



Working Paper

1 / 2000

On January 6, 2000 the Centre for OSCE Research was founded in Hamburg. In this paper we are publishing the speeches given at the founding ceremony.

Contents:

Symposium: OSCE 2000 - A Civilian Peace Policy for Europe

Krista Sager, Second Mayor of Hamburg and Head of the Ministry of Science and Research	2
Ambassador Dr. Rudolf Schmidt, Head of the Permanent Mission of Germany to the OSCE	4
Envoy Dr. Margit Wästfelt, Representative of the Chairperson-in-Office of the OSCE	9
Ambassador Jan Kubiš, Secretary General of the OSCE	11
Freimut Duve, OSCE Representative on Freedom of the Media	14
Ambassador Oleg Belous, Head of the Permanent Mission of the Russian Federation to the OSCE	17

Speeches on the Occasion of the Founding of the Centre for OSCE Research/CORE

Ortwin Runde, President of the Senate of the Free and Hanseatic City of Hamburg	20
Prof. Dr. Dr. Dieter S. Lutz, Director of the Centre for OSCE Research/Core	25
Dr. Johannes Rau, The President of the Federal Republic of Germany	29

Symposium: OSCE 2000 - A Civilian Peace Policy for Europe

Krista Sager,
Second Mayor of Hamburg and Head of the Ministry of Science and Research

Scientific Research Can Make a Considerably Contribution to Strengthening the OSCE as an Instrument of Conflict Settlement and Conflict Prevention

Dear Ambassadors,
Ladies and Gentlemen,

I welcome you to today's symposium, which is also a part of the inaugural ceremony of the "Centre for OSCE Research" (CORE), here in Hamburg.

Establishing the Centre at the Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy is only logical. During the last five years, the IFSH has focused its work on the OSCE. This is reflected not only in countless OSCE related research projects, but no less in the OSCE yearbook. With these tasks, the Institute has already contributed a great deal to the scholarly discussion on conflict settlement and conflict prevention in the past few years, which attracted a lot of international attention especially in Eastern Europe.

With today's inauguration of the Centre, the intensive academic emphasis associated with OSCE work has been given a new foundation at a time when the OSCE faces new difficult tasks and challenges.

The study and the analyses of OSCE experiences and its vast range of activities will not least benefit the OSCE itself. Research can contribute considerably to strengthening the OSCE as an instrument of conflict settlement and conflict prevention. Whether one studies structures, means, and methods or examines the relationships of the OSCE with other organizations and institutions, or prepares its staff for difficult tasks - the work at CORE will be of great political significance, in the areas of policy making as well as making political recommendations.

We have long since known - and not only because of the violent escalation in the Balkans - that the instruments and means for conflict settlement and conflict prevention are clearly lacking. However, the obvious conflict of interests and political differences within the international community of States is just half of the story. Even after having overcome block confrontation, European States have not been completely successful in focusing their ideas and actions on the new security policy landscape. On the contrary: all too often, thought and action remain tied not only to a time before the end of block confrontation, but rather to 19th century modes of thought.

In the past there seemed to be no suitable instruments available to settle conflicts which were not caused by disputes between States, but which arose with the breakdown of law and order within a State or a federation. Conflicts between different ethnic groups, national majorities and minorities, coupled with the extremes of brutal racism and nationalism, could no longer be solved.

The difficult tasks of OSCE missions go much further than ending and preventing wars. Peace, stability and security require more than the absence of war. Therefore, it is particularly important to refine the supranational tools of prevention. And the Centre for OSCE Research can contribute considerably to this field through parallel research.

The ultimate goal of the city of Hamburg is to make a contribution to conflict settlement through scientific research before they become the subject of war reporters. For this undertaking, the IFSH, with its involvement in the regional, national and international dialogue networks, is an ideal starting point.

Hamburg is an open-minded cosmopolitan city and has always pursued an international agenda rather than limiting itself to national interests. This is precisely the reason why the city of Hamburg is unmatched as a location for the Centre for OSCE Research/CORE.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I thank you for your support of this project and wish the centre a great deal of success and I am looking forward to the fruits of this conference.

Ambassador Dr. Rudolf Schmidt,
Head of the Permanent Mission of Germany to the OSCE

Conflict Prevention: Possibilities for and Limitations of the OSCE

I

Our understanding of conflicts is too often associated with the use of violence. Conflicts – especially domestic conflicts - normally begin long before the actual outbreak of violence. In preventing as well as in settling conflicts we have a number of non-violent methods and instruments at our disposal. And we must make clear that these methods are to be preferred to the use of violence in all cases, and that violence should be considered as the last resort, when all other non-violent attempts fail. We actually require, as the UN-General Secretary Kofi Annan and Federal Minister Fischer declared, a culture of conflict prevention. The G8-Foreign Ministers conference in Berlin on the 12th and the 13th of December 1999 was dedicated to this topic, however, it was also overshadowed by a conflict where a peaceful settlement has not been possible: Chechnya.

In the OSCE a culture of conflict prevention is already evolving. It needs nurturing as well as support by the public. It must be made clear that every German Mark, every EURO, every dollar that is spent for conflict prevention, every diplomat, every official, every expert who is involved in this prevention process, can contribute to prevent suffering, human misery and the damage which is caused by the violent settlement of conflicts.

II

More than anything else, the conflicts in the former Yugoslavia have left the deep impression on many of us that they had to result in violence and that the use of violence was inevitable in order to end these conflicts. These discussions will most likely continue for a long time to come.

Two lessons can be learned from these conflicts:

1.a) It is important to examine the history of conflicts to determine exactly which instruments should be applied by the community of States and in which phase.

1.b) Domestic conflicts have complex causes that we should pay closer attention to. In many cases - not only in the former Yugoslavia - it is either a case of many peoples living together within a State, or one or several minorities who are forced to live with the majority in the State. This is by no means easy and becomes dangerous quickly if the precarious balance of

rules and regulations is disturbed. The constitution of the SFRY was an attempt to balance Serbia's predominance in a federal system and gave Kosovo and Vojvodina an autonomous status inside Serbia. The elimination of this autonomy destroyed the precarious balance previously achieved and raised a rebellion within Slovenia and Croatia against Serbian ascendancy. Had it been possible to restore the old order or cautiously adapt it to the situation, the terrible fighting which makes it even more difficult for the people of the former Yugoslavia to live together now could have been avoided. The UN and the OSCE, who are co-operating in Kosovo within the framework of UNMIK have to face these difficulties now.

2) At this point please allow me to mention a few cases in which the OSCE has helped restore and preserve the delicate social balance of relations between different groups of people and within the State itself.

First, there is Macedonia, a State in which 25% of the population are ethnic Albanian. Since 1992, the OSCE has been present there with a long-term mission with the apt name "Spillover Monitor Mission". Along with this, the High Commissioner of the OSCE on National Minorities, Max van der Stoep, has been involved in consolidating the position of the Albanian population. Especially in Macedonia, it has been proven that a democratic system with free elections and multiple parties is flexible enough to make possible the integration of different groups of people. Macedonia was able to survive the mass influx of the Albanians from Kosovo, which greatly increased its Albanian population, however the tension between the Albanians and Slavs has increased.

In the Baltic States of Latvia and Estonia, the issue is the integration of the Russian population, who migrated to these regions during the Soviet period and now want to remain there. In Latvia 40% of the population is of Russian origin. The situation here is especially delicate as the Latvians have not forgotten that it was due to the Hitler-Stalin Pact that their independence was violently taken away from them, and that their language and culture were suppressed during the Soviet period. On the other hand one must understand that a large number of these Russians were born and brought up in these countries and naturally want to remain there. The Russian government is also helping them to do this.

Since 1993 the OSCE has missions in Estonia and Latvia. There too, the High Commissioner on National Minorities has been involved. In both these countries it was with great difficulties that the important steps were taken to integrate the Russian population. Both these countries have taken into account the recommendations of the High Commissioner in their legislation, especially in the areas of citizenship and the language question. The conflict potential has been defused due to these measures, too.

3) Another example of a timely intervention in a conflict of another kind was in Albania. In the spring of 1997 the so called 'pyramid system' broke down. Hundreds of thousands of investors lost all their savings. Unrest, similar to a civil war, broke out. In some parts of the country chaos ruled for weeks. In this case, too, early warnings had been given. International financial institutes had already pointed towards these dangers. Late but not too late the OSCE got involved in the situation, first though, they were forced to cope with the delays and resistance of the Albanian government. The OSCE Chairmanship - at that time Denmark - appointed the former Austrian Federal Chancellor Vranitsky as the Personal Representative in this situation. He succeeded in stabilizing and bringing the situation under control without instruments of power but through persuasion, reasoning, mediation and international assistance. The OSCE organized new elections, which went on relatively smoothly. Since 1997, the OSCE has had a permanent mission in this country.

III

On what grounds can the OSCE become involved in the internal problem of a member country?

