

Ursel Schlichting

Preface

The adoption of the Istanbul Charter for European Security in November 1999, and the Platform for Co-operative Security contained therein, was a promising step towards enhanced co-operation between the security organizations operating in the Euro-Atlantic and Eurasian area. This year marks its 20th anniversary, which is honoured in this edition of the OSCE Yearbook with an in-depth and multi-faceted contribution by Loïc Simonet. However, the Platform proved unable to fulfil the expectations placed in it to the extent hoped for. As Simonet writes, “the extensive web of partnerships and vibrant relations that the OSCE has set up with various international and regional organizations since its inception has developed independently from the Platform for Co-operative Security. The OSCE’s partner organizations have rarely referred to it, even the EU, whose member states introduced the document and have done much to further its adoption.” The year 2019 has not seen many major OSCE anniversaries and it is not until 2020 that we will celebrate the 45th anniversary of the adoption of the Helsinki Final Act and the 30th anniversary of the adoption of the Charter of Paris – and thus the end of the Cold War.

During our research on the topic of “anniversaries”, however, we came across an innovative idea in an essay by Douglas Wake from 18 January 2019: “Did the Cold War end in Vienna thirty years ago this week?”¹ In his article, Wake refers to the Concluding Document of the third CSCE Follow-up Meeting adopted on 15 January 1989,² which had begun more than two years earlier on 4 November 1986. At the time, the document was considered “a tremendous step forward in European security co-operation” (Wake). For example, in the politico-military sphere, the previous negotiations on confidence- and security-building measures were now structured more clearly. Of particular importance was the launch of separate negotiations on a treaty on conventional armed forces in Europe (CFE) within the CSCE with clear guidelines, for example, for “the scope and areas of application” and for the monitoring of compliance with the provisions of the future treaty through “an effective and strict verification regime which [...] will include on-site inspections as a matter of right and

1 Douglas Wake, *Did the Cold War End in Vienna Thirty Years Ago this Week?* Security and Human Rights Monitor, 18 January 2019, at: <https://www.shrmonitor.org/did-the-cold-war-end-in-vienna-thirty-years-ago-this-week/>.

2 Concluding Document of the Vienna Meeting 1986 of Representatives of the Participating States of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, Held on the Basis of the Provisions of the Final Act Relating to the Follow-Up to the Conference, Vienna 1989 (herein after: Concluding Document), available at: <https://www.osce.org/mc/40881>.

exchanges of information”.³ Even details such as the agenda and work programme of the negotiations, working methods, and financial issues were specified. The CFE Treaty was signed in November 1990 and advanced soon to become a cornerstone of European security.

In the human dimension, the Concluding Document not only created a mechanism that allows a participating State to raise questions relating to the human dimension in another OSCE participating State,⁴ but also contains concrete guidelines for the “agenda, timetable and other organizational modalities” for the meetings on the human dimension, including detailed work programmes for each meeting.⁵ The results of the meetings in Copenhagen (1990) and Moscow (1991) in particular are still regarded as milestones for the protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms. Although Wake notes that the Vienna Concluding Document “may appear in hindsight as a logical step in [the] development of the OSCE *acquis* from the 1975 Helsinki Final Act to the 1990 Charter of Paris” it was clearly a “tremendous step” given the political situation at the point of departure for its negotiation. However, with Mikhail Gorbachev becoming the leader of the Soviet Union in 1985, the mid-80s also became a point of departure for unexpected, rapid, and fundamental political changes in Europe and in international relations – finally, it was indeed the Charter of Paris that ended the Cold War. 2020 will therefore mark a much bigger anniversary in the history of the OSCE.

This year, for the opening chapter of the OSCE Yearbook, “The OSCE and European Security”, OSCE Secretary General Thomas Greminger has authored an article that deals with the questions of how the OSCE contributes to the implementation of the 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) of the United Nations Agenda 2030, and how the Organization can further strengthen its involvement in the global framework set by the Agenda. The need to involve the OSCE is clear: Its many and varied efforts to strengthen security in Europe and prevent conflicts are, according to Greminger, of fundamental importance for inclusive and sustainable development. In his contribution, Heinz Gärtner notes that Europe’s role in world politics is mostly ignored in American academic debates – wrongly, in his view. He argues that Europe has concepts and instruments that have successfully contributed to the management and resolution of conflicts outside the EU area and have lost none of their relevance today, one of these being the 1975 Helsinki Final Act. “Europe’s Goal Should Be Helsinki” is therefore the motto at the heart of his contribution. Vladimir F. Pryakhin takes a look back to the time of the Cold War and draws conclusions for the future: He recalls the Scientific Forum of the CSCE, which took place in February and March 1980 at the Congress Centre in Hamburg. Intended to

3 Concluding Document, Annex III, Chairman’s Statement, Negotiation on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe, pp. 43-53, here: p. 45.

