

**STATEMENT TO THE ASRC (IV Session)**  
**BY AMB. GUIDO LENZI**  
**PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF ITALY**  
**TO OSCE**

I of course associate myself with the Statement made by the EU Presidency, to which I would add the following.

Looking ahead, as we should in this session, I would like to emphasise mainly that OSCE doesn't have and cannot acquire a momentum of its own, since it relies on participation, on the convergence of behaviours, political and social, in participating States.

The identity of anybody, whether a person or an organisation, is a function not only of whom we think we are but also of how we are actually perceived by our interlocutors. In that respect, refocusing on the original tasks of the OSCE and projecting a more clearly established common and convergent political will may in itself draw the attention of onlookers, especially of other organisations looking for partners in an increasingly complex multifunctional and cross-dimensional world.

That is what the EU has described as the need for a more effective multilateralism, another name for what we used to call interlocking or mutually reinforcing institutions. The mechanism foreseen by the Strategy adopted in Maastricht would be a useful step in that direction. It would affect also the relations that each participating State and this organisation as a whole have established with partners in contiguous areas.

The CSCE/OSCE method has been demonstrably very effective and should indeed continue to be a model for international relations in other geographical areas. The OSCE would thus become a tool at the disposal not only of PS but also for the stabilisation of other geographical situations in the Mediterranean region, in Asia and beyond.

Addressing now another development that seems to have sown some confusion, and with respect to the essential requirement of participation that I have indicated at the beginning, I would like to submit that there is nothing wrong with the enlargements of EU and NATO, which instead constitute: a) a demonstration of their extrovertedness and therefore b) an opportunity to stimulate further aggregation processes.

The critical mass of OSCE has not been utilised as much as it could have been, not only for conflict prevention and peace-building purposes, but also in order to remove the remaining conflicts in

Europe, and contribute thereafter more credibly also to critical situations at the periphery of Europe and world-wide.

What this organisation needs is not an overhaul of its tasks and instruments, but rather a renewed common commitment, and more determined contributions by each PS, according to their specific aspirations and interests. It's a matter more of wanting to utilise the tools available, rather than updating them. Implementation, the leitmotiv of our CiO, can only result from increased political commitment, for which more aerodynamic structures cannot substitute.

CBMs are the main instrument at the disposal of OSCE. They should be made more effective in particular by putting them at the disposal not only of early-warning and conflict management, but also of conflict resolution. What we heard from Minister Shamshun in that respect this morning was quite relevant and reassuring.

To what Prof. Rasmussen this morning and Ambassadors Perrin de Brichambaud and Stoudman this afternoon described, I would add that the complexity of today's world calls precisely for a more determined contribution of an organisation such as the OSCE. Our organisation is inherently an anti-terrorist tool *par excellence*, geared as it has always been to defuse possible factors of instability and crisis, in which illegality, criminality, corruption and ultimately sheer violence thrive.

In our discussion, we have therefore come full-circle, where we started yesterday when we addressed terrorism, arguably the most extreme manifestation of the fraying of the fabric of international relations, which OSCE (and the CSCE process before it) were precisely designed to counter on our continent. The results achieved are quite conclusive, the business is however unfinished.

The way ahead, I would therefore submit, is more of the same, requiring a greater political investment from capitals in pan-European affairs, as a model and a stimulus also for the wider ring of potential partners.