The OSCE has a more legitimate reason to do so than other organizations. The Charter for European Security in Istanbul states: "Participating States are accountable to their citizens and responsible to each other for their implementation of their OSCE commitments." Therefore, participating States cannot resort to claiming the OSCE is interfering in their domestic affairs. Since 1975 the CSCE, predecessor of the OSCE, had worked out principles and obligations, which were accepted by all the participating States and which, therefore, were also binding. The new States, which emerged after the breakdown of the former Yugoslavia, have explicitly accepted these principles and obligations and at present all the 55 member States are bound by them.

An impressive catalogue of principles regulating the internal conditions and structures of States are included in the Copenhagen Document of 29 June 1990 (Document on the human dimension of the CSCE in Copenhagen of 29 June 1990). This document represents the spirit of the breakthrough period: the governments of almost all European States were ready to begin reforms in the direction of democracy and rule of law. The document did not just contain a declaration of belief in these principles, but extremely concrete guidelines for their implementation. A few examples:

- guidelines for free and fair elections, which ought to be conducted at regular intervals;
- the obligation of governments and public authorities to act constitutionally and in accordance with the law;
- effective appeals against administrative decisions;
- the independence of judges;
- a clear distinction between the State and political parties;
- Subordination of the army and police forces under civilian authorities.

The guidelines specify that minority problems can only be solved satisfactorily within a democratic and political framework, which in turn must be in accordance with the rule of law as well as a functionally independent judiciary. The regulations for minorities were further developed in a report compiled by experts in July 1991.

Especially after the experiences during the negotiations on the Charter for European Security, we must voluntarily admit, that we have not really been able to go beyond the norms set up to this point; unfortunately not even in the protection of minorities. In the coming years, the OSCE must make sure that, especially in cases of potential conflict, the rules agreed upon already are actually adhered to. Depending upon the success of this, the States would themselves be in a position to gradually settle their own internal tensions and conflicts in a democratic and legal way.

This is not easy, but particularly the European Union has a significant and powerful influence along with a high degree of responsibility. The States which have approached the EU, who in the middle or long term, are seeking membership within the coming years, are ready to fulfil all the conditions in effect - and these coincide politically with OSCE commitments. This is an effective lever, which can be used for a greater number of countries after the decision of the Helsinki meeting on EU-expansion.

Germany, in its function as the EU President in April 1999, launched the Stability Pact especially for South-eastern Europe. The aim of this pact is to clear the path towards the EU

for the countries in South-eastern Europe. For this purpose, the new instrument of the stability agreement between these countries and the EU was created. Even the FRY will be free to join this pact, as soon as they are able to get out of the cul-de-sac they were led down by Milošević. The Stability Pact is a comprehensive approach towards conflict prevention. The question now is - whether it would be possible to set up something like this pact in other regions before violence breaks out.

IV

Although most of the conflicts in which the OSCE is involved have domestic origins, the danger of conflicts between two States has not disappeared completely. In order to reduce or check this danger, the concepts of arms control and confidence- and security-building measures were developed. Even in this case we, at the OSCE, did the most that was possible at the time. The adaptation of the CSCE-Treaty was one of the most important tasks achieved in Istanbul. In the case of the adaptation of the Vienna Document, we have not been as successful as we hoped. At present there is hardly any willingness to go beyond the 1994 document and to agree upon transparency and confidence building measures. The desire to opt for quick military action stands in the way of achieving this goal.

In the last few years significant progress has been made in the area of regional arms control, especially through the agreements according to Article II and Article IV of the enclosure 1a of the Dayton-Agreement. This clause includes confidence building measures and - based on the CSE model - sets an upper-limit for certain conventional weapons. Thanks to this agreement, 6,580 weapon systems have been reduced, out of which 6,455 have been destroyed. Another, not to be underestimated side-effect of this agreement and its implementation is that the participants, especially the officials in high ranking positions, have again become accustomed to working together and co-operating with each other. On 8th March 1999 the negotiations began for creating of a regional equilibrium in and around the former Yugoslavia according to Article V of the appendix of the Dayton-Agreement. The significance of such an agreement is clear, especially if cross-links with the CSE-agreement can be made.

V

In Istanbul the Heads of State and the government leaders of the OSCE participating States reinforced their will to prevent the outbreak of violent conflicts wherever possible. There is no comprehensive plan to achieve this, nor is it possible to create one. One must strive for progress step-by-step. I see three fields in which this can be done:

a) The community of States must not wait for violence to break out before they react; nor should it be pictures of refugees, wounded and dead people appearing on TV screens to draw their attention to a violent situation. Timely intervention must be aimed at, so that use of violence is not required. This is not only the responsibility of a few experts in the Foreign Ministry or exclusively the domain of politicians. Public support is also required; financial and personnel aid is necessary to defuse a conflict. It is not easy to get this support. No one can actually promise that a certain measure - e.g. mandating an OSCE mission would surely prevent the outbreak of violence. Nor can one prove that anyone of these measures would actually be successful in preventing an outbreak of violence. It is not the absence of a catastrophe which makes news or which wins the attention of the world media at large.

I just mentioned a few cases in which the OSCE, in my opinion, contributed to the prevention of conflicts. Central Asia is one such region with conflict potential and the OSCE must do a

lot more in this area in the coming years. These Central Asian countries won their independence and came into existence with their independent boundaries in 1991 and 1992, which were earlier a part of the Soviet Union. Now they are going through the difficult phase of democratic reform, in which the OSCE is supporting them. Some of them have a strong Islamic opposition. All of these countries are in the process of building their national identity. The close cross-border cooperation, which was taken for granted during the Soviet period, is no longer in existence. Border regimes are much tighter today and considered important by many of these Central Asian States, to prevent invasion by radical Islamic groups as well as to stop drug-trafficking. At our initiative, the former Secretary General of the OSCE, His Excellency Ambassador Höynck, was appointed the Personal Representative of the Chairmanship for Central Asia at the beginning of last year. He put forth suggestions for the promotion of regional co-operation through the OSCE. This must be now developed further. Economic incentives would definitely encourage the Central Asian countries to co-operate. The EU Council's TRACECA program is a start in this direction.

b) The decisions taken by the OSCE have been restricted up to now by the consensus principle. The OSCE Chairman-in-Office can hardly take any measures without the prior consensus of the participating States. In 1994 the former Federal Foreign Minister Kinkel along with the former Dutch Foreign Minister Kooijmans had already suggested limiting the consensus principle slightly. But these suggestions were heeded at that time. In the meantime some participating States, especially the Russian Federation, insisted on even stricter adherence to the consensus principle. In spite of this, in Istanbul the OSCE Chairmanship and the western countries were able to urge the Russian Federation to acknowledge, that the OSCE would participate in finding a political solution to the Chechnya problem and could also assist in opening dialogue with the Chechen side.

c) The question whether the OSCE is capable of moving their personnel into a crisis situation with more speed than they have up to now, can be answered by citing the recent case of the Kosovo Verification Mission - the OSCE is clearly not up to the job of carrying out this task in its present form. The creation of an Operation Centre, which has now been agreed upon, is a considerable improvement. Furthermore, in future the OSCE must also be in a position to send civilian expert teams (Rapid Expert Assistance and Cooperation Teams, REACT) at the initial phases of a mission.

Thus, the personnel of the participating States should be made operational not only for the aforementioned, but also for long-term OSCE missions. The Foreign Ministry started its own training program for German personnel last year.

VI

In "Foreign Affairs" an article with the title "Give war a chance" appeared a few months ago. The theory of the author was that there are conflicts which can be settled only through violence. In such cases one must allow war to take its course in the hope that finally there will be a lasting solution to the conflict.

It could well be that such cases exist. If they do, the OSCE must steer clear of them. But in most cases, especially in the case of domestic conflicts, a peaceful solution would save a lot of human misery; and above all it would prevent mistrust and hatred, which often stem from violent and bloody conflicts and which make living together even more difficult than before. Therefore let us first give conflict prevention a chance!

Envoy Dr. Margit Wästfelt,
Representative of the Chairperson-in-Office of the OSCE

The Honourable Mayor, Ladies and Gentlemen,

I begin by mentioning that in holding the new OSCE Chair, it is indeed an honour and a pleasure for us to see the OSCE research institute (CORE) come into being in the very first year of our Chairmanship. We have even considered scientific research important in our own work and plan to hold a seminar as a part of the Chair's optional programs, which should also reinforce our connection to research.

The civilian peace policy for Europe characterizes Austrian guidelines for the Chair quite well. The Austrian Chair, the work program and our main focus have been influenced to a large extent by actual circumstances, and at the same time by the Istanbul resolutions. This means finding solutions and implementing them in a conflict situation as well as conflict prevention. This is a very different program from the one we implemented in our EU Presidency which we held a year ago. In any case the OSCE Chair is the next big foreign-policy challenge, for us as well as in Austria.

In the last few years, the OSCE has evolved from being just a political dialogue-forum to a field organization, active in problem areas and conflict regions and therefore an important operative instrument for conflict prevention, crisis management and post-crisis management. The Chairman-in-Office has important initiative powers and an effective controlling function, especially in cases of crises. Otherwise the effective functioning of this organization, which is actually based on the consensus principle, would not be possible.