4 Cf. Concluding Document, p. 35-36; cf. also OSCE ODIHR, OSCE Human Dimension Commitments, Vol. 1, Thematic Compilation, 3rd edition, Warsaw 2011, p. xx, pp. 15-16.

5 Cf. Concluding Document, Annex X, Agenda, Timetable and other Organizational Modalities of the Meetings on the Conference on the Human Dimension of the CSCE, pp. 73-80.

promote scientific exchange in the natural sciences, medicine, and the humanities and social sciences across the rifts between East and West, it proved to be a great success despite previous resistance and differences of opinion at the political level. Forty years later, in the face of today's global problems, Pryakhin advocates a revival of the Scientific Forum: In his eyes, such a revival would provide the international academic community with an opportunity to make an objective prognosis for the development of humanity in the 21st century and the challenges to be met.

In the chapter on domestic developments in individual participating States and their multilateral engagement, Ekaterina Dorodnova describes the developments in Armenia since the peaceful transfer of power in Yerevan in April 2018, an event which is widely regarded as an achievement in democracy building. At the same time, however, she asks whether the still fragile democracy in Armenia can guarantee security there, or whether there is a risk that it will lead to instability in a complex domestic, regional and global context. Using the example of former Kazakh President Nursultan Nazarbayev, Thomas Kunze examines how leaders in Central Asia who plan to voluntarily withdraw from active politics can prepare and steer their political succession in such a way that they can avert the greatest danger they face after leaving office. This danger lies not in the loss of power as such, but in the loss of their financial and physical integrity and that of their families. In his contribution, Vadym Vasiutynskyi deals with socio-psychological aspects of the presidential elections in Ukraine from the disintegration of the Soviet Union to the present day – “from a communist ideologist to an actor-comedian”.

Since its outbreak in 2014, the Ukrainian conflict has regularly been the subject of detailed analyses in the OSCE Yearbook. In 2014, the conflict was a focal point, at the heart of which was a contribution by Claus Neukirch on the timely deployment and rapid growth of the Special Monitoring Mission (SMM) – a prompt and strong OSCE response, a success story that unexpectedly catapulted the Organization into the centre of international attention. In 2015, the conflict continued to be a focus of interest, with a contribution by Heidi Tagliavini, Special Representative of the OSCE Chairperson-in-Office from June 2014 until June 2015 in the negotiations between Russia and Ukraine in the framework of the Trilateral Contact Group, which she moderated, making a central contribution. In 2016, Marcel Peško took stock of the OSCE's response to the crisis; in 2017, Walter Kemp looked at the risks and dangers for a civilian mission operating in a war zone; and in 2018, Lukasz Mackiewicz wrote about the human dimension in the SMM. In 2019, we now focus on another interesting aspect of the SMM: Cono Giardullo of the Istituto Affari Internazionali (IAI), Rome, Walter Dorn of the Royal Military College of Canada, and Danielle Stodilka of the Canadian International Council (CIC) describe the innovative technologies used by the SMM, which include state-of-the-art remote camera systems, satellite images, and long-range unmanned

aerial vehicles (UAVs). These technologies are used for night-time observation, to monitor areas inaccessible to regular patrols, and to document the consequences of the conflict for the population and infrastructure.

Günther Baechler, Special Envoy of the OSCE Chairperson-in-Office for the South Caucasus from 2016 to 2019 and Co-Chair of the Geneva International Discussions (GID), gives an insider's perspective on the mediation efforts of the international community in the conflict in Georgia and the conflict over Nagorno-Karabakh. He provides a detailed and stimulating explanation and comparison of both negotiation formats and concludes: "If the numerous actors in the South Caucasus were to focus more on economic integration and infrastructural communication channels than on identity and territorial issues, then the educated youth, who are still leaving the region in large numbers, would have a good future ahead of them." Elia Bescotti deals with the conflicts in Georgia from a different perspective. The focus is not on the pragmatic stabilization and calming of the situation in the conflict areas, among other things in order to make life easier for the population, but rather on fundamental solutions to the tension between Georgia's territorial integrity and the status quo of the de-facto states against the background of Russian security interests.

