

20/20 OSCE and Central Asia
Past visions, future perspectives





20/20 OSCE and Central Asia

Past visions, future perspectives

This publication is based on a seminar held at the OSCE Academy in Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan on 12 October 2010, organized by the OSCE Secretariat and supported by Kazakhstan's 2010 OSCE Chairmanship.

November 2010

The views expressed in this publication are the views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the OSCE or its participating States.

Published by the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE)
Press and Public Information Section
Wallnerstrasse 6
A-1010 Vienna, Austria
www.osce.org

© OSCE 2010

All rights reserved. The contents of this publication may be freely used and copied for educational and other non-commercial purposes, provided that any such reproduction is accompanied by an acknowledgement of the OSCE as the source.

The names and boundaries on the map in this publication do not imply official endorsement or acceptance by the OSCE.

ISBN: 978-92-9234-151-0

Edited by Sarah Crozier and Sonya Yee
Designed by Nona Reuter
Map by Nona Reuter

Printed in Austria by Ueberreuter Print GmbH

Contents

- 5 **Foreword by the OSCE Chairperson-in-Office**

- 7 Usen Suleimenov
Kazakhstan and the OSCE in 2010

- 9 Virginie Coulloudon
Shaping the future: the Paris Charter as a vision and reference

- 13 S. N. MacFarlane
Political and strategic challenges in wider Europe: the last 20 years

- 19 Martha Brill Olcott
Kyrgyzstan: perspectives and implications for the region

- 25 Andres Ilves
Afghanistan, redefining our world

- 29 Maxim Ryabkov
Patiently attending to details: three lessons from the past 20 years

- 33 **Annex I:** Agenda, rapporteurs' report

- 39 **Annex II:** Charter of Paris for a New Europe



Foreword by the OSCE Chairperson-in-Office

Twenty years ago, as the Cold War was finally drawing to a close, the visionary leaders of North America, Europe and the then-Soviet Union gathered together and signed the Charter of Paris for a New Europe, declaring that “the era of confrontation and division of Europe has ended” and a “new era of democracy, peace and unity” has begun.

They committed their countries to democracy and human rights, and recognized no divisions between East and West.

The Central Asian states, then still a part of the Soviet Union, were not present at the Paris Summit of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe in November 1990. But just months later, the five republics — Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, and Turkmenistan — declared independence. Shortly thereafter we too joined the CSCE — now the OSCE — as states in our own right, and committed to the values underpinning the OSCE’s vision of inclusive, comprehensive security.

These commitments are more relevant than ever. While remarkable progress has been achieved since, the promise of a “new era of democracy, peace and unity” remains elusive. Over the past two decades many of our countries have suffered war. Conflicts in our region remain unresolved, and as we have seen, can erupt too easily into violence. We are confronted with new security challenges and dividing lines — not between two blocs, but stemming from lingering mistrust and differing perceptions.

It is time once again to show vision and resolve, and realize a common Euro-Atlantic and Eurasian security space. “20/20 vision” in English means the ability to see clearly, without assistance — a gift granted to us only with the benefit of hindsight. It is incumbent upon us to learn the lessons of the past 20 years as we seek to define our aims for the next 20.

The discussion on the future of security in our region is taking place at the highest political level, most notably on 1 and 2 December 2010 in Astana, where OSCE Heads of State are meeting at the invitation of the President of Kazakhstan, Nursultan Nazarbayev. But it is also very important that this dialogue is enriched by the insights of academics and experts, and engages the people who have the most at stake — young people, whose aspirations and visions for the future we must also respect and take into account.

This publication is based on a seminar on the OSCE and Central Asia, supported by Kazakhstan’s OSCE Chairmanship, which took place on 12 October 2010 at the OSCE Academy in Bishkek. Noted experts spoke about some of our most pressing challenges, and engaged in spirited debate with students from across the region.

As our leaders meet at the first OSCE Summit in more than a decade — and the first ever to be held in Central Asia — I hope that these articles will provide food for thought, and contribute to the many lively discussions I expect we shall have in Astana.

**OSCE Chairperson-in-Office,
Secretary of State and Foreign Minister of Kazakhstan
Kanat Saudabayev
November 2010**

Kazakhstan and the OSCE in 2010

By Usen Suleimenov

On 16 December 1991, the Republic of Kazakhstan was officially proclaimed a sovereign and independent state. On 30 January 1992, as one of the new country's first steps in joining the international community, Kazakhstan became a participating State of the OSCE, then still the CSCE, the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe.

Now, in 2010, Kazakhstan is chairing this big family of the OSCE — the first Central Asian country, the first country of the former Soviet Union and the first predominantly Muslim country to hold this important position.

The short period of time from declaring independence to leading the world's largest regional security organization has been a remarkable journey for Kazakhstan. Under the President of Kazakhstan, the country has successfully faced many of the challenges of transition. Kazakhstan has become a recognized leader in global nuclear non-proliferation efforts, starting with the President's decision in 1991 to close down the world's second largest nuclear test site at Semipalatinsk, and later to renounce the nuclear weapons in Kazakhstan.

As a country with 136 ethnic groups representing 46 confessions and which has secured inter-ethnic and inter-confessional harmony, Kazakhstan has played an important role in promoting tolerance, non-discrimination and inter-cultural dialogue in the international arena. The country has pursued a balanced foreign policy, seeking good relations with all countries of the world.

This emphasis on co-operation and dialogue is very much in keeping with the values of the OSCE. This Organization is a unique body, formed at the height of the Cold War with the aim of easing tensions between East and West to secure peace.

The founding document of the OSCE, the 1975 Helsinki Final Act, established the principles of indivisible, comprehensive and co-operative security, encompassing three dimensions — the political-military, the economic and environmental, and the human dimension.

Over the years, the 56 OSCE participating States have developed a set of commitments that cover all dimensions of security, and implementing these commitments is a common undertaking for all the participating States. Consensus and the equality of all States in the OSCE continue to define the *modus operandi* of the Organization.

2010 is a landmark year for the OSCE. It is a tribute to the other 55 participating States of the OSCE that this commitment to equality and to erasing divisions between East and West was clearly reaffirmed by the decision to award Kazakhstan with the 2010 Chairmanship.

This year we also mark the 35th anniversary of the signing of the Helsinki Final Act and the 20th anniversary of the adoption of the Charter of Paris for a New Europe.

For this and many other reasons, this year is not business as usual at the OSCE, not least because the OSCE will be holding its first Summit in more than a decade, on 1 and 2 December in Astana.

The agreement to meet at the highest level is an expression of our States' commitment to co-operative and indivisible security. It is also an expression of the urgency that many of us feel — that it is high time to address the pressing security challenges that we collectively face.

All is not well. The crisis in Kyrgyzstan has highlighted many of the security challenges facing the Euro-Atlantic and Eurasian area. Conflicts remained unresolved in some OSCE participating States and these are far from "frozen".

The erosion of Europe's conventional arms control regime remains a challenge. Energy security and new transnational threats are matters of increasing concern. Threats arise also from outside the OSCE area, especially from instability in neighbouring regions, including Afghanistan. All our States

to varying degrees continue to struggle with the negative consequences of the global financial and economic crisis.

Relations within the OSCE have also been strained at times, and the Organization has arguably suffered from a lack of high-level engagement. A summit-level meeting has not been held since 1999 in Istanbul. The annual OSCE Ministerial Council meetings have failed since 2002 to agree on a political declaration, highlighting the difficulties in achieving consensus on major security issues.

It has become increasingly clear that we face a host of problems that still divide the Euro-Atlantic and Eurasian area and a range of challenges that can only be tackled by working together. In 2008 the Presidents of Russia and France called for a renewed dialogue on the basic questions of European security, and the OSCE accordingly was the first Organization to respond.

This dialogue started under Finland's 2008 OSCE Chairmanship. In June 2009, the Greek Chairmanship followed up with an informal meeting of OSCE Foreign Ministers on the island of Corfu. Forty-four ministers and five deputy ministers attended the meeting, along with representatives from NATO, the EU, the CSTO and the CIS. As a result, the Greek Foreign Minister declared that a "Corfu Process" had been launched, a decision which was formalized at the OSCE Ministerial Council in Athens last December.

The Corfu Process, carried forward by Kazakhstan, has fostered this open and ambitious dialogue to rebuild trust, reaffirm commitments to basic principles, and restore the basis for common purpose in the OSCE.

The Process continues through informal, regular and open meetings in Vienna, and progress was reviewed at an informal meeting of OSCE Foreign Ministers in Almaty on 16 and 17 July this year. These fruitful discussions in turn led to an agreement to hold the Astana Summit.

Over the years the CSCE and OSCE have served us well in challenging times — by helping to bridge differences during the Cold War, and to reunite Europe when the Iron Curtain artificially dividing us fell. The Astana Summit similarly promises to renew co-operation and common action in the OSCE at a critical moment.

Let us hope that the spirit of Astana can inspire the wisdom and foresight so urgently needed if we are serious about building together an indivisible Euro-Atlantic and Eurasian security community for the 21st century.

*Usen Suleimenov is a Deputy Permanent Representative
of the Republic of Kazakhstan to the OSCE.*

Shaping the future: the Paris Charter as a vision and reference

by *Virginie Coulloudon*

*“Europe whole and free is calling for a new beginning.
We invite our peoples to join in this great endeavour...”*

In Paris, in November 1990, 34 Heads of State met at a Summit of the Conference for Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE), which was soon to become a reference in European history.¹

At that time, images of East Germans crossing the border from Hungary into Austria and breaching the Wall in Berlin to reunite with their West German friends and families were still vivid in the minds of many Europeans. Germany had reunified less than two months before. NATO had adopted the London Declaration on a Transformed North Atlantic Alliance, in which Europeans, Canadians and Americans declared they would work together “not only for the common defence, but to build new partnerships with all the nations of Europe”. The European Community had begun work on what would become the Maastricht Treaty. The USSR Communist Party Secretary General and Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev had repeatedly called on heads of state to build a “European common home”; Moscow was pursuing its strategy of *perestroika* and *glasnost* — the structural reform of the USSR and the call for greater transparency and freedom of information.