I would like to classify the most important tasks, which await us during our tenure, in the following manner: First there are regional challenges and points of main focus, then there is the strengthening of the OSCE, especially in the area of civilian crisis intervention, furthermore there is the human security dimension, which has a special meaning for us especially in connection with other dimensions and last but not least, we must not overlook the great events which have occurred - the ministerial meeting and the celebration of 25 years of the Helsinki Accord.

We give conflict prevention high priority at the OSCE. In our dual role as the OSCE Chair and as a member of the European Union, we will concentrate on combining democracy, human rights, minority rights and economic reform. This should lead to an optimisation of the resources which help to create stable relations in new democracies. Hence, "democratisation plus economic reforms is equal to stability".

Let's take a short geographical tour. The Balkans is our first stop because of its close geographical proximity as well as its historical links. Also Kosovo is of utmost importance where conducting fair and free elections is the greatest and first task we must fulfil. An especially difficult process is the registration of the population and the date of the elections must be carefully selected, so that the elections are not held too early. Our goal is the reinforcement of multi-ethnic elements in institutions. The police school has already made progress towards this. And public broadcasting and media have been strengthened. Under the Austrian Chairmanship the re-integration of the Yugoslavian Republic in the OSCE would

also be a possible issue to consider. The prerequisite would naturally be a change in government and free and fair elections.

Bosnia and Herzegovina: We support the concept of the High Representative Petric, namely, in delegating responsibility to the Bosnians themselves, so-called 'local ownership'. The municipal council elections in April 2000 as well as the parliamentary elections in autumn will be conducted with the assistance of the OSCE. Another OSCE task will be to push ahead the confidence-building process, militarily. Under the Austrian Chair we will also strive to consolidate state institutions in the security area.

Croatia: The parliamentary elections were observed closely by the OSCE. We expect that the return of refugees will be made easier under the new circumstances. And their reintegration will be one of the important tasks of the mission now. Other important tasks await us in Montenegro, in Macedonia, where the stabilization of the ethnic balance is an important but tricky topic. This is also true for Albania, where the OSCE has already achieved some success in the past.

A few words on the Stability Pact for South-Eastern Europe. The Austrian Chair will support the OSCE in its efforts to effect constructive contributions, especially in the areas of democracy and human rights as well as for comprehensive security. After all the Stability Pact has been placed under the auspice of the OSCE.

Particularly because of the Kosovo conflict the Balkans have superimposed their own conflicts and problems on other EU regions. But in the Caucasus and in Central Asia, the OSCE has the comparative advantage of being an organization with a wide geographical range as well as a comprehensive security concept. In the Istanbul Summit Declaration the OSCE was assigned a special role in Chechnya, which we intend to fulfil as extensively as possible. An Austrian diplomat will be head of the acting OSCE Assistance Group in Moscow. In Nagorno-Karabakh there are positive movements towards a solution to the Azerbaijan-Armenian conflict. A series of talks have been held between both Heads of State through direct meetings. In the coming year, the OSCE could play a significant role in developing and implementing a peace-agreement, possibly also playing a role in setting up and maintaining a peacekeeping operation.

Central Asia: The OSCE is the only institutional connection that Central Asia has with Europe. The OSCE must counteract the destabilizing factors on its periphery. We must secure the stability in this region, otherwise there might be far-reaching negative consequences for the core of Europe. We must also keep in mind the various problems that these countries face and find hard to deal with - drug trafficking, arms-trade, terrorism, etc.

Therefore, within the framework of the OSCE, we want to develop the most extensive security approach possible, which would encourage the democratisation process in these countries by finding joint solutions to their economic and ecological problems, e.g. the water issue.

Finally - Moldova, where there are also guidelines stipulated in the Istanbul Declaration. These include the withdrawal and retreat of Russian troops by 2002 and the destruction of weapons and ammunitions depots. We will push ahead for a solution to these problems. Last but not least: Belarus, where we hope that the democratisation process will progress to such an extent by the end of this year, that the country could once again be better integrated within the European framework.

Now as to strengthening the OSCE, especially in the area of civilian crisis intervention. Here we are talking about the implementation of the REACT concept. This is an improvement in OSCE intervention capabilities in the case of a crisis, through the creation of a civilian stand-by capacity. This means police troops, election-observers, and other experts.

Because of its many field operations, it would be desirable to legalise the OSCE further, comparable to the status of other international organizations. Austria will make a new attempt to achieve this.

As to the human security dimension, which should and will be one of our main areas of focus: We will concentrate more heavily on the human security dimension, including e.g. children's rights and small weapons, and links with and between the human and the political-military dimension.

And finally I would like to mention a most important event, namely the silver jubilee of the Helsinki Accord, which we want to celebrate with a ceremony in Vienna where we will invite actors in the OSCE process to attend. And to conclude there will be a meeting of the Ministerial Council on the 27th and the 28th of November in Vienna, which will give a synopsis of OSCE progress and a forecast of the next Chair.

Ambassador Jan Kubiš,
Secretary General of the OSCE

Madam Mayor, Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is an excellent opportunity for all of us to start this new year with such a prominent OSCE focus, at least for those who are participating here in a string of very important events starting with the presentation of the Yearbook and then going through the symposium and the founding act of this centre, which I believe is a very important development, which should in a way create a good ground for our future cooperation as well.

I was asked to take the floor and speak about what the OSCE prospective might be in the year 2000. Of course, here I will follow on what was said by the previous speakers and specifically by the representative of the Austrian Chairmanship. To start I would like to focus your attention on what the OSCE means, and what it is about. Speaking about the OSCE today in comparison with what the OSCE was some time ago is the best way to do it. Here just some figures: in comparison with 1994, the budget of this organization has increased almost tenfold. The number of international mission members has increased almost twenty times. Before some time around 1994 we had approximately eight field operations and around forty to fifty international staff members, mission members. Now we have around 1100 international mission members in the field and around 2700 national staff. Before quite a substantial part of our OSCE budget was for our general operations, for the general fund. Today our field operations, that means missions and large-scale missions, consume 86% of our budget. From this one can draw a very clear conclusion: We are more and more a field-oriented organization, and not only a norm-setting organisation, not only a guardian of the implementation of the OSCE commitment. And here I would like to refer to Ambassador Schmidt's question: the legitimacy of this organization to act. This is basically one of the factors shaping a sort of future of the organization, that we are a legitimate organization, to look into how our participating States implement their commitments and that they are

accountable both to us but - first and foremost - to their citizens. Together with our focus on democratisation and transformation of the societies, in my opinion this creates a good basis for our conflict prevention capability.

Regarding our priorities in the year 2000 we heard about some of the most important areas, and I can just complement what was said here from the point of view of the Secretary General of the Secretariat. Therefore I will start with the strengthening of operational capacities and capabilities of the organization including the Secretariat. This is in my opinion among the most prominent features and the most prominent focus of our activities this year. The REACT program was mentioned, this rapid deployment capability which will shape the future of the organization in many instances. I would like to stress one thing: Sometimes it is not very clear - at least for those who are outside of the organization proper: This is very much a nationally-owned exercise, this is a capability which should and will be developed and supported by the OSCE participating States. It is they who should keep its roster of candidates and experts in a sort of stand-by mode (I would like to avoid this becoming a stand-by force) for rapid deployment. We as the Secretariat and OSCE structures will support the program, will manage it, but it is for the participating States to maintain the adequate number of experts, this must be well understood. It will be a heavy burden, financially, from the point of view of human resources, and organizationally.

Another focus of our activities will be to create an operation centre, basically for the first time, to create a centre responsible for better comprehensive and focussed planning of our operations, overall operations to support the Chairmanship. We have been engaged in planning even before, but on case by case. This time we are getting a clear request from the Istanbul Summit: Create an Operation Centre with true responsibility for planning and then deployment of our field operations. This is a major new development.

In all of this there is one field which I would like to highlight: It is the development of our civilian police capability. As you know in two of our operations we are already focussing on civilian police: This in Croatia and in Kosovo. Nevertheless this is the first time we got a very clear order from our participating States to create a capability for rapid deployment of civilian police expertise under the REACT program. This is very important and is the way to focus our activities with the Chairmanship this year. The only way to develop all these capabilities is to do it with other main key partners in the field and first and foremost with the European Union. I know that we are a comprehensive organization, that we have a good number of participating States, the majority not members of the European Union. Yet taking into account the development of the European Union and taking into account specifically the foreseen development of the new non-military crisis response mechanism, I believe, it would be unacceptable to develop our own non-military, civilian rapid deployment capability without cooperating as closely as possible in this process specifically with the European Union, and definitely with other partners, with some other international organizations.