Few conflict resolution efforts have received the same ongoing coverage in the OSCE Yearbooks as the process of political settlement of the Moldova/Transdnistria conflict. This year, too, one article is devoted to this topic – this time, however, the conflict itself is relegated to the background: The turbulent domestic political developments in Moldova prompted the editorial team to approach one of the most renowned experts on the situation in Moldova, William H. Hill, who headed the OSCE Mission to Moldova for many years. After the parliamentary elections in February 2019 failed to produce a clear result, the pro-Russian Party of Socialists and the pro-Western Alliance ACUM agreed on a coalition government shortly before the deadline for new elections had expired. The ruling Democratic Party (PDM) of oligarch Vladimir Plahotniuc nevertheless tried to stay in power for a week and refused to leave the government buildings. It was only when Russia, the EU and the US agreed to support the new coalition that the PDM gave up and Plahotniuc fled the country and Maia Sandu became the new prime minister. Hill's contribution this year therefore not only deals with "steps forward and stumbles back" in the conflict resolution process, but also includes an analysis of domestic political events. The chapter closes with a detailed contribution by Namig Abbasov on the federal, regional, and local dimensions of conflict in the North Caucasus, in which he explains his thesis, against a detailed historical background, that the conflict in the North Caucasus has not ended, as Putin announced in February 2008, but is merely "frozen".

Until 2019, Anita Danka was Human Rights Adviser in the OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR), whose mandate is largely to collect and analyse information on the implementation of OSCE commitments on human rights and fundamental freedoms in the OSCE region.

To this end, ODIHR carries out targeted monitoring activities, for example with regard to the right to fair trial, the application of the death penalty, the situation of human rights defenders, and the freedom of peaceful assembly. Using the example of monitoring freedom of assembly in OSCE participating States, Danka illustrates the work of ODIHR human rights observers, in this case their independent, impartial, and objective reporting of demonstrations and protests, including documentation of the conduct of both assembly participants and law enforcement officials, which makes a valuable contribution to the protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms in the OSCE participating States.

The assassinations of three journalists – Daphne Caruana Galizia in October 2017, Ján Kuciak in February 2018, and Jamal Khashoggi in October 2018 – are just a few prominent examples of the alarming increase in violence against journalists in recent years, as well as the daily harassment, threats, and intimidations. In his contribution, Representative on Freedom of the Media Harlem Désir pays tribute to the Ministerial Council Decision No. 3/18 on “Safety of Journalists” of 7 December 2018 and calls on participating States to give greater priority to the safety of journalists and to develop legislation to ensure that attacks on journalists are investigated without exception and the perpetrators brought to justice.

In his contribution, Kurt P. Tudyka notes that the OSCE’s involvement in the cultural field of the human dimension has been steadily decreasing over the years and presents a wealth of ideas that could be initiated, supported, or implemented by the OSCE and its institutions, particularly in conflict-prone “hot spots”. His ideas include cultural meetings, and events such as exhibitions, film screenings, concerts, festivals, and opera and theatre performances.

The first formal United Nations Security Council debate on the link between climate change and security was held in April 2007, and the topic found its way onto the OSCE agenda that same year. In the OSCE, climate change is dealt with mainly through projects led by the Office of the Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities (OCEEA) and implemented in co-operation with international partners and OSCE field operations. In her informative and detailed contribution, Esra Buttanri, senior advisor in the OCEEA, discusses the potential security implications of climate change in both global and OSCE contexts, provides an overview of the international debate, and outlines the OSCE’s response to these challenges. In her conclusions, she summarizes possible future actions to address the security implications of climate change, including enhanced multilateral co-operation while combating climate change at the regional level.