In November 1990, Gorbachev, together with US President George Bush and German Chancellor Helmut Kohl, gathered in Paris at the invitation of French President François Mitterrand. Gorbachev emphasized that only the use of new political and diplomatic instruments would guarantee security in post-Cold War Europe. Force, Gorbachev said, should be used only in extreme cases, primarily to separate sides at war, and only in agreement with all of Europe. Mitterrand called the Summit “Yalta on Seine” as he wanted it to close the era of the Cold War and confrontation between two blocs.

At the Paris Summit, one after the other, the Heads of State demonstrated high enthusiasm and passion about the future of Europe. They all focused on how they would shape a greater Europe together, building a reunited Europe beyond re-unified Germany and Berlin. Chancellor Kohl thanked all political leaders who helped the “new thinking” to prevail in international relations, above all in the heart of Europe: “Placing their faith in the CSCE ideals, they stood up for their rights, for freedom and for self-determination”.

Germany played a key role in shaping such enthusiasm. The Chancellor emphasized that united Germany would pursue a modern conception of sovereignty: “We are willing to transfer Germany’s sovereign powers to the European Community. Conscious of German history and the resultant moral and political responsibility, a united Germany will be the cornerstone of the peaceful European order”.

The Heads of State adopted the Charter of Paris for a New Europe, recalling the principles of the CSCE’s founding document, the 1975 Helsinki Final Act. They welcomed the end of an “era of confrontation and division” and proclaimed the desire to “build, consolidate and strengthen democracy as the only system of government”. They emphasized their collective commitment to democratic governance, market economy, rule of law and respect for fundamental freedoms. The document was new in that it represented an inclusive vision for future European governments and society.

¹ The states represented at the OSCE Paris Summit were: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Cyprus, Czech and Slovak Federal Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Holy See, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy -European Community, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, San Marino, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom, United States of America and Yugoslavia.

On the sidelines of the Summit, Heads of State signed the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe, which was seen as a major contribution to stability in the region. Members of NATO and the Warsaw Pact stated in a joint declaration that they no longer regarded each other as adversaries and sought to establish a new partnership.

Twenty years ago already, the Heads of State were discussing a new security architecture for a common European home.

The Paris Summit also saw that “common efforts to consolidate respect for human rights, democracy and the rule of law, to strengthen peace and to promote unity in Europe require a new quality of political dialogue and co-operation and thus development of the structures of the CSCE.”

This led to the transformation of the CSCE, with the creation of its first permanent structures, including a Secretariat, the Conflict Prevention Centre and the Office for Free Elections (now the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights). This process would continue at the CSCE Council in Budapest in December 1994 with the renaming of the CSCE as the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE).

The Heads of State did their best to inspire in their populations the enthusiasm that was so clearly felt at the Paris Summit. In his speech at the Summit, Kohl said that “European human and minority rights must become firmly rooted in the lives and consciousness of our people” and added that all countries should “send signals of hope and chart paths of peace”. Mitterrand stated in his press conference that Yalta ended in Paris and that dialogue won over conflict. The Paris Charter declared the end of an era, of the superpowers’ spheres of influence.

Back home, however, they faced considerable scepticism. On the day following the Summit, the Soviet newspaper *Pravda* wrote that one cannot jump overnight from an old Europe to a new one since people’s worldview changes more slowly than political structures: “Where is the guarantee that our sad history won’t repeat itself?”

In November 1990, throughout the Soviet Union and even in Moscow, people were struggling to find food. There was a huge economic divide between Moscow and the republics.

A week after the Paris Summit, the UN Security Council authorized use of “all means necessary” to eject Iraq from Kuwait, and the United States, the United Kingdom and allied countries would soon be occupied with the Persian Gulf War.

The disintegration of the former Yugoslavia would lead to some of the darkest pages in European history. The break-up of the Soviet Union would provoke an unforeseen economic and social crisis in the 15 ex-Soviet republics. Existing regional conflicts (Nagorno-Karabakh and South Ossetia) would deepen further and new conflagrations (Abkhazia and Transdniestria) erupt soon after the Paris Summit. They remain unresolved to this day.

In Paris, the Heads of State had expressed confidence that the Paris Charter would help shape a new Europe “whole and free”. Had they lost sight of reality?

Later in 1995, Gorbachev acknowledged in the French journal *Politique Internationale* that the course of Europe had diverged considerably from the optimistic vision that Heads of State shared at the end of the Cold War:

“Heads of State and Government who were at the 1990 CSCE Paris Summit were convinced that the Old Continent would harmoniously develop itself in a spirit of co-operation. [...] However, today, Europe rather looks like an area highly exposed to the risk of war. Instability and mutual incomprehension predominate. I believe this is the result of mistakes made by leaders who have acted too quickly and too lightly when they needed to find solutions to regional conflicts.”

During the time of East-West antagonism, the CSCE’s primary mission was to foster a common language between the two Europes. Gorbachev’s policy of opening up to the West and the re-unification of Germany paved the way for a new dialogue in three areas: security and arms control; the development of democracy and economic integration; and the respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms.

In this sense the Charter of Paris can be seen as a document of its time. The Heads of State needed to put an end to the Cold War antagonism between the two blocs. The Charter of Paris for a New Europe was a way to consolidate Europe, to strengthen co-operation for the turmoils to come.

Speaking at the Paris Summit, German Chancellor Kohl emphasized the pivotal role the CSCE played in ending the Cold War: “Without the foundation laid 15 years ago for a peaceful order encompassing the whole of Europe, it would not have been possible today to accomplish German unity and to restore the historical unity of our continent, as we are doing here in Paris. As an idea and as a forum for forward-looking policies, the CSCE has stood the test of time.”

Twenty years later, the CSCE — now OSCE — continues to stand the test of time, and the Paris Charter remains a key document.

In retrospect and in the short term, the exuberance of Europe’s leaders as they gathered in Paris in 1990 appears overly optimistic, as sad history did indeed repeat itself, and the ensuing decade proved to be one of Europe’s bloodiest.

But taking a longer-term perspective, one can argue that the Heads of State were right in Paris. With the benefit of hindsight, it is clear that they did close the Cold War chapter. Instead of offering a conventional ‘peace treaty’ to end the Cold War, the Paris Charter was an expression of a vision, a perspective of the European society of the future.

The Charter also launched a process of co-operation that continues today, based on a region-wide consensus that democracy, economic liberty and the rule of law are principles to be respected.

Today as in 1990, the OSCE functions as a forum for genuine dialogue, one that uniquely includes the states of Central Asia, the South Caucasus, the Russian Federation, Western and Eastern Europe and North America, and which has helped to develop a body of standards, of common policies and agreed guidelines in many fields related to security, be it good governance, fighting terrorism or trafficking of human beings, managing borders or police.

The Organization is also known to break new ground. Each week in Vienna, the 56 participating States continue to pioneer new approaches to address their security problems. This includes finding new foundations in international relations. In December 2007, the 56 OSCE participating States’ unanimous decision to give the Chairmanship to Kazakhstan testifies to the Organization’s willingness to renew itself.

In November 1990, no one would have thought that Kazakhstan, then a Soviet State, would not only chair the Organization 20 years later, but would also compel participating States to develop a new vision of Euro-Atlantic security which would include Eurasian States as strategic partners.

The Paris Charter remains a vision more than a reflection of reality. But its ideas still constitute a unique framework for the processes taking place among and within the OSCE participating States as they work for a common future and shared security on three continents.

Dr. Virginie Coulloudon is the OSCE Spokesperson and Head of the Press and Public Information Section.

Political and strategic challenges in wider Europe: the last 20 years

by S. N. MacFarlane

I have been asked to speak for about twenty minutes on political and strategic changes in wider Europe over the last 20 years, with an emphasis on Central Asia, and then to say something about the future. That is a very small amount of time and this is a very large topic. So I shall have to be selective rather than comprehensive.

I have little to say about the development of Central Asian states and their relations with one another. Instead, I focus on changes around Central Asia that affect the region. The risk here should be acknowledged — the nature of the analysis pushes us away from the agency of the governments and peoples of Central Asia and this agency is at least as important to the future as is the strategic context. I shall return to this theme in the conclusion.

My second introductory remark concerns the term “wider Europe.” The European context is only one of many ways in which we can interpret the region in strategic terms. Central Asia can also usefully be seen as part of the former Soviet space. It is geographically and, increasingly, economically part of Asia. In terms of old and new security challenges, it is strongly affected by processes originating in South Asia and Afghanistan.

As for Europe itself, it has a chronic problem of defining what it is and where it ends. For example, European states can't seem to agree on whether Turkey is part of Europe, even though it borders directly on the EU, or, for that matter, what the Europe is that Turkey might or might not be part of.¹ My general point here is that, in thinking about political and strategic change affecting Central Asia, the European lens is neither the only, nor necessarily the most promising lens to look through.

Since we are talking about 20 years (which takes us back to Soviet times), I suppose the place to start is with the collapse of the USSR in December 1991. By and large, everything I have to say follows from that one event. The collapse opened a huge number of previously closed questions and challenges for the region: national identity, sovereignty and statehood, interstate relations within and beyond the region, direct participation in the global economy. Building a state and learning the ways of statehood are not easy at the best of times. The challenge for Central Asia's states was particularly daunting, since the borders they inherited were arbitrarily defined and did not correspond to ethnic identities. And they had to build their states in the midst of a profound economic collapse; the Soviet economy crumbled away, and the infrastructural basis for integration into alternative markets was rudimentary.