Another major field of our activities for this year are tasks related to the management of the organization, predominantly our field operations. Management, that is how we with the Chairmanship will manage our field operations and how we can provide better support for the Chairmanship and the participating States. It will be one of our major tasks not only to recognize what the patterns of cooperation are and what the possibilities are to provide support for the Chairman, but also to establish them for the future, so we are not in the same situation every year, with every new Chairmanship being obliged to develop our modalities of cooperation almost from the scratch, only to have to go through this exercise the following year with the next Chairmanship.

Among the rather important fields is the study focussed on the question of the legal capacity of the OSCE. This is again a commitment, this is an instruction from the Istanbul Summit and

the Chairmanship will go ahead with the study. My personal opinion is that it is a timely initiative, it is timely instruction, and probably we need some development towards achieving this legal capacity. What will be the eventual result is very difficult to predict now.

Specific areas of our attention have already been mentioned: many field activities, many missions, the so-called frozen conflicts, Moldova, Georgia. A regional approach will be rather visible, I assume, under the Austrian Chairmanship in the year 2000, focussed on Central Asia, on the Caucasus and especially on South-Eastern Europe, without neglecting other operations. I would like to say that we as the organization will be rather heavily involved this year in what is going to happen in Belarus. We would like to see free and fair elections in the country, we would like to see developments which might assist all of us, including mainly the Belarusians, to overcome the constitutional crisis existing in the country.

But there are also some other fields of activities or focuses: Training and capacity-building is one of the fields which we will try to develop more profoundly in the organization. It is connected with the REACT program but not exclusively, it is generally a personal management approach in policy. It is something which deserves of more profound development.

Press and public information work: The question of public visibility is very important, and even more so when in the future all of us acting in the field of international relations will address the same constituency to get support, to get funds. So we must be visible, we must be seen and we must be acknowledged especially when we do something which is acceptable. We will be supported, but also criticized, if necessary, but concretely in a very pointed way, not in general, if we are not doing the job properly. Then we will be able to say why we are not doing the job properly.

Among the focuses of our attention might be questions connected with religion, culture and conflict prevention. This field has been tackled by the previous Norwegian Chairmanship which has organized seminars and round tables. I believe they were right in selecting these two topics: religion and culture, and conflict prevention. In my opinion these are the fields to develop further: struggle against terrorism, drug control, and activities to counter weapons proliferation, anti-corruption measures. I believe these are fields which will be at the forefront of our activities. And I would like just to say - because I believe it is necessary to say this, to give a complex picture of our activities - that all OSCE institutions will develop their activities in their respective fields. I am not going to talk about ODIHR or the High Commissioner on National Minorities, and Mr. Duve is here to highlight the activities of his institution.

To finish: Among the key fields of our activity will be the development of modalities of our interaction with different other key players, mainly international organizations and non-governmental organizations active in the field, our main partners in the field. I mentioned the European Union and the European Commission, I can mention NATO, the Council of Europe and the UN family, particularly such organizations as UNHCR, UNDP or programs. We will try to develop our cooperation in the whole spectrum of activities, including the deployment and development of certain programs that we would like to implement in our field operations. We will also develop further the cooperation with our partner countries, with the Mediterranean partners for cooperation. All of them are showing much more interest in our organization, but what they are telling us is to be more focussed and be more concrete - not in words but deeds, be more concrete in activities. And we will try to get over the Austrian Chairmanship to develop more concrete activities and cooperation with our partners, and I believe it is worth doing.

One of the interesting signals is that also other countries, mainly Asian countries, are approaching us now and asking "what does it mean to be an OSCE partner for cooperation? We would like to become one". So we might see a certain development, we feel that there is a movement, there is thinking going on, at least in Asia and probably also in the Mediterranean area. I am very much looking forward to what is happening under the Barcelona process at the EU. And we must look at what will be done under the Barcelona process and how we would like to cooperate there.

Finally, and coming back to my remarks at the beginning: We must try to develop further our cooperation with research institutions, with academic fields, with NGOs acting in this field and centres like the one which is going to be founded formally very soon. And again I know that our Austrian colleagues are very much interested in this field, and they will also further this kind of activities and cooperation. So it is a very timely and very welcome opportunity for all of us to be here.

Freimut Duve,
OSCE Representative on Freedom of the Media

Ladies and gentlemen,

It is a great pleasure to be given the opportunity to speak in my home town where I was involved in political processes for so long.

The OSCE has a special strength, previously mentioned, which offers me a great deal of support in my own position. This is that all States are in accord on OSCE institutions, including my office. There are four OSCE institutions which have a right to the surveillance and scrutiny of information and events, guaranteed by the participating States. This goes much further than the offices of comparable institutions like the OAS in Latin America. Recently the UN Representative of the Media and myself, the OSCE Representative of the Media had a meeting. He was not able to report any comparable rights of surveillance of any of the events occurring in UN States. Of all the organisations whose structures are less global than the UN, the OSCE can ensure its rights to the greatest extent through the formal joint signature of resolutions. In my experience, compared with other organisations, the OSCE is the most widely accepted despite all the limitations that one encounters.

One of its weak points has already been mentioned, i.e. the consensus principle. The General Secretary and my office as Media Representative are products of this principle. The disadvantage is that it is very difficult to get 54 or 53 States to agree on a word, a paragraph, an entire paper or even to a person under this principle. Any State can say no. However, merely 50 yes-votes aren't enough and that's a problem. Nevertheless when a consensus is achieved a certain strength is also achieved, at least for offices like my own. I would like to mention a State, which I have seriously aggravated: Belarus. This is also true of its foreign minister, the last one was easier to handle. The beginning of the discussions always proceed as follows: "You were the one who voted for me and you even signed my mandate." Then based on this mandate we start talking to one another about one thing or the other and I express my criticism of certain things. As far as I know this is not the case in any other international organization less global than the UN, much less the UN itself. One could say the UN is a family of States and the OSCE is a family of democracies. Albeit an incomplete one. We could go through a list of the individual States, but that is not my intention here. Nevertheless, the chances of becoming a family of democracies is on the whole relatively

higher in the OSCE than it is in comparable regional organisations, e.g. those in South East Asia.

There is one OSCE characteristic which is a weakness as well as a strength: The OSCE is strikingly diplomatic. I have a spontaneous tendency not to be very diplomatic and consequently I run into problems. However it makes a lot of sense to acquire a language including the gamut of diplomatic caution. On the other hand, certain discussions which are laden with hidden meanings are detrimental, for example those that hide the fact that there is currently a very dramatic, military conflict occurring in Chechnya. The events there are significant for everyone and even dramatic for the OSCE. This is a horrendous occurrence which has taken place now for the second time. This means we cannot afford to be too diplomatic. I am saying this because my friend the Russian Ambassador is sitting next to me and we have known one another for two years now. We must speak our minds in a direct manner and yet remain conscious of the diplomatic dimension. If this is done simply to maintain a public image it is senseless. This means that contrary to statements made in NGOs, in governmental organisations, or in the role of a scientific researcher, one has to decide ahead of time what one is going to address as well as express in public. I will clarify this with an example later.

When I appear in post-socialist countries, and basically these include Russia, Belarus, and the Ukraine, where I have worked most recently, I usually begin my lecture with the statement that if there had been a free press in the Soviet Union, Chernobyl would not have occurred. This is true because in fact information on the scandalous danger of atomic reactors has been available and scientists have made an effort to publicise this. I can only emphasize this for the chemistry industry because already in 1978, I received a manuscript in which there were dramatic warnings on the environmental dangers of the chemical industry to Lake Baikal. We published this information here but that had no effect in the Soviet Union. That is, in addition to being one of the human rights to freedom, to which all States subscribe, freedom of speech also has a functional aspect for the modern economy and modern large-scale investment, which is absolutely indispensable. In point of fact, this was the main reason my office, which everyone approved, was established. It is an institution for freedom of the media that works on two levels. The first is on the level of freedom for journalists, single journalists who can turn to us for assistance. This includes the critical surveillance of processes and events. I can confirm that in the short period of its existence – one cannot measure success here – however we have had enough experience with OSCE Missions in the field to be able to see that it's a good thing that my office was created. I'd like to give you an example: I felt compelled to condemn openly and very sharply the denunciation of journalists in Slovakia by the Meciar Regime, in an appearance in Bratislava as well as elsewhere. Of course there are those in the OSCE in other functions who have said, and with good reason, "You've spoken a bit too loudly on that topic!" My answer to that is, "Fine that's your opinion but that's the way I do things." And in fact the open statements made by the OSCE have played a major role in this Central European country as could be seen after the elections and the change in government. Even in Croatia, I would say that we made a small contribution to a change in voting and voter behaviour. Croatia has very good and positive chances of success.

