through the OSCE Mission to Croatia, but also expressed expectations that additional steps be taken “in Croatia as well as in other countries of the region” to facilitate sustainable solutions to the plight of refugees and internally displaced persons, including the full exercise of their rights to return home and to repossess their properties “throughout the region”. With this wording, the Council implicitly conveys its criticism that administrative obstacles remain, which impede the return of Serb refugees, but also at the same time, addresses the fact that there are still similar shortcomings in other states of the region as well.

Regarding *arms control*, the Council commended the OSCE’s continued work in assisting in the implementation of Articles II and IV of Annex 1-B of the Dayton Accords<sup>3</sup> and welcomed the conclusion of the negotiations under Article V. Furthermore, it reiterated its commitment to addressing the problem of small arms and light weapons, in particular, through the OSCE Document on Small Arms and Light Weapons and welcomed the activities undertaken by the states in the region in this regard.

The *second section* is devoted to the Republic of Moldova. The Ministerial Council noted the efforts on all sides towards a comprehensive settlement of the Transdniestrian issue, but at the same time, reaffirmed that in the resolution of this problem the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Republic of Moldova must be ensured, and with this reinforced its disapproval of concepts for the independence of the Transdniestrian region. It called upon both sides, and particularly the Transdniestrian authorities, to resume promptly and in the existing format the negotiations on the status of the Transdniestrian region. With this emphasis on the Transdniestrian authorities, the Council also clearly expressed its criticism of their refusal to participate in the negotiations.

Furthermore, the Council welcomed the fulfilment by the Russian Federation, ahead of the agreed time (end of 2001), of the commitments undertaken at the OSCE Istanbul Summit in 1999 on withdrawal and disposal (that is primarily the destruction) of the CFE Treaty-Limited Equipment located in the Trans-

---

3 Cf. Heinz Vetschera, The Role of the OSCE in the Military Stabilization of Bosnia and Herzegovina, in: Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg/IFSH (Ed.), OSCE-Yearbook 1998, Baden-Baden 1999, pp. 305-325.

dniestrian region. This relates to the holdings of heavy weapons that had belonged to the 14th Army previously deployed there. They had remained in the country and represented a point of contention. The Council also noted the progress achieved in beginning withdrawal of the Russian military equipment not limited by the CFE Treaty, i.e. essentially small arms and light weapons covered by the corresponding OSCE document. Finally, the Council thanked those states who had contributed to the voluntary fund to assist the Russian Federation to fulfil its 1999 OSCE Istanbul Summit commitments to remove or destroy weapons and ammunition in a timely manner.

The *third section* is devoted to Georgia. The Council expressed its “firm commitment to support the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Georgia”, thus excluding any claims to secession. It welcomed the developments in the peace process in the Tskhinvali region/South Ossetia, in particular the measures taken by the OSCE Chairman-in-Office, the OSCE Mission to Georgia, the European Commission, and the Russian Federation *inter alia* to reduce the quantities of small arms and light weapons in this region and expressed hopes for further progress in 2002, particularly on defining the political status of the Tskhinvali region/South Ossetia within the Georgian state. The latter formulation also signifies a clear refusal of secessionist tendencies.

With regard to the situation in Abkhazia, the Ministerial Council emphasized the leading role of the United Nations there thus again reconfirming the division of labour between the United Nations and the OSCE in Georgia which exists anyway. It called on the two parties to reach a comprehensive settlement, which would also define the political status of Abkhazia as a sovereign entity within the state of Georgia. This shows evidence of a clear differentiation regarding the status strived for in both regions as the term “sovereign” is not used in connection with South Ossetia.