Given the substantial interdependence of the states of the region across a broad range of areas including water, energy, transport, production and trade, as well as the very imperfect match between territoriality and ethnicity, the development of logics of co-operation was essential, but difficult. Central Asia's states also had to work out their relations with contiguous states, both Russia and neighbours outside the former Soviet context (e.g. China and Iran), in a region whose structure had not yet emerged. There was also the matter of how to develop policies and relations with states and organizations in the broader international system.

Concerning Russia, this was a two-way street. Just as Central Asian states had no record of, and little expertise in, relations with an independent Russia, so Russia too was faced with the huge challenge of sorting out what its strategy and policy towards its former Soviet neighbours would be.

¹ For a recent discussion of these debates in Germany, see *ESI Newsletter 4/2010* (21 October, 2010), and *ESI, The Great Debate: Turks, Integration, and Islam in Germany, 2004-2010*, <http://www.thegreatdebate.eu/>.

Farther afield, Western and Central European states, China and the United States all lacked a strategic perspective or a developed policy towards the former Soviet space as a whole.

This leads me to a second politico-strategic change of relevance to Central Asia — the reimagining and restructuring of major European regional institutions. I have in mind NATO, the EU, and the CSCE/OSCE. I shall focus primarily on the first two.

The re-design of key European institutions is also a very complex topic, and my treatment of it is very thin. NATO was a Cold War alliance, the basic purpose of which was to deter the USSR from attacking Western Europe, and, less convincingly, to defend Western Europe if deterrence failed. Realist theory predicts that states co-operate in security matters when they face a common threat. It follows that when the threat disappears so too does the structure of co-operation. In the early 1990s, many predicted that NATO would die. It didn't.

Instead, it reinvented itself in two ways. First, it reached out to the USSR and the members of the Warsaw Pact to co-operate on common security challenges, to deepen military contacts and to establish regular diplomatic liaison. This initial initiative was rapidly followed by the establishment of the North Atlantic Cooperation Council and the Partnership for Peace, and then in 1995 by agreement on the principle of and the criteria for enlargement.² In other words, NATO reinvented itself as a vehicle to assist in the spread of common security in Central and South-Eastern Europe. The underlying institutional logic here was well put by, I think, Ron Asmus (paraphrasing Prince Gorchakov): NATO must grow or die.

I have no doubt that enlargement enhanced the security of new members, not least by requiring aspiring members to resolve outstanding territorial and ethnic disputes by peaceful means. In addition, the implicit democracy conditionality in NATO policy may have accelerated positive political change in aspiring members. The cost, regrettably, was a gradual alienation of the Russian Federation from the Alliance, and, arguably the beginning of a new split in the so-called common European security space. The implications of this outcome are not yet clear for wider Europe, but they may in time be profound, as Georgia found in August of 2008.

The second was a functional reinvention. While retaining its traditional collective defence mission, NATO embraced non-Article 5 operations — in the first instance the Petersberg Principles.³ This laid the basis for NATO responses in Bosnia-Herzegovina in 1995 and Kosovo in 1999. In addition, NATO widened its geographical scope of operations. Although the Alliance refused a substantial role in the second Iraq War, it accepted one in the context of the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in Afghanistan. This brought substantial NATO forces to the doorstep of Central Asia.

Third, NATO's and the US's engagement in Afghanistan gave both reason for enhanced strategic engagement in Central Asia itself. Engagement was a product of one of the most significant strategic challenges of the past decade — terrorism. Central Asian bases in Uzbekistan and Kyrgyzstan were important in staging the operation. Overland routes across the Caucasus and Central Asia have become increasingly important to supply allied forces in Afghanistan. Instability in Central Asia (internal or spilling out of Afghanistan) can interfere with security of supply.⁴

Looking into the future, the US and NATO regional presence is a product of a particular conflict, rather than evidence of substantial long-term change. If the conflict is resolved or dies away, or if NATO allies' role in it declines, one might expect the profile of NATO *vis-à-vis* Central Asia to decline. There is also good reason to ask just how sustainable NATO's global outreach is, given the experience in Afghanistan, European publics' disillusionment with the operation and the deepening debt and spending crunch in Europe.

The American war effort, likewise, is not going particularly well and the Obama Administration is clearly looking for the exit from the conflict. Taken in conjunction with the global economic crisis, these struggles have created an unsustainable burden on the United States. The US budget is a mess, accumulating debt is a real problem, the military is overstretched. Americans (right and left)

2 NATO, "Study on NATO Enlargement" (Brussels: NATO, September 1995).

3 The Petersberg Principles were formulated by the Western European Union. See WEU, "The Petersberg Declaration" (19 June 1992). Available at: http://www.assembly-weu.org/en/documents/sessions_ordinaires/key/declaration_petersberg.php.

4 The concern over spillover is also shared by China and Russia. See: SCO, "Tashkent Declaration of SCO Heads of State Council Meeting" (11 June 2010), paragraph. 8. Available at: <http://www.sectsco.org/EN/show.asp?id=224>.

appear to be increasingly unhappy with the international activism of the Bush area. This adds up to the likelihood that the United States will take a narrower and more selective (self-interested) view of engagement in global politics. Selectivity probably involves increasing focus on the Pacific Basin rather than Europe, narrow or wider. The likely result is a reduction in US engagement both globally and regionally in Central Asia. The space that will be left, along with doubts about the durability of NATO's engagement, creates another strategic challenge for wider Europe: who and what will fill the gap?

This leads me back to the question of European institutions, and to the EU. The collapse of communism and the Soviet Union coincided with the Community's growing aspiration to become a Union, with a larger political dimension. Faced with the post-Soviet institutional vacuum, what was the response of the organization to be? Again, there were two dimensions. One was organizational and the other was in policy towards the newly opened states of Central and also wider Europe. In organizational terms, and reflecting not only the end of the Cold War, but also the internal logic of integration in Europe (spillover), efforts redoubled to enhance the political dimension of the community. In the early 1990s, it transformed itself into a "Union" with significant, although contested, aspirations to evolving into a political and security organization. The Maastricht Treaty, in addition to laying the basis for a common currency, added two new pillars to the activities of the body: foreign and security policy, and justice and law.⁵ The effort to develop European military forces ensued and in the Berlin Plus process, the EU agreed with NATO on access to NATO-committed assets for EU operations. Without commenting on the Lisbon Treaty, I think it is fair to say that the EU is attempting to establish itself as a regional and global power in its own right. How this works out remains to be seen (not least because of remaining sensitivities about state sovereignty), but it is possible that these organizational developments will fundamentally reorder the strategic landscape of Europe, or at least its western part.

Turning to "eastern policy," the EU decided to move into the new space reasonably quickly with the PHARE programme for Central and South-Eastern Europe, the focus evolving into assistance in meeting EU accession criteria. By 2007, all the states of Central Europe and the Eastern Balkans had acceded to the Union. With completion of the second round of EU enlargement in 2007, the issue of policy towards those states in the former Soviet space was posed more starkly, not least because of the increasing number of EU member states who bordered on the region and who were closely associated with it.

The increasingly disaggregated EU approach had several dimensions. The European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP) took in Ukraine, Belarus, Moldova, and the three South Caucasian republics. The ENP and the later Eastern Partnership (2009) contemplated the deepening of bilateral relations between these states and the EU, including the possibility of reasonably comprehensive free trade and liberalized visa arrangements, leaving the question of eventual membership open-ended. Russia was covered by a separate bilateral arrangement and the two parties continue to negotiate on a replacement for the EU-Russia Partnership and Co-operation Agreement (PCA) that expired in 2004.

The centrepiece of the EU's outreach to Central Asia is the Central Asia Strategy, which is complemented by bilateral PCAs. These could all be discussed in detail, but I don't think there is much point. The commitment of resources in the Central Asia Strategy is about 750 million euros over five years, or 145 million per year. This is a modest amount relative to regional GNP. To take one example, it is less than one thousandth of the GDP of the region's largest economy, Kazakhstan. Moreover, the EU's strongest leverage with partners has been the prospect of membership. That prospect is not meaningfully present with respect to the Neighbourhood, let alone Central Asia. The agreements with Central Asian countries themselves are long on principle but modest in substance. In a general sense, one sees in both NATO and EU approaches a west-to-east tapering off in both interest and commitment.

One exception lies in the energy security field. Energy security became a major preoccupation of EU planners in the middle of the last decade, in view of the considerable dependence on Russian energy supply, and interruptions in Russian supply through Ukraine and Belarus in the latter half of the 2000s. In this context, the EU has been promoting a southern gas route (NABUCCO) to supplement

5 "Text of the Maastricht Treaty" (7 February, 1992). Available at: <http://www.eurotreaties.com/maastrichttext.html>.

the Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan (BTC) and Baku-Tbilisi-Erzurum (BTE) oil and gas pipelines crossing the Southern Caucasus. The process has been protracted due to difficulties of ensuring adequate input of gas, and of negotiating routes and transit fees, along with competition from alternative proposals such as Russia's and ENI's South Stream. However, in the past year several developments (not least a reasonably clear statement by the President of Turkmenistan that the country wishes to feed gas into NABUCCO, and the agreement involving the European Investment Bank, the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and the International Finance Corporation to launch a funding process for the project in September 2010) suggest growing seriousness. When combined with the 2009 opening of the Turkmenistan-China gas pipeline, the development of NABUCCO could amount to a substantial reduction in Russian control of gas transit from the Central Asian region.

Speaking of China, twenty years ago the Chinese economy was about three fifths the size of Russia's in 1990 US dollars. The country had very limited trade and investment in the region and no political or strategic engagement. In 2009, China's GNP was over four times the size of Russia's.⁶ As it has grown, its need for the resources of Central Asia has expanded considerably. China is a deeply involved player in the region's politics (bilaterally and through the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation) and economically. For example, according to EU data, China is now Kazakhstan's primary state trading partner (imports plus exports), accounting in 2009 for over 20% of Kazakhstan's total trade, ahead of Russia at 18%.⁷ In Turkmenistan, in 2009 China is second after Turkey.⁸ This trend will continue as China penetrates regional import markets and deepens its involvement as an investor and importer of Central Asian resources.