In the section on OSCE Institutions and Structures, Lamberto Zannier and Eleonora Lotti present the experience of the OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities (HCNM) in relation to the Ljubljana Guidelines on Integration of Diverse Societies. The Guidelines, which were adopted in 2012, state that it is not enough to simply recognize the culture, identity, and political

interests of minorities. Instead, they recommend that states develop and implement policies to promote the integration and cohesion of ethnically heterogeneous communities. If states do not do this, there is a risk that large communities in particular will become increasingly isolated from one another. Such a development would pose a serious risk to the stability of multiethnic states.⁶ As Zannier/Lotti write: “Classic inter-state conflict has almost disappeared. Instead, we are now witnessing acute crises and hybrid conflicts characterized by internal strife, sometimes in the context of failed or dysfunctional states, or violent separatism, in some cases accompanied by quasi-military operations affecting the civilian population.” Furthermore, it is increasingly difficult to juggle protecting the sovereignty and territorial integrity of states and, at the same time, ensuring the rights of peoples to self-determination, including minorities. Modern conflicts therefore require a shift in the OSCE’s approach to conflict prevention, and the HCNM’s main working method of quiet diplomacy may therefore have to be complemented by new tools. In addition, according to Zannier/Lotti, “there is also a need to forge and strengthen coalitions with other international players, including the United Nations, regional organizations and arrangements [...] as well as with civil society.”

As mentioned above, this year we also have an anniversary to celebrate: On 19 November 1999, in the framework of the Istanbul Summit Meeting, the Heads of State or Government of the OSCE participating States adopted the Platform for Co-operative Security in order to strengthen co-operation between the OSCE and other international organizations concerned with comprehensive security within the OSCE area. Twenty years later, Loïc Simonet asks whether and how the OSCE’s contribution to “effective multilateralism” can be strengthened. The starting point for Simonet’s answer to this question is the assessment that, 20 years after its adoption, the Platform’s record is mixed: Its fundamental objective to support the OSCE’s role in peacekeeping was never translated into operational arrangements; the Platform’s vision of the OSCE as a “key instrument” has proven to be a myth; although international organizations such as the EU, NATO, and the Council of Europe have often agreed to act “with” the OSCE, they have shown reluctance to work “through” the OSCE and to be co-ordinated by it. Simonet then presents and discusses a wealth of ideas and prospects for effective multilateralism going forward.

Last but not least, Anastasiya Bayok deals with a very complex topic that is not (yet) at the centre of discussions in Europe: “Challenges and threat perceptions regarding Central Asia in China and the EU”. She examines the attitudes of China and the EU to Central Asia in terms of interests and threat perceptions in the region. In her conclusions, she states that, on the one hand,

6 Cf. Hans-Joachim Heintze, The Significance of the Thematic Recommendations of the OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities, in: Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg/IFSH (ed.), OSCE Yearbook 2012, Baden-Baden 2013, pp. 249-265, here: pp.264-265.

China and the EU actually share similar threat perceptions with regard to Central Asia, such as terrorism, religious extremism and radicalization, organized crime, and drug trafficking. On the other hand, she concludes that closer cooperation between China and the EU in combating common security threats, working together on conflict prevention, fighting against corruption, and deepening economic co-operation could be beneficial for the region, as well as for relations between China and the EU. For China, the deeper involvement of the EU in Central Asia has advantages, such as the promotion of economic development and the opportunity for jointly combating terrorism and contributing to maintaining regional security and stability. However, it also has disadvantages related to the intensified competition between the great powers in Central Asia, including the strategies of the US, Japan, Turkey, and Russia.

The editors would like to take the opportunity to thank all the authors for their dedicated work and the wealth of vivid presentations, detailed analyses, and interesting ideas.

Our special thanks also go to this year's OSCE Chairperson-in-Office, Slovak Foreign Minister Miroslav Lajčák, who combines his foreword to the OSCE Yearbook with an important concern: his "Bratislava Appeal" for stronger multilateralism and more dialogue. Against the backdrop of rapidly changing global challenges to peace and security that can only be met by working together, the threat to the multilateral order in Europe that he has observed takes on particular significance. The source of this danger, however, is the often hopelessly discordant participating States themselves: "We are unable to find consensus" Lajčák writes in his foreword, and continues: "If we cannot even agree on the basics, from our annual budget to agendas for our events, what chance do we have of realizing the full vision of the Helsinki Final Act?" In his Bratislava Appeal, he therefore calls for "increased flexibility and willingness to compromise in order to broaden and strengthen our interactive dialogue" and to "to focus on finding what unites us rather than divides us."⁷ It is to be hoped that his appeal will also find resonance in everyday political life.

7 OSCE, OSCE Chair Lajčák kicks off 26th Ministerial Council with his "Bratislava Appeal"; calls for increased flexibility and willingness to compromise, Bratislava, 5 December 2019, at: <https://www.osce.org/chairmanship/441173>.