How do we do our work? We maintain firmly that in principle our partner is the State, the government that created our position and voted me into office. However in every country we have at least three additional partners; the journalists and the press, the parliament, and the non-governmental organizations. These are the groups that deal with my topic, freedom of the media and also with human rights, in a special manner. Thus none of my employees nor I can go into a country and speak exclusively with the government. We always meet with the other

three parties as well and this is a necessity in my area at any rate. I am also very happy the OSCE Missions, who are naturally our most important partners, have given us exceptional support in the field. And this in missions that have huge problems to solve. Sometimes a State will say: "We don't need a Mission any longer, what's going on here, we need a re-christening." Everyone knows what I'm talking about. The Missions have co-operated with my institution in an exceptional manner and have given me assistance in making other contacts as well as allowing me to be open about my opinions. Let me give you an example of one very undiplomatic intervention I was involved in. As you know, our organization has a certain strength but also a certain weakness, we are transatlantic and transural. These two "trans" are a real challenge for the OSCE and this is especially true for the question of freedom of the media. Washington also plays a large role in this arena. And freedom of the media is perceived differently in Central Asia than it is in Vienna or in Hamburg. Anyway, together with two of my own employees and one member of the local mission in this particular country, namely Uzbekistan, on my first visit, I literally tore open the door, I mean physically, to the office where a reporter had told me that around 10 or 15 censors did their work. This was just after their boss had told me at a dinner party that censure had been abolished since 1992. In any case, then you have to take the next step, which not many people should be informed about and say: "This is the building where they all sit and checkmark your texts line-for-line, day-after-day until they're distributed around 4:30 P.M. (that's why I was at their door around 4:30)". No one can publish even one page in this country before the censors have check marked a text, line-for-line. I was able to witness this and as a former reporter, I realized this was a unique procedure, a really unique procedure. We then informed the "Permanent Council" about this affair and I must say that the State Uzbekistan was a rather vexed about the matter. Nevertheless, they did not react negatively. We were able to start discussions on freedom of the media with them and this in a State where that topic is an immense challenge. I don't want to say that I've been completely successful yet, but this affair, which I had immediately placed before the Permanent Council for discussion during the following weeks, got things moving. We have to pick our topics, we have to get the ball rolling and freedom of the media fits the bill. Sticking to traditional diplomacy is not going get us anywhere.

Unfortunately, I can't go into the issues of all the individual countries. In the coming year we will work further with countries, which we have had special dealings with before. Some of these I've mentioned already. Of course the Ukraine has played a special role during the past year because they are and must continue moving closer and closer to Europe and a membership in the EU. This is another reason why it's good that the EU, the Commission has an interest in what the OSCE Representative on Freedom of the Media has to say. There is something I would like to make clear and have made clear to countries that would like to approach Europe. Don't get the idea that we have stopped paying attention and that you can simply get into the EU without any changes in the media and that freedom of the media doesn't matter anymore. This consensus, along with those in Brussels who think about these questions, is very positive, especially in the journalistic circles of the States affected. They don't want something to be established behind their backs that is then chalked up as a minus to democracy. We will be concentrating on the very difficult situation of regional and provincial media. We often have a relatively positive image of metropolitan areas because we have contacts there. Again the example of the Ukraine: The two examples, which I introduced at the first event we held there, one from the Crimea and another from another region made clear the tremendous and also physical dangers even leading to life-and-death situations which the critical reporter or newspaper could be exposed to in those regions. This is particularly true in places where no international reporters manage to get in. This is associated with the question of whether a reporter can enter a country and is allowed to survey the

terrain, a particular issue for Moscow. Even now during the Chechnya war, I got relatively strong support from the Russians and other governments when we heard that 8 reporters had disappeared for a couple of days. We were able to determine relatively quickly where the reporters were and help them get out of that situation. Even today the third Helsinki basket plays a role in the task I've been assigned.

Ambassador Oleg Belous,

Head of the Permanent Mission of the Russian Federation to the OSCE

Ladies and Gentlemen,

allow me at the outset to sincerely thank the Board of the Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg for this kind invitation and for its valuable initiative to create the Centre for OSCE Research. I would like also to extend my gratitude to the Senate of Hamburg and the Citizens of Hamburg for their hospitality and I would like to wish you all a very happy and prosperous New Year. Don't be surprised about these wishes, because they go along with the Russian tradition of starting the general count-down for the New Year after Russian-Orthodox Christmas, which will be celebrated in Russia on the 7th of January – that means tomorrow.

It is very difficult for me to speak after my distinguished colleagues who gave you a very detailed picture of the activities of the OSCE, especially of the OSCE field operations. Thus I will try to present some more general considerations about the OSCE.

Once one of my colleagues in Vienna asked, what is the difference between the OSCE and the other organizations acting in the Euro-Atlantic area? Every day the OSCE must prove that it is a useful organization and Europe needs this Organization. Well, other organizations exist, act, work and they don't need to prove that. I think there is some logic here because the OSCE is a very young Organization – it is only five years old. So the question is, can we prove that it is a meaningful Organization?

Some of us present here participated in the Istanbul Summit. It was a very difficult Summit, which is understandable, because we had a very troublesome year all over Europe from all points of view, the political most of all. Nevertheless, we did manage to overcome all these difficult circumstances and made a significant step forward in strengthening the OSCE's role as an inclusive pan-European organization entrusted with ensuring peace and stability in this region. We have preserved the recognized basis of international relations in Europe founded on the principles of the UN Charter, the Helsinki Final Act and norms of international law. Thus, the Heads of State and Government signed the Charter for European Security which along with the adapted Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe turned out to be the main guidelines for Europe entering the new century. In other words, we proceed in Russia from the fact that the adopted Charter has become to an extent the code of an all-European conduct which can give responses to modern risks and challenges to European security and set up solid foundations for the peaceful and harmonious coexistence of States.

I was asked to speak about the Russian Federation's expectations of the OSCE. I think they were well formulated in the Helsinki 92 Document: to foster and manage changes in Europe. And with the adoption of the Charter in Istanbul we strongly believe that the OSCE should provide a proper framework in which approaches and directions for all-European cooperation in security and confidence-building could be elaborated upon and improved. In fact the OSCE

with its broad membership and comprehensive concept of security embodies the mainstream of European development. With the adoption of the Charter the OSCE has proved its capacity to set norms of behaviour of States, to give impulses to the shaping of the new Europe free of divisions and to play an integrating role in deciding on major issues of security and cooperation in the European area. A primary task - perhaps even a key one - of OSCE, i.e. early-warning, crisis management and post-conflict rehabilitation, has already been explored in detail by Ambassador Schmidt. To avoid repetition I will prompt to speak on the dimensions of OSCE activities.

We have all known, that since the inception of the OSCE as a regional organization according to Chapter VIII of the UN Charter, we have witnessed a significant increase in the OSCE practices in all the dimensions of security - political, military, economic and human. The OSCE has greatly contributed to refining the standards and norms of the human dimension, which is an essential element of the concept of overall European security. The special tools and institutions like the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights, the High Commissioner on National Minorities and the Representative on Freedom of the Media have become very efficient in supporting international efforts to protect human rights including those of national minorities, fundamental freedoms and the rule of law. We expect that the Charter for European Security will further enhance the OSCE's ability to appropriately address problems in the human dimension and to find adequate responses to them to benefit the security and stability in the region. Clearly one should not exaggerate the importance of human dimension since politico-military and economic "baskets" are of equal significance as the integral component of the OSCE's security concept and require immense attention.

Our expectations in Russia also include advancing comprehensive security dialogue, in particular on a broad range of politico-military issues as well as promoting the economic dimension. In Istanbul we created new instruments for the enhancement of political dialogue. We think that the OSCE can and should make decisive steps towards strengthening arms control regimes as well as promoting equal and mutually beneficial economic cooperation in Europe. The OSCE is now well equipped with conceptual and practical tools to foster its cooperation with other international organizations. A new culture of such cooperation and interaction should emerge through the Platform for Cooperative Security which was also endorsed in Istanbul and initiated by the European Union.

The Secretary General touched upon the issue of strengthening the OSCE. We think that this is one of the fundamental tasks for this Organization and the problem remains a preoccupation on the Russian side. We believe that for the OSCE a range of rules, procedures and precise definition of competences of all its bodies and institutions is required as well as an arrangement to provide this Organization with legal capacity. This will not necessarily be to the detriment of the OSCE's flexibility to manage crises and conflict situations. On the contrary, it will meet the interest of maintaining the predictability and consistency of actions according to collectively adopted decisions. I think the discussion today at this table between the two German representatives on the consensus rule was very useful. In certain cases it is very difficult to reach a consensus, but, as Mr. Duve pointed out, once consensus has been achieved, it is the commitment and the obligation of all who supported that decision. This is the strongest advantage of consensus. In order to make consensus work, we need to develop a culture of consensus-building. This formulation of consensus-building is not only applicable within the OSCE: There is another organization whose Secretary General stated: "My main task is the consensus-building between sixteen States".

This year we will be celebrating the 25th anniversary of the Helsinki Final Act, which represents a benchmark in the modern history of Europe. This document remains and must be held a cornerstone for international relations and a foundation of peace and security in all-European region. And we hope that we will commemorate this event under the able Chairmanship of Austria in Vienna.