In some respects Chinese activity cuts across elements of Russian foreign and foreign economic policy in the region. So far the potential tension resulting from Chinese economic penetration has been well managed by Russia and China. Whether that will remain possible in the future is an open question.

This brings me finally to Russia. In the 1990s, Russia appeared to be well on its way to failure as a state. Many Russians had aspirations to dominate the former Soviet space, and Russia had good strategic reasons to seek to maintain a position of predominance there. However, it lacked the capacity to do so. In the last ten years, the global economic crisis notwithstanding, Russia has acquired the capacity to begin to match its aspiration as a regional power. The Russian invasion of Georgia in August 2008 highlighted its willingness to act to defend what it perceives to be its security interest in its neighbourhood.

Although the invasion was largely determined by local dynamics, it plausibly had a subsystemic logic as well. First, it was clearly related to the Russian government's unhappiness with previous rounds of NATO enlargement, and Russia's refusal to accept the prospect of NATO membership for other CIS states (the two Membership Action Plan applicants having been Ukraine and Georgia). Second, it was a reflection on the ground of Russia's claim to preponderance (special rights and duties) in the former Soviet region as a whole.

One *de facto* result, NATO's denials notwithstanding, is that enlargement further into the area is no longer on the table. The war also raised serious questions about the existing security architecture in wider Europe, an implication that the Russian Federation has taken further in its advocacy of a renegotiation of the European security framework (the Medvedev Plan).

To conclude, there are three major clusters of strategic challenges for wider Europe and in particular Central Asia. One concerns international political economy: what is the place of Central Asia in the global and regional energy security equation? How will pipelines and energy trade develop out of the current ambiguities of the EU-Russia-China triangle in this area? A second is the management of rapidly evolving Russia-China engagement in the region. People frequently talk about a great game in the region. That may or may not be a fruitful expression. If the analogy has merit, it is likely to be not in the Russia-West context, but in the Russia-China one. The third is: whither Afghanistan and what will the longer term structure of security in Central Asia be if the US and NATO reduce their level of

6 Data comparisons are drawn from World Bank, "Country Indicators: GDP Current US Dollars." <http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.CD>.

7 http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2006/september/tradoc_113406.pdf.

8 http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2006/september/tradoc_113457.pdf.

engagement? The answers to the questions depend in considerable measure on the political development of the Central Asian states themselves and on their capacity to co-operate in facing these challenges.

Professor Neil MacFarlane is the Lester B. Pearson Professor of International Relations at Oxford University, and a specialist in the regional dynamics of the former Soviet Union. He is currently spending several months as a Visiting Professor at Tbilisi State University.

Kyrgyzstan: perspectives and implications for the region

by *Martha Brill Olcott*

Kyrgyzstan is in the midst of an exciting experiment in political institution-building, but one that makes most of its neighbours and many of the country's closest international friends very nervous. The decision to introduce a parliamentary form of government is a bold but a risky step. It is also a potentially destabilizing one given that nearly one out of every two eligible voters chose not to vote in the 10 October election.¹ Unless a government of national unity composed of representatives from all five political parties awarded seats in the legislature, the "majority bloc" that will choose the government will be representing the interests of a minority of Kyrgyzstan's population.

This creates a potentially dangerous situation in the country, which could be manipulated by political leaders who are not included in the government, or whose parties did not reach the five percent threshold of eligible voters and so failed to gain representation in the parliament. This risk will be amplified if the "majority bloc" includes none of the parties that prefer a presidential system to a parliamentary one. This might lead the "pro-presidential" parties to join with the excluded parties who also favour constitutional change.

Regardless of its makeup, the new government will be under a great deal of pressure from the Kyrgyz population to keep utility prices low (rate hikes being one of the reasons for former President Kurmanbek Bakiyev's ouster) while delivering new economic opportunities. While the international community is offering Kyrgyzstan's government increased developmental aid in addition to humanitarian assistance for the three southern oblasts affected by inter-ethnic violence last June, this will not lead to any short-term economic turnaround.

The government will also need to find ways to stimulate the healing of inter-ethnic tensions, and this will be a growing challenge unless the new government is able to successfully introduce policies of national consolidation. These themes were underdeveloped during the recent election campaign. Efforts by the international community to introduce projects designed to heal local wounds will not be sufficient if the will of local politicians is not there.

The international community will face difficult choices if civil order does not hold in Kyrgyzstan, and may not be as unified as they were in June, when no outside parties were willing to send troops into the country. This time, some countries might be willing to consider such a step, especially if they thought this might facilitate the restoration of a presidential form of government. In the face of such actions international unanimity might be stressed. The OSCE Summit will provide the chance for a thoroughgoing discussion of what happened in Kyrgyzstan in June, and what efforts can be made to prevent its repetition in an inclusive manner that engages Kyrgyzstan's new government.

Kyrgyzstan and its new government

The ouster of Bakiyev left a political void in the country which the introduction of a parliamentary system of government is intended to help fill. But there is a real risk that the kind of parliamentary system chosen will lead to further fragmentation of political power given the fledgling nature of most

¹ The final election results released on 1 November 2010 by Kyrgyzstan's Central Election Commission for the five (out of a total 29) parties that passed the 5% threshold to win seats in parliament: Ata Jurt 8.47%, SDPK 7.83%, Ar-Namys 7.57%, Respublica 6.93%, Ata-Meken 5.49%. Voter turnout was 55.31%.

of the country's political parties and the rules under which the election was conducted. Normally, parliamentary systems rely on well-developed political parties with clear platforms that elect disciplined members as parliamentary deputies. All of these factors contribute to the orderly functioning of parliament. While most of their leaders are experienced political figures, none of the political parties that competed in the October election in Kyrgyzstan have any experience in governing, most lack clear political platforms and they generally ran with disparate lists of candidates whose long-term loyalty as parliamentary deputies cannot be assured.

The best-case scenario is that a parliamentary system will lead to a government which has popular confidence. This could most easily be obtained through a government of national consolidation or unity in which all five political parties that were seated in the new parliament co-operate in the naming of a government. Such a government would have the best chance of pursuing potentially unpopular economic policies that offer the greatest opportunity for medium and long-term economic development. It would also be the best guarantor of the integrity of the new constitution, as it would effectively deny those groups who failed to pass the five percent barrier potential allies from parliament.

But there has been little evidence over the last three weeks to suggest that such a government might be in the offing. Instead the division between the political leadership who took power after Bakiyev was ousted and those who prefer a presidential to a parliamentary system appears to have hardened. And President Roza Otunbaeva's own preference appears to be that the political groups that were in opposition to President Bakiyev should be given the opportunity to form the new government as these were her long-time political allies.

On a positive note, it does seem likely that a coalition will be formed quickly, once the parliament meets on 5 November. This will sharply reduce the risk that another election will need to be held before the presidential election, which is scheduled for October 2011. Given that 29 parties contested in the election, there was good reason to fear that the political fragmentation would be so great that no coalition could be formed.

The most likely political alliance, that of SDPK, Ata Meken and Respublica, will have the advantage of being composed of the two parties (SDPK and Ata Meken) that are considered the heroes of the April 2010 revolution, and that are most committed to the advancement of a parliamentary democracy in Kyrgyzstan. But their partner, Respublica, has no real political ideology, and their deputies may prove more unpredictable, putting the long-term viability of the coalition at risk.

An even worse scenario is that powerful political groups will opt to go into opposition in preparation for the October 2011 presidential election, and will try to obstruct the functioning of the parliament by making the passage of legislation difficult. The likelihood of this scenario is increased if both Ar-Namys and Ata Zhurt are excluded from a governing coalition.

Both parties favour a presidential system over a parliamentary one, but their exclusion from the government could put the new constitutional order at risk. Ar-Namys leader Feliks Kulov has gone on record with his opposition to the current parliamentary system — and to the parliamentary system in general — and has stated his own leadership ambitions. It is also made more likely by the fact that Ata Zhurt got more votes than any other party, and its leadership favours the old political order over the new one. Ata Zhurt has also been tied to strong Kyrgyz nationalist sentiments in southern Kyrgyzstan, suggesting that they could be a dangerous enemy of a new government that would exclude them.

These parties enjoy the support of Butun Kyrgyzstan. Butun Kyrgyzstan, also a critic of the parliamentary system, failed to pass the five percent threshold as a result of the Central Election Commission decision to include all the additions to the voting rolls in the total used to calculate the minimum vote required. They too are strong in the south, and reject the legitimacy of the elections entirely.

These three parties could form a troublesome opposition which would at best try to use any weakness in the governing coalition to their advantage in the presidential election, with an eye to modifying the constitution in its aftermath. At worst, they might seek to use any popular protests that develop into the opportunity for a bloodless *coup d'état*. Moreover there may be groups within the Russian political establishment, and possibly even in Uzbekistan and in Kazakhstan, that will root for them to succeed.

The events in Kyrgyzstan have called into question the effectiveness of international and multilateral security agreements as well as bilateral accords

The international community has been keenly interested in diminishing the risk of ethnic violence in Kyrgyzstan, and has been relatively successful in using diplomacy to this end. The Kazakh Chairmanship of the OSCE proved timely in this regard, as it interjected an actor that was generally trusted by almost all of Kyrgyzstan's political leadership, and the Kazakh interlocutors had good understanding of the Kyrgyz political climate.

The challenge for Kazakhstan, though, has been one of multiple roles, reconciling its obligations as Chair of the OSCE with its need to protect its own national security. The Kazakhs closed the border with Kyrgyzstan to try to meet the latter, but in doing so they angered all sectors of Kyrgyz society and the elite because of the economic consequences in Kyrgyzstan.