The ministers acknowledged the significant contribution made by the OSCE Border Monitoring Operation “along the border between Georgia and the Chechen Republic of the Russian Federation” and directed the Permanent Council to examine proposals to extend border monitoring to “the Georgian border with the Ingush Republic of the Russian Federation”. Shortly thereafter, the Permanent Council adopted a corresponding Decision.<sup>4</sup>

Furthermore, the Ministerial Council welcomed, on the one hand, the progress towards meeting the commitments made in Istanbul by the Russian Federation on the future of its forces in Georgia and described the closure of the military base at Vaziani and the withdrawal of the equipment from the base at Gudauta as important steps forward. However, it also called for an early transfer of the infrastructure of the former Russian military base at Gudauta as well as an early agreement on the duration and modalities of the functioning of the remaining Russian military facilities whereby it implicitly

---

4 OSCE, Permanent Council, Decision No. 450, Geographical Expansion of the Border Monitoring Operation of the OSCE Mission to Georgia, PC.DEC/450, 13 December 2001.

expressed its criticism that up to now the implementation of this undertaking has been slow-paced.

Finally, it welcomed the aspiration to good-neighbourly relations between Russia and Georgia, above all, the establishment of a joint commission to investigate the reported cases of bombardments in the border areas, which had led to considerable tensions.

In the *fourth section*, on the one hand, the ministers noted with appreciation the progress that the five Central Asian participating States achieved in the ten years that have passed since their accession to the OSCE. They also noted that the support of the OSCE for social, economic and democratic reforms would contribute to stability and prosperity in the region. The latter formulation again expresses some implicit criticism of the still existing shortcomings in these areas.

Furthermore, the Council emphasizes the special threats to stability and security these states are confronted with emanating from international terrorism, violent extremism, and organized crime. Although these threats affect the stability and security of all OSCE States, they are particularly important for the states bordering Afghanistan. It thus strongly reaffirmed its sustained commitment in support of these states towards further building of modern societies as well as the "creation of a secure, stable and prosperous environment in the region".

In the *fifth section*, the participating States express their concern that efforts have failed to achieve a settlement of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict for the time being despite the intensified dialogue between the parties and the active support of the Minsk Group Co-Chairs, established in 1994 within the OSCE as a framework for negotiations to solve the conflict. The Council called on the parties to continue the peace dialogue and to achieve an early resolution of the conflict based on the norms and principles of international law thus expressing clear shortcomings in the current process. It further encouraged the parties to explore additional measures that would enhance mutual confidence and trust, including the release of Prisoners of War (POWs). This demand explicitly refers to the fact that some of these prisoners are still being detained a decade after the end of the hostilities in violation of international conventions.

#### *The OSCE as Forum for Political Dialogue*<sup>5</sup>

Decision No. 3 is devoted to the role of the OSCE as a forum for political dialogue. In this Decision, the Ministerial Council is primarily concerned with the role of OSCE bodies, in particular, the role of the

- the Permanent Council as the principal body for political consultations and decision-making of the OSCE as well as

---

5 On this see the article by Victor-Yves Ghebali in this volume, pp. 329-336.

- the Forum for Security Co-operation (FSC) as the OSCE body of the politico-military dimension for reviewing the implementation of OSCE commitments in the fields of arms control and confidence- and security-building, and for negotiating measures in the fields of arms control as well as confidence- and security-building.

In relation to this, the FSC is also tasked with addressing those aspects of new security challenges that fall within its mandate and updating its activities accordingly. The FSC will - while retaining its present autonomy and decision-making capacity - be more closely connected with overall OSCE work and, to this end, will make available its expert advice on issues of a politico-military nature, at the request of the Permanent Council. This may include, as necessary, advice on politico-military issues of OSCE field operations. The FSC may also advise the Permanent Council or the Chairman-in-Office on its own initiative. This statement seems rather redundant with regard to the Permanent Council as the same delegations are represented in both bodies, however it does extend the FSC's role with respect to the Chairmanship.

#### *Police-Related Activities*

Decision No. 9 continues the course of action already begun at the 1999 Istanbul Summit to strengthen co-operation between and among participating States in police-related activities.