To conclude I would say that Germany is one of the key players in the OSCE, and the advent of the Centre for OSCE Research could not only contribute to promoting the role of the country within the Organization, but also to providing more public awareness of the OSCE and its activities.

Speeches on the Occasion of the Founding of the Centre for OSCE Research/CORE on 6th January 2000 at the City Hall of the Free and Hanseatic City of Hamburg

Mayor Ortwin Runde,

President of the Senate of the Free and Hanseatic City of Hamburg

The "Memory" of the OSCE as a New Building Block of Peace Research

Dear Mr. President, dear Mrs. President of the State
Parliament of Hamburg, Your Excellencies, Prof. Lutz,
Ladies and Gentlemen,

I welcome you all at this founding of the Centre for OSCE Research/CORE at the Institute of Peace Research and Security Policy in this banquet hall of the City Hall of Hamburg. Especially I welcome you Mr. President. By participating in this inaugural function you have continued the great tradition:

Because it was your predecessor in office, and if I may add, your political example, Mr. Gustav Heinemann, who stimulated the founding of the German Society for Peace and Conflict Research 30 years ago and with that carved the path for research into conflict prevention in Germany. He was the one who made possible an official acknowledgement and public support for this project.

In an address in December 1972, Gustav Heinemann introduced this relatively young and occasionally critically perceived discipline with the following words:

"Should we and the world simply ignore the most important need of the day only out of fear? Should we cling on to the ways of violence also out of fear? Don't good sense and the will to live on demand that we have the courage to search for new ways?"

The search for new ways in the area of peace and conflict research, the most important stocktaking of practical security policy, like the analysis of its alternatives, have belonged to the lasting tasks of the Hamburg Institute of Peace Research and Security Policy for nearly the last three decades.

The financing of this work has not always been easy. The old federal government has already bidden goodbye to the institutional support of the peace and conflict research in 1983.

I am greatly pleased that the budget committee of the 'Bundestag' have set the long overdue turning point in November and the Federal Ministry of Education and Research have announced a donation of 50 Million Marks for the formation of a "German Foundation of Peace Research".

Last but not least, the changing world political conditions have also left their traces in the activity field of the Hamburg Institute: "the focus of the activities of the OSCE" and today's expansion of this research area to the "Centre for OSCE Research" prove the constant readiness of the institute to adapt to the continuously changing requirements of the international security policy, not only scholarly, but also to accompany them in an anticipatory and work oriented manner.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

"The world is becoming smaller" - one hears this statement often.

The boundaries of nation-states are becoming permeable; in the fields of politics and economy, ecology, culture and technology, mutual dependencies are becoming greater. Common welfare and prosperity of all the national societies are getting more and more closely linked with the global development.

The progress and the problems of the whole world are becoming the progress and problems of one world. The need for peaceful and united cooperation between the people and the nations is greater than ever today.

In Hamburg this is not a new thought, rather it is a thought that has been being practiced since long. Because here we have been cultivating our links for a number of centuries - "in the spirit of peace" and "as mediator between all the continents and the peoples of the world" - as is stated in the preamble to our constitution.

Hamburg is proud today to possess the reputation of being a metropolis with a high standard of living, an urban and a cosmopolitan city. Not only the 96 Consulates, but also the 3,500 international companies, countless commercial centres and cultural outfits from all countries show the international character of the city.

And we are proud of the work of the Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy.

The Institute could not have been better situated in any other place of the country than Hamburg.

Hamburg is the meeting point of nations: Hamburg hoists the flag in the world. The international character of Hanseatic City, its geographic situation and its function as the hub of the North and the South, the West and the East, are some of the "location factors", which are of great significance for the institute.

Also the scientific angle: the University, the libraries, the documentation centres and last but not least, the training academy of the German Armed Forces, all complement the work of the Hamburg Institute.

With its foundation in 1971 we ventured into a completely new, practically oriented approach. Wolf Graf von Baudissin, the first Director of this institute, who was responsible for remarkable and pioneer work in this field, outlined the tasks of the institute in the following words:

"The aim of the research is not the removal of all conflicts - that would be illusory - rather to objectify them, which would also mean humanizing them at the same time, and above all the settlement of conflicts with a minimal use of violence. For this aim we have to draft models, strategies, structures and procedures."

In 1984 Egon Bahr could take over a research project of international significance, was able to develop research reports and successfully focus on different concepts, like the concept of "common security".

Continuity and change also characterize the successful work of the institute since 1994, and now also under your direction, Prof. Lutz.

The current focus of the research is in the following fields:

1. Arms control in Europe and worldwide.
2. The transition processes in the States of Central and Eastern Europe
3. Developing cooperative strategies for conflict prevention, and
4. Developing structures for a pan-European security order. A part of this work is also linked with the critical analyses of the many activities of the OSCE.

With these four points the main fields of activities of the Institute is covered; but the high quality of research deserves a special mention. The qualifications and the dedication of its staff especially characterize the institute.

I am pleased about these welcome opportunities, and would like to extend my warmest thanks for all your dedication, for your part in the research as well as the implementation of your results in politics, media and educational areas.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

According to the English historian Eric J. Hobsbawm, the past century was characterized by "an era of extremities"; on the one hand by breathtaking scientific-technological progress, which brought an unparalleled material enrichment in most parts of the world, but on the other hand also by monstrous horrifying wars, famines and genocide.

In the last 100 years, more than 200 million people - men, women and children - were killed in these catastrophes, which were brought on by human beings themselves. This was one tenth of the world's total population in the year 1900.

The hopeful wish that after the end of the Cold War and the fall of the wall and the barbed wire, a peaceful world order would be established, remains only a dream till now. Even worse: War and expulsion have come back to Europe in the 90s.

In place of the threat due to the ideological division of the world in two blocks, today we have new security risks and reasons for uncertainties and violent conflicts: the collapse of the State

structures and ethnic conflicts, hunger and poverty, environmental pollution and unbearable social conditions or the severe violation of Human and Minority Rights.

The world of the 21st century can solve great tasks only by balancing national interests, i.e. only through institutional coexistence. Cooperation and the broadly based coalitions are not only the right political answers to economic globalisation, they are also the proper concepts for Human Rights and democratisation, effective conflict prevention and safeguarding peace as well as a righteous and sustainable development.

When we talk about the building and developing of multilateral structures, there are no other alternatives to supporting them in German foreign and security policy, considering the German history and the geographical situation of Germany in the heart of Europe.

The strengthening of the United Nation, the completion of the European Integration and the consolidation of the regional organizations in the international arena are, therefore, the primary aims.

Especially the potential of the OSCE, which is the only regional security organization that comprises all of the Northern Hemisphere, from Vancouver to Vladivostok, must be used for the pan-European security in the future as well.

The OSCE and its predecessor, the Conference for Security and Cooperation in Europe, can look back at a remarkable list of successes. The breathtaking change in Europe was not a result of a few courageous hours; it was also not an isolated sudden historical moment. It was the result of reconciliation over decades.

The CSCE was undoubtedly an important instrument to overcome the East-West conflict. In it each moral and political consensus was articulated, which has become the fundament of reason for the political shaping of our continent.

The Final Act of Helsinki, the Charter of Paris and other documents of the OSCE, which are acknowledged as the regional security system after chapter VIII of the UN-Charter, belong to the most important basis of the coexistence of the States and the people in new Europe today.

One must keep in mind OSCE's helpful intervention in achieving a peaceful solution between Estonia and Latvia, on the one hand, and the Russian minorities on the other. Or the long-term missions in Moldavia or the complicated but important, indispensable commitments and efforts of the OSCE in the Baltic region.

In spite of the failures and the setbacks, the success of the OSCE must not be under-estimated.

Peace research, a paradox realization of the recent past, always becomes the centre of public interest when it seems to be denied. The OSCE, which is nevertheless, predestined, like no other European organization, to be the pioneer in the area of "culture of prevention", for whose development UN General Secretary Kofi Annan appealed.

The strength of the OSCE in the field of arms control, its instruments for early warning and civil crisis management as well as its pan-European legitimacy in the quest for human rights and minority rights are a good foundation for this undertaking.

However, the agreements of the OSCE can develop their peace-building effects only when all its members adhere to the agreed-on rules without exception. The war in Chechnya is still raging on, although Russia has signed the "Charter for European Security" at the OSCE Summit in Istanbul and had therefore acknowledged that the adherence to Human Rights standards is not only to be considered as an internal matter of a State.

Russia accepted the role of the OSCE in the search for a political solution in the northern Caucasus. The German government and its partners remain obliged to keep pressing for a diplomatic solution to the conflict and an end to the fighting that is going on in Chechnya.

The debates over the military operation of the NATO in Kosovo have shown that the States are obliged to further develop and work upon international laws.

Without a restriction of the principle of States sovereignty and the policy of non-interference in internal affairs, military intervention is not legitimised by international law, not even to prevent severe violation of Human Rights. The mandate of the United Nations must be the unmodified basis of military sanctions.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

"Peace" as the French politician and noble prize winner for peace Astride Briand reminds us, "requires continual efforts, untiring and tough; to achieve it and to safeguard it, one must want it".