This said, the OSCE was able to co-ordinate its diplomatic efforts with those of the UN (through the UN Secretary-General special envoy Ambassador Miroslav Jenča and his office of preventive diplomacy) and with the EU Special Representative for Central Asia, Ambassador Pierre Morel (of France). The co-ordination by all three contributed to the backing away from further violence in the south, but this has not translated into an effective strategy for preventing further confrontations.

In fact, the opposite has been true. The Kyrgyz political elite have made it very difficult for the international community to effectively investigate the causes of the June violence. Because of Kyrgyz opposition, an independent commission under the direction of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly's Special Representative for Central Asia, Kimmo Kiljunen of Finland, was unable to begin its work until after the election campaign ended, even though President Otunbayeva chose Kiljunen for the task. This commission does not have the imprimatur of either the UN or the OSCE. The Kyrgyz government also held up support for a police advisory group of 53 people, which the OSCE participating States voted to send to Kyrgyzstan, after long deliberation. The OSCE was unwilling to consider any sort of larger peace-making presence.

In general international actors have found it challenging to identify potentially successful instruments with which to intervene, save in the area of providing humanitarian and developmental assistance. There was a successful international donor conference held in late July, at which 1.1 billion dollars was pledged, but it is intended simply to spur economic reforms and help Kyrgyzstan deal with larger-than-expected budget deficits. But medium and long-term success will require jump-starting the Kyrgyz economy and a hitherto absent patience on the part of the Kyrgyz population, and the delivery of assistance will be contingent on the preservation of order in the southern parts of the country.

Good intentions notwithstanding, there has been unwillingness on the part of most major actors to take risks in Kyrgyzstan, be they human, financial and in the case of neighbouring states, that of domestic backlash. And this has helped shape what has in reality been a rather anaemic international response to the June violence.

The events in southern Kyrgyzstan pointed up the weakness of some of the multilateral organizations that declined to intervene. This was particularly true of the Collective Security Treaty Organization (CSTO), a Russian-led organization that has sometimes pressed for recognition as being on equal footing with NATO. This organization declined to intervene to stop the bloodshed in southern Kyrgyzstan in June, maintaining that the ethnic unrest did not pose an external threat, this despite the fact that interim President Roza Otunbayeva had asked Russian leaders to intervene. Moscow responded that the violence was an internal affair that the Kyrgyz leadership had to handle itself.

Russia's inaction calls into question the reliability of bilateral agreements signed with the Russian Federation, and it also severely diminishes the potential role of the CSTO in providing security guarantees to its participating states. The unrest in southern Kyrgyzstan also pointed up the potential risk of deploying a multinational CSTO force. Part of the reluctance that member states had about deployment was that the presence of troops themselves could create new kinds of inter-ethnic disturbances within the proposed theatre of operations. This certainly could have been the case if Uzbek, Kazakh or Tajik troops had been sent into Kyrgyzstan, and Russia was unwilling to assume

the burden of protecting Kyrgyzstan's citizens on its own. Such a military campaign would likely have been unpopular within Russia. The Kremlin's refusal to engage also raises questions about the adequacy of Russia's own forward deployment capacities, and whether in the face of the ongoing security threats in the north Caucasus region Russia is able to engage successfully on other fronts.

The unrest in June also showed the limitations of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) in the area of security. Co-operation to mitigate the shared security risks of member organizations is one of the justifications for the existence of the organization, but its behaviour during Kyrgyzstan's crisis suggests that the role it will play for the near future at least is that of a discussion forum for top government officials of the member states. While this in itself is worthwhile, the SCO should best be viewed as a source of confidence building, and possibly even conflict prevention, but not as a conflict-mitigating organization.

There was no obvious role that NATO could have been called upon to play during the June unrest, even in the atmosphere of high-level decisions in Washington and in Moscow that the US and Russia would co-operate in trying to mitigate conflict in Kyrgyzstan. To date the spirit of co-operation between the US and Russia on questions of Central Asian policy has yet to be translated into an effective bilateral policy for solving Kyrgyzstan's short, medium and long-term problems.

This spirit of co-operation is likely to facilitate future bilateral discussions between the US and Kyrgyzstan on the future of the US transit centre at Manas, as it means that Russia will likely not play the role of behind-the-scenes spoiler. But it does not ensure that the new Kyrgyz government won't itself behave in an obdurate fashion. If Bishkek chooses to act in this way Moscow is unlikely to lobby for a change in behaviour. Moreover the "reset button" in US-Russian relations is unlikely to modify Russian behaviour if the Kremlin perceives that a low-risk (in terms of loss of life) strategy is available to restore presidential rule in Kyrgyzstan.

Russian leaders, and Kazakh and Uzbek ones, believe that a parliamentary system of government is by definition a risk to security, not only in Kyrgyzstan but for the region more generally. They fear that such a system is inherently unstable in countries with weak political parties. However, the notion that they fear that the new Kyrgyz government will serve as a successful model for their own opposition groups seems to be largely a figment of the oppositions' imagination.

Implications of events in Kyrgyzstan for regional security

In the long run the introduction of a parliamentary system of government may well contribute positively to the security environment in the Central Asian region by convincing leaders of neighbouring states that each country in the region should be free to figure out their own form of government and such experimentation will not have a negative influence on the security of their neighbours.

However, the Kyrgyz government must recognize that the security environment in the region as a whole has been adversely affected by the June violence, rather than by their choice of a parliamentary democracy.

Even small attacks, like we have seen in Tajikistan, can be very destabilizing, and a few hundred new fighters shifts the balance. While the recent fighting in Tajikistan need not be linked to that in Kyrgyzstan, the perception that the international community is fully occupied in Kyrgyzstan will be a motivating factor for opposition groups.

Disaffection on the part of Kyrgyzstan's Uzbek population can destabilize the political environment in the Uzbek part of the Ferghana Valley, because talk of secession bandied about by Kyrgyz politicians could encourage even small groups of disaffected elite in Uzbekistan.

Large shifts of Uzbek populations from Kyrgyzstan to Uzbekistan would be destabilizing in the latter. So too might be the departure of small groups of disaffected young Uzbeks who have left for training in jihadist camps in Afghanistan and Pakistan. When their training is complete they could serve to destabilize the environment not only in Kyrgyzstan but in Tajikistan and in Uzbekistan.

Kazakh-Kyrgyz relations have also become more complicated because of Astana's institution of tighter border controls, which came at the same time as new trade restrictions were introduced. The

latter were the result of the changes in Kazakhstan's trade regime caused by the country's entrance into a customs union with Russia and Belarus.

Since April there have been competing narratives developed to describe what happened in Kyrgyzstan, influenced by whether one is for or against the decision to substitute a parliamentary form of government in place of Kyrgyzstan's earlier presidential system. The distance between the competing narratives grew after the June violence, both between competing Kyrgyz factions, and between how Kyrgyz politicians depict these events and how the outside community views them.

The OSCE Summit should seek to address the discord between the discourse on what occurred within Kyrgyzstan last April and last June inside and outside the country. For Kyrgyzstan's politicians these events are of internal concern, and they approach them as a state-building challenge. But many of the narratives being used inside Kyrgyzstan could serve to exacerbate inter-ethnic tensions within the country, and these are a legitimate source of OSCE concern.

What happens within Kyrgyzstan has implications for all of the neighbouring states. Kyrgyzstan's leaders cannot let their preoccupation with their own domestic challenges blind them to their greater international responsibilities. Given the role that the international community is playing to help rebuild Kyrgyzstan, there is no reason why OSCE participating States should be shy about pointing this out, especially now that the election campaign is over.

The upcoming Summit of the OSCE would do well to evaluate the plusses and minuses of the various responses that were made in the wake of the April, and especially the June events in Kyrgyzstan, and hope that a detailed examination of what was and was not done, and why, will contribute to an ability to be more effective should further problems arise in the future.

While not anticipating further unrest in Kyrgyzstan, or elsewhere, the OSCE Summit must offer a realistic assessment of the challenges that may lie ahead, especially as NATO considers winding down in Afghanistan. As an Afghan government begins to try to assert more control over its country, peace and stability in Central Asia needs to become more of a priority. Drug trafficking and criminalization of the economy of Afghanistan have been destabilizing factors in Central Asia, especially in Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan. These problems will not be solved solely through viewing them through the lens of Afghanistan. We need to find ways to engage with these questions more effectively in Central Asia as well, or else withdrawal from Afghanistan will simply mean the beginning of a new, more dangerous phase in Central Asia in general and in Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan in particular, and could pose great risks for the new and still fragile Kyrgyz system of government.

Dr. Martha Brill Olcott is a Senior Associate with the Russia and Eurasia Programme at the Carnegie Endowment in Washington, D.C., and specializes in the problems of transitions in Central Asia and the Caucasus, as well as the security challenges in the Caspian region more generally.

Afghanistan, redefining our world

By Andres Ilves

Most contemporary national boundaries are quite arbitrary. Border posts and barbed wire split tribes, languages and co-religionists. This is certainly evident when looking at a map of Africa, for example. The independent states that emerged, in the latter part of the 20th century, from the hegemony of far-off European colonial powers have generally been saddled with state borders that reflect not a natural separation of distinct peoples, but rather the political exigencies of rival European empires carving up spheres of influence at the Berlin Conference a century before.

In Europe itself, many borders, especially in the central and eastern parts of the continent, were similarly created in the aftermath of the collapse of empire — in this case, the Austro-Hungarian, Russian and Soviet.

For the Central Asian states and Afghanistan, the curiously straight lines running through the desert around the Aral Sea, the serpentine frontiers carving up over 10 million people in the Ferghana Valley among three countries, and the mostly invisible Durand Line separating the Pashtuns of Afghanistan from the Pashtuns of Pakistan, are the legacy of Soviet surveyors and of Sir Mortimer Durand, the illogic of which tens of millions of people in that region must cope with to this day.