The participating States reaffirm the fact already recognized at the Istanbul Summit that the new challenges to security - international terrorism, violent extremism, organized crime, and drug trafficking as well as the excessive and destabilizing accumulation and uncontrolled spread of small arms and light weapons - demand correspondingly increased co-operation in police-related activities and that effective policing is essential to uphold the rule of law and to defend democratic institutions. They recall the commitments contained in Articles 44 and 45 of the Istanbul Charter for European Security to enhance the OSCE's role in civilian police-related activities as an integral part of the Organization's efforts in conflict prevention, crisis management and post-conflict rehabilitation.

This Decision gives special significance to the role of police training, particularly integrated police training, i.e. joint training for multi-ethnic police services in ethnically mixed areas, as has been promoted and implemented by the OSCE in South-eastern Europe. Another focal point of this Decision is the creation of police services that can enjoy the confidence of the entire population, as well as reinforcing the OSCE's existing role in police-related issues, also through provision of advice and assistance on restructuring and/or reconstruction of police services and through monitoring and training of existing police services, including training regarding human rights and

fundamental freedoms, thus also addressing a continuing problem in many police services.

OSCE assistance in police training is aimed at improving operational and tactical policing capacities, enhancing key policing skills, including respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, and, as appropriate, dealing with the criminal aspects of illegal migration as well as increasing community policing, anti-drug, anti-corruption and anti-terrorist capacities. This too expresses implicit criticism of the existing shortcomings in this area in many places.

At the request of participating States and with their agreement, advice or arranging for the provision of expert advice on requirements for effective policing and an exchange of information among and between two or more participating States regarding lessons learned and best policing practices in countering the new security challenges are to be provided and/or encouraged. In support of the activities mentioned, the OSCE will convene, as appropriate and preferably annually, meetings of police experts from OSCE participating States and representatives of other relevant specialized international and regional organizations and ensure that OSCE activities in police-related issues are conducted in co-ordination with other relevant actors and organizations to compensate for shortcomings and avoid duplication or overlapping of competencies. Finally, the OSCE is to promote its capabilities in designing, conducting and managing effective police training, monitoring and capacity building in police-related areas.

### *Conclusion*

The Bucharest Ministerial Meeting presents a conglomerate of topics contingent on the events. On the one hand, current issues had to be dealt with and solved or at least updated, as was the case in other such meetings. On the other, the terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001 also dominated the agenda of the OSCE Ministerial Meeting and were given the appropriate consideration in the Declaration, the Decisions, and the Plan of Action.

This ambivalence can be comprehended through the language used. While in formulating the Decisions in the area of regional security and police-related activities the Ministerial Council often had to fall back on the set phrases of political compromise, this is hardly the case in the statements on terrorism. Condemnations have been made without any reservations and thus allow the conclusion that all 55 participating States have really come to a strong and lasting consensus on this issue.

This consensus is due to several factors. On the one hand, the attacks had their origins outside of OSCE space and were based on an ideology which all OSCE States consider a threat, namely Islamic fundamentalism. For Islamic

Fundamentalism, the Western states represent just as much of an enemy image as Russia or the OSCE Central Asian participating States.

On the other, the rejection of terrorism is not necessarily based on common values. For Western democracies, violence in politics represents an unacceptable instrument, whatever the motives are. In other participating States, up until a short time ago, violence in politics either belonged to the repertoire of domestic debate or support was given to groups willing to use violence in other countries in the name of "liberation struggles". However, to the extent that the political elites of these states see themselves as being threatened by violent oppositional or secessionist movements, they too have every reason to support a general rejection of terrorism and improved co-operation in combating it. For this very reason, however, it was also necessary to incorporate within the pertinent text the warning that the fight against terrorism must not be misused as a pretext to suppress human rights.

Even the clear and unambiguous language on the topic of "terrorism" should thus not obscure the fact that the OSCE is comprised of a true mix of participants, who with regard to their geographic and strategic situation as well as to their ideas on values and their political development cannot be described as homogeneous with respect to standards agreed in the OSCE. This lack of homogeneity finds expression, as a rule, in the often complicated roundabout wording and set phraseology in the documents in which differing views and attitudes must be reconciled through formal compromises. However, it can even be seen in situations where, after the shock of an event like the attacks on 11 September 2001, all 55 participating States have found a common language.