"Si vis pacem, para pacem" - "If you want to have peace, prepare it!" - this over two thousand years old Roman saying has still not lost its meaning in today's context.

To prepare for peace also means to do research on peace: to explore existing possibilities of early warning and conflict prevention.

The Centre for OSCE Research will be an important element: as connection between academic research, political counselling, and practical on-the-spot work; "the memory of OSCE" will analyse the operation of the security organisation, formulate recommendations and help to avoid mistakes and prevent escalations.

Gustav Heinemann acquired his perceptiveness and passion for politics through his conviction that the concern for peace is not just the responsibility of the State, but of both rulers and ruled alike.

To speak of Heinemann today also means: to remind all of us of our common responsibility for peace.

I wish the Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg, its new Research Centre as well as all of us a lot of success in its service of peace.

I hereby declare the Centre for OSCE Research open!

Prof. Dr. Dr. Dieter S. Lutz,
Director of the Centre for OSCE Research/Core

War is not Normal!

Dear Mr. Mayor,

My sincere thanks for the presentation of the new OSCE Research Centre CORE on the board.

Many thanks also for your kind words about the institute and the efforts of its staff. Please allow me to assure you that we will not wane in our commitment to this project.

Dear Mr. President of the Federal Republic,
Dear Mr. Vice-President,
Your Excellencies,
Ladies and Gentlemen,

In the federal system of the Federal Republic of Germany and its distribution of powers, peace and international security do not belong to the tasks of the "Länder", at least at a first glance. It is, therefore, not a matter of course that a city-state like Hamburg would support an institute for peace research and security policy. Nonetheless the Free and Hanseatic City of Hamburg has been doing just that through its support for the foundation for the last almost 30 years - and as I myself consider: rightly so. Mr. Mayor, you just mentioned a few of the reasons for this. Indeed, like you said, "The Institute could not have been founded in a better place than Hamburg". Please allow me to take this opportunity and extend my warmest thanks to this beautiful and great city and its citizens, along with the hope that you will continue to be on our side and will support IFSH and now also CORE in the future as well.

That this hope is not unjustified has been proven today by a number of citizens of Hamburg. You made possible the financial fundament for the building of this new institution. Kindly allow me to thank you by your names. They are:

Mrs. Hannelore Greve,
Dr. Klaus Asche,
Mr. George Domizlaff,
Dr. Helmut Greve,
Prof. Dr. Leidenberger,
Dr. Ulrich Meincke,
Prof. Dr. Hermann Schnabel

and last but not least, Dr. Michael Otto, who has been kind enough to support the institute and its work since a few years.

Our thanks and respect is due to you. Your special commitment for scholarship *and* peace will be our incentive!

Ladies and Gentlemen,

the Centre for OSCE Research/CORE, which we are founding together today, is the first institution in the world which is specifically dedicated to research on the Organization for

Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE). As you know, the OSCE is the successor organization to the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE). As a regional security organization with 55 participating States, the OSCE comprises all of the Northern hemisphere. It is the only international organization with the explicit goal of advancing peace and security in the whole of Europe. In particular, the OSCE includes those crisis regions whose States are even in the long term not going to join other European organizations, but which nevertheless fundamentally affect European security. Reacting earlier and more successfully than other organizations to crises and conflicts, the OSCE has developed a set of innovative, non-military instruments for the prevention and settlement of ethno-political conflicts.

CORE, which we are founding today, works as a politically independent think tank, combining basic research on central aspects of the evolution of the OSCE with demand oriented analysis of current problems and practical contributions to relevant issues. Addressing political actors as well as the academic and political public in Germany and abroad, CORE wants to accompany the development of the OSCE with analysis and critique, thus permitting a deeper insight into the problems and perspectives of the Organization. The research seeks to support the OSCE's endeavour for effective conflict settlement and the construction of a European security order.

Along with the contributions of the OSCE to democracy and the rule of law, the main focus of its activities is on conflict prevention, conflict settlement and - I emphasise - above all and always the prevention of war.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

"A century of wars lies behind us ..." With this statement the German Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder opened his New Year's address a few days ago.

Many of us remember the Second World War from our own personal experience. Some of us even carry the burden of the First World War. We all were horrified by the wars in Yugoslavia in the last years, especially the Kosovo war, which we followed ourselves. At the moment the pictures from Chechnya are deeply shocking.

Allow me to add the following quote:

"War, which has always been a most unfortunate incident in the history of mankind, has become, if I may say so, even worse in the last few decades."

It was Roman Herzog who uttered this statement. A few of you might still remember this quote of his. The occasion was the ceremony to commemorate the 25th year of the Existence of the Hamburg Peace Research Institute in 1996, here in this very hall. It was not the years and decades of nuclear deterrence in East and West when he made this statement. It was six years after the end of the East-West conflict; the so-called "turn of times" of 1989/90.

According to many, the East-West conflict and the Cold War in the decades following 1945 did not allow a lasting worldwide peaceful environment. The hope of the people and the promise of the politicians at the time of the East-West differences was that the existing problems of the time - war, hunger, global poverty and pollution - could be solved only if the system of deterrence and the danger of the nuclear war could be overcome first.

The end of the East-West conflict was also accompanied by such euphoric expectations. Today, just a few years after that, the feelings of euphoria and hope have, however, faded out; the reality is dramatically different. None of these high expectations were fulfilled after 1990. Not only this: For the first time in Europe after many a decades, war ruled for a number of months. (Mayor Runde just mentioned this in his address). And it was a barbaric and bloody war, which was unimaginable in Europe at the end of the 20th century. And that is why David Rieff gave his book the following provocative title "Slaughterhouse. Bosnia and the failure of the West". In the book, the political essayist, who lives in New York, described his experiences during a number of his visits and stays in the war inflicted area of Bosnia between 1992 and 1994. His verdict: the atrocities and the harshness of the war in Bosnia exceeded everything that one thought was possible in "civilized Europe". If Europe, USA, and the United Nations really wanted they could have prevented this destructive war. And so it was a dream that died in Bosnia:

"The dream that the world does have a conscience; like the dream that there is justice for the weak as for the strong... The defeat, the disgrace is complete."

After 1998 are we not forced to recognize, if not already accept, that basically human beings are not peaceful, and seeing it historically and evolutionary, that they can never be so?

This is hardly a new realization. The great poet Friedrich Schiller gave the following words to his medieval character Wilhelm Tell in 1803/1804 :

"The gentlest person cannot live in peace, if his neighbour does not want him to."

Are we cursed to have wars forever and forever? To put it soberly, we have to admit that human beings are not peaceful.

The American psychiatrist Jonathan Shay, who works with a group of Vietnam war-veterans suffering from post-traumatic personality disorders, writes in this context:

"In face of such monstrous horrors, like the ones which were seen during the disintegration of Yugoslavia, a real and lasting end to all wars seems to be an impossible dream..... Wars have always been a part of the human history. Maybe this is a part of human nature. I really have my doubts, if it is ever possible to control the phalanx of cultural, economic, and social powers, which support war."

Who would not be deeply shocked by these statements? But these statements do describe the potential aggression, embodied in the genetic makeup of the human beings, which is probably responsible for this. A potential aggression which can aggravate to the level of a madman's fury; a potential that can be found in civilized human beings even without rage and fury, but that can destroy the basic human values such as feelings of sympathy, compassion, and morals.

But what is the consequence of these realities? That the reality is unchangeable? That violence and above all war, this curse on mankind, is "normal"?

Ladies and Gentlemen,

In Jena there is a merger of a series of associations and initiatives, among which there is also a Protestant church with the name of "War is not normal".

The fact that the majority of people believe in this statement, "war is not normal", has been proved by diverse surveys and opinion polls conducted to determine the opinions of people in the first few days of the New Year. Please allow me to quote the newspaper group "Lahm-Dill". The title of their result of the "New Year's Readers' Survey" for 1999/2000 on the 2nd of January was:

"Health for all and at last peace in the world – are the outstanding New Year's wishes of our readers."

Ladies and Gentlemen,

I am absolutely convinced that if we were to conduct a poll right now in the hall or outside the city hall, the result would be the same. Not only in Hamburg, but also in Moscow or in Washington or in any other place.

Clearly the wishes of people - even before we ever started talking about globalization - are global and international. This desire of the human beings can be found in all regions, societies, religions and cultures. In German one would say, "Do unto others what you want others to do unto you". This is especially true for the worldwide desire for peace.

If it is true that the great desire of the people is to have long-lasting peace in the world, then violence and war cannot be "normal". But on the other hand, if to have peace is still not "normal", as the reality shows, then we must understand that we have to prove ourselves, not during a war, rather in the "case of peace". I am especially glad that President Rau was ready to deliver the speech on Heinemann's words.