When the Helsinki Final Act was signed in the summer of 1975, perhaps the best-known, and most controversial, aspect of the document had to do with the recognition of post-war state borders. The international boundaries that had been imposed on central and eastern Europe at Yalta and Potsdam were to remain frozen in perpetuity. As the treaty made clear, “the participating States regard as inviolable all one another’s frontiers as well as the frontiers of all States in Europe.”

To the 35 European and North American heads of state and government assembled in the Finnish capital three and a half decades ago, the only matters of real significance to be addressed by the then-CSCE were relations between the two Cold War power blocs, and the easing of tensions among the superpowers of the time. The US and Canada aside, it was a distinctly European affair, from its name — it was, after all, the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe — to its concerns. This was about the Oder-Neisse line between Germany and Poland, not about the Durand Line between Afghanistan and Pakistan.

As far as neighbouring countries were concerned, statements were received from the “non-participating Mediterranean States” of Algeria, Egypt, Israel, Morocco, Syria and Tunisia, but countries such as Afghanistan, bordering on the far end of the Soviet Union, were of scant significance.

Afghanistan, simply put, didn’t matter to Europeans in 1975. English-language dictionaries actually list the term “Afghanism”, denoting an interest in obscure and distant places at the expense of paying attention to local problems. To quote an academic speech delivered in California in 1955, “Afghanism, as you know, is the practice of referring always to some remote country, place, person or problem when there is something that ought to be taken care of near at home that is very acute.”¹

In the world of Helsinki in 1975, this would certainly have been an apt phrase. Afghanistan then was a relatively peaceful and far-off place, adjusting to a bloodless palace coup two years before, in which its king had been overthrown by his brother-in-law while on a trip to Europe. Ironically, considering the events that were eventually to unfold, for half a century — from the late 1920s to the late 1970s — Afghanistan was in fact one of the most peaceful countries in Asia.

Of course, in the bifurcated world of the aftermath of the Second World War, truly non-aligned countries were few and far between. In the competition for influence in South Asia, Afghanistan’s fate came to be drawn into the East-West conflict as the Cold War, often fought in the shadows of the

¹ “The Sources of National Strength,” *Engineering and Science*, May 1955.

globe, came to find yet another flashpoint in the mountains and deserts that lay squarely in the no-man's land between the USSR, China, Pakistan and Iran.

Viewed as a strategic object, not so much for control as to prevent others from drawing it into their orbit and thereby achieving a position of advantage, Afghanistan benefited from a generous degree of foreign largesse in the post-war era, as the US and the USSR vied for influence there and poured in hundreds of millions of dollars in assistance.

The pro-Soviet *coup d'état* in Kabul in April 1978, followed by dramatic and hugely unpopular social changes forced on a largely unwilling population by the new Marxist regime, in short order led to widespread opposition, unrest and ultimately armed resistance. Faced with the prospect of "losing" a client state, Leonid Brezhnev sent 80,000 Soviet soldiers to invade sovereign, neighbouring Afghanistan in December 1979, launching a nine-year war that would cost Moscow thousands of casualties and, ultimately, its empire.

The cost to Afghanistan was infinitely greater. The Soviet occupation of Afghanistan left millions of Afghans killed or maimed. Millions more — some one third of the pre-war population of the country — found themselves living in squalor and uncertainty as refugees. Eventually one in every two refugees on earth was an Afghan, driven out by the Soviet invasion and its aftermath. The country was laid waste by the occupation and war, and has never had an opportunity to recover. The quotidian reminder of the Soviet legacy in Afghanistan are the 10 million land mines they left, claiming Afghan limbs and lives every day.

As the CSCE began its transformation into the OSCE with the signing of the Paris Charter in 1990, the Soviet Union was crumbling, and the Afghan client regime that had been installed by Moscow was struggling for survival. Not long thereafter, that regime was replaced by a government of the victorious Mujahidin, whose leaders then dragged the country into a savage civil war as they jockeyed for power. After years of chaos and occupation, battered Afghanistan finally collapsed, exhausted, into the embrace of the Taliban, who imposed order through brutality in a reign of terror over what remained of Afghanistan's numb population.

Next door, the former Soviet Central Asian states (Moscow, it might be noted, viewed Central Asia as only including the Uzbek, Kyrgyz, Turkmen and Tajik Soviet Socialist Republics but not the Kazakh) faced challenges of a different sort after achieving independence in 1991. There were stops and starts during the 1990s in the transition to independent countries, and Tajikistan endured a particularly difficult civil war, but there was nothing on the order of the chaos that obtained in Afghanistan.

There has been, instead, a certain stability, after a fashion. At the time of the signing of the Paris Charter in November 1990, the president of the then-Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic was Islam Karimov, and the president of the Kazakh SSR was Nursultan Nazarbayev, though of course they were not signatories in Paris as their countries were not yet independent. Twenty years later, these two largest countries in the former Soviet Central Asia are still led by the same two individuals. Afghanistan, on the other hand, has been through a dizzying series, not just of leaders, but of systems of government in the last 20 years, from Democratic Republic under the communist regime, to Islamic State under the Mujahidin, to Islamic Emirate under the Taliban, to Interim Authority, Transitional Administration, and finally Islamic Republic since December of 2001.

Central Asia has been the focal point of invasions and titanic struggles for power for millennia. From Alexander the Great to the Persians, Genghis Khan to Tamerlane, the advent of Islam to the arrival of Russian colonizers: conquerors, cultures and peoples have marched, fought and settled across Central Asia. The pressure has come from all directions.

One of Afghanistan's greatest misfortunes has been to be viewed not as an entity in itself, but as a buffer zone. As the Russian Empire pushed inexorably south and the British Empire moved north on the Indian subcontinent, Afghanistan became the ground that neither empire occupied, and in fact its borders came to be explicitly intended to prevent the two rival European powers from meeting in Asia — thus the origins of the thin sliver of the Wakhan Corridor in Afghanistan's northeast, in some places a mere 10 kilometres wide.

The Soviet invasion, occupation and the ensuing decades of war have left a devastated Afghanistan today facing all manner of horrors. According to the World Health Organization, an Afghan born today has a life expectancy of approximately 40 years. One in four Afghan babies will die before the age of five; an Afghan child surviving beyond the age of five only has a 30 percent likelihood of ever learning how to read. Afghanistan is relentlessly battered by some of nature's most extreme challenges, including famine, drought, earthquakes, locusts and an extraordinary host of diseases. Afghans face an ever-present danger from epidemics and outbreaks of polio, tuberculosis, typhoid, malaria and other diseases normally easily prevented or curbed, but less easily so in a country that has been so utterly destroyed.

In the absence of almost any state-level capacity to address these problems, and with an insurgency raging in much of the country — an insurgency bent on ensuring that such capacity cannot be built — civil society plays an important role in Afghanistan. Not just NGOs, but media, educators, medical professionals and myriad other players try to plug the gaps where they can.

Nine years after the fall of the Taliban, it is difficult to predict Afghanistan's political future. What is clear is that in the post-Taliban era there are three political struggles taking place on parallel levels, and although they overlap and converge, we do well to separate them:

- ***The fundamental battle for control of the Afghan state:*** the insurgency — the “Taliban”, to use shorthand — and its fight against the Kabul government and what the latter represents to them. Although it is clear that Afghanistan's future is firmly Islamic, this is the battle to determine whether the country will remain an Islamic republic or return to some form of ‘emirate’, with a strict interpretation of Islam as under the Taliban.
- ***The political battle for power in the Afghan government:*** the question of who will govern in the traditional sense, as determined by elections and the normal give-and-take of politics in a parliamentary democracy, albeit a flawed one for now. It is the inspiring competition in which millions of voters are free to choose among thousands of candidates vying for a few hundred seats in the Parliament — and the tedious, tortuous struggle to ensure that those elections are fair and transparent.
- ***The international battle for influence over Afghanistan.*** As noted before, whether as a buffer zone or as a strategic pawn, Afghanistan is on the agenda of competing international powers, who are not necessarily even its immediate neighbours. The United States, Europe, Russia, India and China all claim a strategic stake in the outcome of the aforementioned battles for Afghanistan's future, and they are vying for influence in a future Afghanistan that is at peace.

The lines between these differing fields of competition are not clear-cut, of course. The insurgents are increasingly seen to play a political role, and warlords past and present engage on both a military and a political level.

In the post-Soviet era, Afghanistan occupies a different neighbourhood from before, one in which Russia is no longer next door. Where the Amu Darya River once separated the Soviet Union from Afghanistan, since 1991 not only does Russia no longer border on Afghanistan, it no longer even shares a border with any of the three Central Asian countries — Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan and Tajikistan — that now constitute Afghanistan's northern neighbours.

Most analyses of these Central Asian countries' relationship to their southern neighbour revolve round three general areas: trade and transport, opium and ideologically extreme movements. Trade has grown between the north of Afghanistan and the countries across the border; by one estimate², income in Balkh province has increased from some five million dollars in 2004 to 115 million dollars in 2010, largely because of cross-border trade. The proposed trans-Afghanistan pipeline, rooted in the controversial history of Unocal and Taliban-era negotiations, continues to be an eventual prospect, intended to transport natural gas from Turkmenistan through Afghanistan, on to Pakistan and neighbouring India.

Some 90 percent of the world's opium derivatives have their origins in Afghanistan. Much of the opium is transported through Central Asia, although Iran and Pakistan are important routes as well.

2 Cited in 'With Security, Business Booms In Mazar-e Sharif', Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, 24 September 2010. http://www.rferl.org/content/With_Security_Business_Booms_In_Mazare_Sharif/2167252.html

Finally, the activities of such movements as Hizb ut-Tahrir and the Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan (IMU) are often cited as evidence that there is a transfer of extremist ideology and its armed adherents across the northern border of Afghanistan — in both directions.