Dear Mr. President, Dear Mr. Rau,

Please allow me to say in the end that I'm extremely pleased and proud of having the honour of welcoming you to this founding ceremony of CORE. Naturally proud and also thankful that you have documented with this step that you, as the Head of the State, are as involved in the peace research as your predecessor Mr. Gustav Heinemann. Glad that you are involved in this project not only as a politician but also as a human being having strength and qualities, which characterize peace. I mean your capabilities of going up to people and listening to their problems and helping sort out conflicts. And this, according to me, is really a good omen for the new OSCE-Research Centre and its future.

If I may now request you Mr. President to come on the podium, and Ladies and Gentlemen, at the end, I thank you all for your kind attention and patience.

Dr. Johannes Rau

The President of the Federal Republic of Germany

**Peace is the Challenge -
The OSCE's Contribution to a Policy**

for Peace and Security in the Twenty-First Century

Mayor, Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is a pleasure for me to be with you today at the opening of the OSCE Research Centre at the Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy of the University of Hamburg.

The Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy has already made a name for itself in the field of OSCE research. Indeed, the OSCE Yearbook published by the Institute every year since 1995 is internationally unique.

With the founding today of the Research Centre, the Institute is giving a new sign of hope: finally academia and politics are taking the prevention of armed conflict seriously. Prevention is becoming the standard for politics.

This is the approach which UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan wanted when he called for a "culture of prevention". This culture is now emerging, is now taking effect.

It was one of my predecessors-in-office, Gustav Heinemann, who said "It is not war that is the challenge..." This sentence of his runs counter to European philosophy. It contradicts Heraclitus, it contradicts Schiller. "It is not war that is the challenge, it is peace that is the challenge in the face of which we all have to prove ourselves, for beyond peace there is no existence."

Gustav Heinemann said this in 1964, not as Federal President, but five years before his election. He said it at a time when preventing a nuclear war between East and West had become the prevailing maxim of security policy.

Ten years ago the East-West conflict made its exit from the stage of history. The drama closed sooner than anyone had dared hope. The bipolar system disappeared as the Eastern system collapsed under the weight of its own contradictions.

This final curtain fell on the whole peacefully. For this we have to thank the policy of détente and in particular the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, the CSCE, which was underestimated by many. When the CSCE Process began, it was in an atmosphere of mistrust. Today though, nobody doubts the contribution it has made to overcoming the division of our continent and unifying Germany.

- With the Helsinki Final Act of 1975 the political forces in Eastern Europe which spoke for freedom and human rights finally had a basis to support their demands.
- The CSCE Process had opened a new dimension of cooperation: firstly it bridged systems, then it opened and ultimately overcame them.
- Three elements have, if I am right, played a major role in eroding the power structures that grew in Europe after the Second World War:
 - firstly, human rights took priority over the principle of non-interference in the domestic affairs of third States,
 - secondly, democracy and the rule of law developed a unique attraction,

- and thirdly, confidence building, which includes all measures aimed at producing openness and transparency in military matters, became the guiding principle of cooperation.

Last year war returned entirely unexpectedly to a part of Europe:

- The security problems of our continent are related to the fact that weak States are called upon to restructure simultaneously their policies, their economy, their society and their culture.
- The problems are linked to the collapse of States whose national and cultural boundaries are disintegrating.
- And they are related to unscrupulous forces who use these tensions to their own end, to gain power or to keep it.

Security in Europe is today less threatened by the claims to power of individual States than by the inflaming of group antagonisms within individual States.

The so-called new security risks - social imbalances, the effects of international financial crises, ethnic conflict, fundamentalist violence, drug dealing, transnational crime - can no longer be met by the classic military means of security policy.

That is why, ladies and gentlemen, Gustav Heinemann's words, "it is peace that is the challenge", take on a wider meaning today than 36 years ago:

- At that time, the challenge could be and indeed was defined negatively - to prevent the Cold War from reaching a "boiling point".
- Today the task facing us in Europe is the positively defined one of shaping the peace. It is peace that has today become the challenge.

Sustainable development in the countries in transition can only be achieved by civil means. And it is sustainable development that we mean when we talk of stability.

The fundamental idea of the CSCE Process, which lives on in the OSCE, is today more up-to-date than ever: democracy, the rule of law and freedom of the individual are the best guarantees for peaceful coexistence, not just between individuals, but between peoples. They ensure a shared economic development. They allow a stable international order to emerge.

Our thoughts and actions are still largely keyed to reacting to conflicts, instead of preventing them in advance through foresighted, systematic action.

We are still a long way indeed from the "culture of prevention" which Kofi Annan called on us to create.

Such a culture requires a fundamental change in the way we think. This is only possible if we look to fundamental values and attitudes. In my opinion there are two important criteria for this new culture:

- firstly, it must be built on a shared fundament of values. This must include respect for human and minority rights, democracy and the rule of law and the principle of the market economy. In the face of global competition, the market economy must not lack the attribute "social".
- Secondly, we must accept the fact that prevention today can only succeed if it is multi-lateral. The fact that national strategies are overstretched is seldom laid so bare as it is in this field. No international crisis can be prevented or managed by States acting alone.

If we, ladies and gentlemen, apply these two principles to Europe, then we see that the OSCE is, like no other organization, predestined to be the precursor of this "culture of prevention", to use the words of Kofi Annan once again.

- The OSCE is the only Euro-Atlantic organization which brings together all the European States, Russia, Ukraine and the other successor States of the former Soviet Union and the North American democracies. It includes them all in a consensus of values, in which respect for human and minority rights is linked to the maintenance and strengthening of stability and peace.
- The OSCE is largely responsible for the fact that the respect for fundamental human and minority rights is no longer regarded solely as a matter within a State's domestic jurisdiction. The international community may now intervene.
- The Charter on European Security was adopted in Istanbul last November. This goes so far as to state that even internal conflicts in one participating State are matters for all OSCE members, because common security could be threatened. It is true that this is a somewhat tentative formulation, but it is an important beginning to the next step forward.
- The OSCE already has an active conflict prevention strategy with its concept of "civil society", i.e. the democratization of all parts of society. It is now simply a matter of grasping this concept as a task for preventive foreign policy. Therefore the OSCE should focus its activities even more consciously on the development of pluralistic democratic structures in the participating States. These must become the basic requirement of political and economic stability.

In the last few years the OSCE has on this basis already developed a remarkable array of instruments for the prevention and civil management of conflicts:

- the High Commissioner on National Minorities,
- the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights,
- the OSCE Representative on Freedom of the Media, Freimut Duve,
- and the soon-to-be twenty long-term missions of the OSCE.

All of these have played a significant role in ensuring that crises did not develop into violent conflicts and in confining existing conflicts.

As examples I would like to mention the successful settlement of minority conflicts in Estonia and Latvia, the stabilizing of Macedonia and the prevention of a renewed outbreak of war in the Republic of Moldova.

In the Balkans, which I visited in December when I went to Bosnia and Herzegovina and to Kosovo, "peace building", the creating of civilian structures, has now become the most important task. In this way the preconditions for maintaining the public order will be created, so that democratic institutions can be developed, so that free elections can be organized, so that pluralistic media can be promoted and structures of civil society strengthened.

I come to the conclusion that, despite all prophecies of doom, the OSCE has an impressive list of successes to show for itself. The sine qua non for its successes, for the successes of this preventative strategy, is its quiet and discreet work. Recommendations and proposed solutions may only have a chance of success if they can be discussed by the parties involved with no visible external pressure and in the certainty that nobody will have to lose face.

But the more successful the OSCE is in this field, the less it comes to the notice of the public. A conflict that is prevented or which is kept under control is not news.

If the OSCE is brought to the notice of the public, then it is often as a "toothless tiger", because it does not after all have any military capabilities.

And unfortunately many self-appointed "realists" today think once again in terms of "hard" military might and less in terms of "weak" political power - the power of persuasion and of confidence-building.

I maintain that in spite of the war in the Balkans and other regional hot spots, the security policy for today and tomorrow must be a policy of persuasion. And for this I can think of no better instrument than the OSCE.

Stalin's cynical question as to the number of divisions at the Pope's disposal, still remembered today, should be consigned to the past. All Europeans hope that conflicts will in the future be solved by political means, not military means. The "culture of prevention" is the alternative to the machinery of war of the past century.

Naturally the presence in Kosovo of KFOR and the Bundeswehr units therein is necessary to prevent a renewed outbreak of violence.

But no army can undertake civil conflict management alone. The OSCE can achieve success, although it has no army - indeed precisely because of this.

The Hamburg Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy can make, or I should say, can continue to make an important contribution to these political endeavours, considering what Wolf Baudissin, Egon Bahr and Professor Lutz have, with the help of their colleagues, already done to help us build a lasting European order of peace. In order to realize this goal, present and potential conflicts in Europe have to be analyzed. Suggestions as to how to solve them are needed. Above all we must help to focus the special strengths of the OSCE.

The OSCE Research Centre, which Mayor Runde has just opened, is a very promising step towards the objective of making this continent a safer place.

And that's why I sincerely wish you, Professor Lutz, and all of your colleagues - in the interest of us all - success with your work on the challenge of peace.