As for Afghanistan's neighbours to the south and west, Pakistan and Iran's respective relationships with Afghanistan will likely play the most significant role for the foreseeable future. The Pakistani state has deftly moved from helping create the Taliban movement and being one of only three countries to recognize the Taliban regime to being the key front-line state in the battle against the Afghan insurgency, even as the notoriously fluid Durand Line allows for easy movement by insurgent forces and their sympathizers. Iran is a natural trade partner but also faces ongoing accusations of meddling in Afghanistan's internal affairs.

In the public mind — when it was there at all, such of course was its obscurity — and to strategists and policy makers, Afghanistan was once firmly rooted in Asia. With the Central Asian ground under Soviet Union hegemony, Afghanistan found itself in the South Asian orbit, discussed in terms of Pakistan, India and the superpowers' competition for influence on the subcontinent.

The Islamic roots of the anti-Soviet Mujahidin resistance, the nature of Taliban rule and, finally, the actions of al-Qaeda and the events of 11 September 2001 have propelled Afghanistan in both the public's and policymakers' eyes into the world of global Islam and, by extension, the Middle East. How much Afghanistan and its people — the aforementioned considerable deprivations and devastation aside — have changed as a result of the tumultuous past three decades is a matter of conjecture, and it is in any case too soon to ascertain. Yet to the rest of the world, Afghanistan has moved from being a dusty South Asian frontier state to being at the very centre of what some see as a struggle between two differing visions of the world, the traditional and the modern, the Islamic and the European, the Eastern and the Western.

So much of the world's attention to Afghanistan is thus based on an understanding of Afghanistan as a key to the resolution of global conflicts or superpower rivalries. After the Cold War had seen its final act played out in Afghanistan, during the 1990s the world turned inward and consolidated, and then the lines were redrawn for a new definition of the East-West struggle. Although that perceived competition is being fought on many levels, the actual battleground where blood is being shed is once again Afghanistan.

Throughout its history as an independent state, Afghanistan has suffered from being perceived as a strategic object, not even so much in a regional context but a global one. Thus, in fact, as the Russian and British empires fought to maintain their strategic positions *vis-à-vis* each other in Central Asia, they were ultimately doing so as far-off colonial empires occupying a local regional base from which to expand. As time passed, other powers fought proxy wars either around or in Afghanistan, and some might argue it is what is happening today.

Historians and commentators sometimes seek lessons in wars from the Afghan past, or make overwrought comparisons with bygone conflicts elsewhere. Yet we clearly live neither in the world of British General Elphinstone's retreat from Kabul in 1842, nor of US General Westmoreland and the Tet Offensive in Vietnam in 1968.

The world has redefined itself a few times since the likes of Erich Honecker, Olof Palme and Gerald Ford gathered in Helsinki 35 years ago, and even since the Paris Charter was signed two decades ago by such now-nonexistent states as Yugoslavia and the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic. Far-off Afghanistan — and the wars the world has fought over its land and people in the past few decades — has helped fundamentally reshape our definition of Asia, the Middle East and of the very notion of East and West.

Andres Ilves oversees the BBC's programming for Afghanistan. He was previously the founding director of Radio Free Afghanistan, and is chair of the board of trustees of Peace Direct, a UK-based international charity supporting local peace building initiatives in conflict zones. Ilves was educated at Princeton University in the United States. The views expressed herein are his own.

Patiently attending to details: three lessons from the past 20 years

By Maxim Ryabkov

This publication is based on papers presented by leading experts at a seminar at the OSCE Academy on 12 October 2010. There is a common theme, I believe, in these otherwise very diverse interventions, and perhaps in the overall tone of the discussion. All speakers seem to recognize that a vision of an ideologically uniform future that appeared possible 20 years ago did not in fact come to pass. The OSCE space remains, as it should, heterogeneous in many regards. Usen Suleimenov (this volume) explains how Kazakhstan's efforts contributed to positive recognition of this diversity within the Organization, but also perhaps in a wider context. The voices "east of Vienna" reflect the persistence of historical differences in cultures and approaches, and their distinction cannot be disregarded anymore or reclassified as inappropriate. If I am right with this, one could take stock of these 20 years and think of the policy consequences of this experience. I propose three ideas for this discussion:

- The last 20 years suggest that positive change in the region is going to be slow, uneven and largely dependent on domestic dynamics, with its historical and geographical embeddedness. This means that further efforts toward comprehensive security in the region will require patience, longer-term planning, and eventually greater attention to the "low politics" of education and economic development.
- Proper attention to domestic dynamics is necessary for understanding and an adequate reaction to the non-traditional threats that largely emerge from a nexus of socio-economic and identity-based cleavages. This is the lesson of the Kyrgyz crisis.
- One more lesson is that a domestic crisis can easily be amplified by external involvement, and this suggests that the international community needs to be extremely careful in imposing patterns of dependency on states in crisis.

Looking now at the last 20 years of development in the OSCE area and especially in Central Asia, one can see that the change that was heralded in the late 80s-early 90s differed from what actually happened. The reversals feared by many did not occur, nor did the positive changes happen as smoothly as many expected, and not necessarily where and for the reasons they were expected. Much of this lack of predictability had to do with lack of knowledge about the transition countries and about how textbook economics will interact with regional political economies in practice. The divergence of developmental paths from Turkmenistan to Kyrgyzstan shows how the choice of transition reflected the nation-building needs of political elites, as much as their different capacity to extract rents from available resources. As a result they differed in their transition paths, despite the approximate equality of external conditions.

Speaking about Kyrgyzstan, one could see how liberalization served illiberal interests, and political decentralization led to accumulation of power in the hands of subnational elites. There is a lot of sad irony in this, but then history does like to be ironic. Central Asia has taken diverse nation-building paths, and this divergence is predicated on a nexus of history and geography, and as such hardly falls into simple categories of success and failure. Transitions were unique and history-laden to an extent that we may not have expected.

The slowness and haphazardness of change and the diversity of routes taken by countries depending on their history and geography suggest a lesson. Development towards comprehensive

security requires a lot of patience, with greater attention to domestic structures. This change often takes generations, and is thus affected by what happens to children in school no less than by large privatization programmes. Moreover, the dynamics of domestic political interests will not allow for a linear transformation induced by well-calculated external inducement.

In this regard I would like to call attention to the issue of education, one area in which the disappearance of the Soviet Union has brought about significant changes immediately, both positive and negative. On the positive side, we see an expansion of internationally-supported opportunities for education, whether they were taken up or not. Central Asia in particular has opened up to informational flows, including access to serious scholarship to the extent it had never been open before. Unfortunately, we see that the process of using those low-cost opportunities was not unproblematic, not least due to the region's inability to stem brain drain and the shock of transition on the educational system.

Maintaining this openness and these opportunities and encouraging their proper use in the region seems to me a major way of providing a long-term sustainable impact on all other developmental efforts. It is perhaps worth remembering that education itself is an exercise in patience.

Often we neglect the role of domestic factors — issues of human security and socio-economic and identity cleavages — that may not be readily apparent to eyes focused on state-level dynamics. There is a lesson from the past that one should keep in mind. Taking a current configuration of states as if they were a given, well defined and forever the same, we risk missing those gradual changes that bring about tectonic shifts. Such was the case with the disappearance of the Soviet Union, a dramatic event indeed, and more interestingly, unpredicted. Speaking about early warning, there was none at the time, or very little. In some ways, *perestroika* was taken at face value, as a gradual reform of what was largely to remain. But subtle domestic changes pointed towards more radical transformation.

This brings me to the situation in Kyrgyzstan, and the unpredictabilities present here. The Tulip Revolution in Kyrgyzstan was mistakenly placed in the context of a series of “coloured revolutions”, itself a very problematic classification. Equally misleading may be viewing the current crisis in Kyrgyzstan solely in the conceptual framework of the constitutional and electoral process, putting aside the ethnic and socio-economic cleavages that may at some critical junctures become decisive factors.¹ I thank Dr. Olcott for reminding us of the simple fact that poverty breeds political problems (this volume), and I should add that the issue is not only that of GDP per capita, but also of the extant patterns of employment among the Kyrgyz population. These livelihoods are not only meagre but also precarious, which affects the patterns of investment in human and social capital. Jointly with the power of local identities, this will have an impact independent of the actual purchasing power of household incomes. This all in turn impacts on political developments and eventually transpires as negative influences on regional security.

Having said that, economic grievances *per se* rarely explain regime change. Too little research has been done to assert that short-term economic fluctuations played any major role in the regime change in Kyrgyzstan. Patterns of mobilization reflect the capacity of elites to exploit grievances and dislocations, such as internal migration.² For essentially the same reason, I would be equally suspicious of light-hearted use of cultural variables, despite all the importance of identity cleavages, as they too can be instrumentalized and reinvented in the political process.

The balanced and timely reaction of the international community, and the OSCE and Kazakhstan in particular, to the crisis in Kyrgyzstan was clearly a major factor in stemming the instability. Andres Iltis (this volume) usefully reminds us of another, less positive story of the international handling of a domestic crisis. The developments in Afghanistan in late 70s show how a domestic crisis transforms into an international one, and from some point the balance of power inside the country starts being determined by the preferences of outside players. The latter have a tendency to abstract away from

1 Anna Matveeva, *Kyrgyzstan in Crisis: Permanent Revolution and the Curse of Nationalism*, Crisis States Working Papers Series No.2, September 2010.

2 See in this regard Charles Tilly, *Processes and Mechanisms of Democratization*, *Sociological Theory*, Vol. 18, No. 1 (Mar., 2000), pp. 1-16; Charles Tilly, 'Does Modernization Breed Revolution?', *Comparative Politics*, Vol. 5, No. 3, 1973, pp. 425-447.

local detail, and dress policy in ideological garb that rationalizes patterns of support and denial of support that are eventually detrimental for the country's development.

The Afghan history before the Taliban thus shows a tremendous level of responsibility on the part of the international community for what happens in such fragile states. This includes the dangers of war by proxy and also of the discourses that rationalize the imposition of regimes of dependency through aid and its withdrawal, carrot and stick, with all the mechanics of conditionality. Rubin's *The Fragmentation of Afghanistan* is a powerful reminder of this,³ especially as he shows how a rentier state in Afghanistan emerged long before the crisis of the 70s and the Soviet invasion, through the dependency on foreign aid. The lessons of the past suggest that the incentives for development may require a far subtler fine-tuning, taking into account that the autonomy of even weak states and societies *vis-à-vis* international actors has been much greater than expected. The difficulties with eradication of opium production is one such example; the complexity of fighting corruption is another. But even in less dramatic settings, the interaction of domestic and international levels suggests that understanding the uniqueness of each country's situation is key to the success of the international security agenda.

The prospects for Central Asia will thus depend on the success of the domestic processes that will benefit from a friendly, co-operative and otherwise enabling international environment. Long-term structural change and the "low politics" of education and economic development should not be sacrificed in expectation of dramatic shifts in political power configurations.

Dr. Maxim Ryabkov is the Director of the OSCE Academy. His academic interests include the interaction of ideas and interests in international public policy shifts, and international support for development in Central Asia.

3 Barnett E. Rubin, 1992, *The Fragmentation of Afghanistan: State Formation and Collapse in the International System*, (New Haven and London: Yale UP).

Annex I

Rapporteurs' report

20/20 OSCE and Central Asia: past visions, future perspectives

OSCE Bishkek Academy

Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan, 12 October 2010

Agenda

- 9.00-10.00 Welcome: Dr. Maxim Ryabkov, Director of the OSCE Academy
Message from the OSCE Chairperson-in-Office
Kazakhstan and the OSCE in 2010: Usen Suleimenov, Deputy Permanent Representative, Mission of Kazakhstan to the OSCE
20 years since the Paris Charter: Dr. Virginie Coulloudon, OSCE Spokesperson
- 10.00-11.00 Session 1: **Political and strategic changes in Central Asia**
Keynote speaker: Professor Neil MacFarlane, Oxford University
Moderator: Maxim Ryabkov
- 11.30-12.30 Session 2: **Kyrgyzstan – perspectives and implications for the region**
Keynote speaker: Dr. Martha Brill Olcott, Carnegie Endowment
Moderator: Ambassador Andrew Tesoriere, Head of the OSCE Centre in Bishkek
- 14.30-15.30 Session 3: **Afghanistan**
Keynote speaker: Andres Ilves, BBC and Chair of Peace Direct
Moderator: Ambassador Tesoriere
- 16.00-17.00 Session 4: **Central Asia – future perspectives**
Wrap up: Maxim Ryabkov
Panel: Ambassador Andrew Tesoriere, Virginie Coulloudon
Moderator: Usen Suleimenov

Discussion

The following themes were discussed during the Q&A sessions of the seminar.

Kazakhstan's OSCE Chairmanship

With respect to Kyrgyzstan, Olcott said that Kazakhstan would play a critical role in Kyrgyzstan's economic development, which would be shadowed by security concerns. Kazakhstan did fulfil expectations as OSCE Chair and there were many pluses it brought to addressing the crisis in Kyrgyzstan as they knew the key actors.

Tesoriere also said that the familiarity Kazakhstan brought to the situation in Kyrgyzstan was crucial and proved to be a real strength in dealing with the chemistry of the situation and defusing the problem.

Suleimenov emphasized that good relations between the countries will continue, and mentioned that Kazakhstan was the first country President Otunbaeva visited after taking office. Kazakhstan has provided 11 million dollars in assistance, and will continue committing more. During the crisis it was Kazakhstan as OSCE Chair which consulted with major states about the situation, and the three Presidents of Kazakhstan, Russia and the United States which helped to facilitate the safe departure of former President Bakiyev. Suleimenov said further bloodshed would have been difficult to avoid if this had not been done.

Responding to a question on what the major threats for Kazakhstan were after becoming Chair of the OSCE, MacFarlane said that Kazakhstan showed courage in going for a Summit, and that the risk was failure to get a Summit declaration. Suleimenov pointed out that Kazakhstan's candidacy for the Chairmanship had not just been a question of national pride, but a feeling that the country could represent Central Asia and the CIS within the OSCE, and bring their values west of Vienna. If there is no political declaration at the Summit, he said, it will not be the failure of Kazakhstan or Central Asia, but rather of all 56 states.

Ryabkov said that the presentation by Kazakhstan's Chairmanship gave the opportunity to reflect on different approaches to issues of common concern, not only to recall the difference but to hear the voices we have not heard, or heard enough, and understand the multiplicity of points of view.

Suleimenov emphasized that the Chairmanship's guiding principles for the year were "Trust, Tradition, Transparency and Tolerance". The Chairmanship held a high-level conference on tolerance and non-discrimination in Almaty in June, and has actively encouraged civil society participation during the year. He emphasized that the Corfu Process represented a genuine breakthrough in increasing trust. When the Corfu Process started, the participating States said let's start listening to each other, let's stop accusing each other, and find something in common and seek consensus. The OSCE is a consultative body. It was the informal Corfu Process meetings and not the official meetings of the OSCE Permanent Council that helped Kazakhstan to put forward the idea of a Summit.

Olcott said there have been a lot of very positive accomplishments on the part of Kazakhstan's Chairmanship — it has been a totally normal chairmanship, which critics did not think it would be. With respect to other Central Asian states holding the Chairmanship, Olcott said Kazakhstan's Chairmanship proved that any country regardless of location has an international platform, as long as it had a diplomatic corps able to assume responsibility. Kazakhstan proved that it has it. Olcott said she was not sure if another state in the region had the diplomatic capacity.

Central Asia and international co-operation

Tesoriere emphasized the importance of "money", that is to say how it is allocated (or not as the case might be) to policy choices. Addressing the broad subject of Central Asia, he asked whether given the mandate of the OSCE for early warning and conflict prevention, more should be invested in Central Asia than in the Balkans, given that there are other multilateral organizations providing significant support in the Balkans and that the incentives of EU membership are serving to mitigate the risks and vulnerabilities of conflict. In conflict mitigation terms, the time has come for a rebalancing of OSCE resources from west to east. Suleimenov said that the OSCE is very committed to Central Asia, with a large part of the budget currently going to the region, and pointed out that the OSCE has centres in all five Central Asian states.

In response to a question about whether there was a Central Asian integration process and whether the EU had potential interest in this, MacFarlane commented that Central Asia was no different from other regions in the sense that trade and resources can be sources of both conflict and co-operation. It will depend on whether Central Asia can move towards an integration process, he said, but the EU has a strong declaratory EU interest in developing co-operative regimes.

Suleimenov pointed out the differing economic successes of Central Asian states since independence. In trying to raise economic and social standards in the region, one of tools proposed by Kazakhstan's President Nazarbayev is a single economic zone in the post-Soviet space and Central Asia. Kazakhstan has signed a customs union with Belarus and the Russian Federation, which other countries are welcome to join. He also pointed out other regional organizations such as the Conference on Interaction and Confidence-Building Measures in Asia (CICA), which is similar to the OSCE but for Asian countries, mainly working on politico-military and economic and environmental issues. Kazakhstan has proposed a Central Asia union and there is also a Central Asia dialogue with Japan.

Tesoriere enquired about the scope for stronger operational co-operation between international and multilateral organizations, including the OSCE, and the regional organizations in wider Central Asia. He suggested this issue could be reviewed and vitalized at the OSCE summit. MacFarlane commented that the EU and NATO have been quite active in the context of CSDF/ESDP; whether it can go further will depend on NATO and where it goes next. He expected that NATO's aspirations in the near future will be very light, with membership for Georgia and Ukraine off the table — there was no consensus before the 2008 Georgia war and there is certainly none after. NATO will have a light footprint, and it will get lighter the further east one goes. In terms of room for further institutional co-operation he observed that interfacing is complex; UN and OSCE co-operation has happened but institutions get locked into their own logics, which creates difficulty in dialogue between organizations.

Coulloudon pointed out that over the past couple of years there has been an increase of dialogue, including a high-level meeting of seven international organizations (EU, NATO, CIS, CSTO, UN, Council of Europe and CICA) plus the OSCE on the sidelines of the Almaty informal ministerial in July 2010. Also, in 2009, the OSCE's informal ministerial on the island of Corfu directly followed an informal ministerial meeting of the NATO-Russia Council and was in turn followed by an EU meeting.

She said that identity remained a problem for the Organization given its broad geographic and thematic scope. Since 1975 the CSCE/OSCE has been based conceptually on geography, east and west, but there is a problem of identity if we stick only to geography. Australia is also a partner country now. There are transnational threats, including energy security, trafficking of human beings, drug trafficking. There is a need to redefine security and to "enlarge the debate", as in this seminar.

Tesoriere underlined the tripartite approach adopted by the OSCE, EU and UN in Kyrgyzstan with their three special representatives, who spoke with one voice, had developed an action plan at an early stage and complemented each other. Kyrgyzstan remains a work in progress in terms of how large organizations can work together, not to the exclusion of regional organizations. Another aspect of the work in Kyrgyzstan is that the Centre in Bishkek has been innovative in operationally reaching out to the CIS and the CSTO in the south.

Kyrgyzstan

Tesoriere said that events in Kyrgyzstan in April and June showed how fragile domestic situations can quickly unravel and threaten wider regional security. They underscored the need for international dialogue and support on security-related issues.

Olcott emphasized that the events in Kyrgyzstan should trigger an awareness about the current security environment, that the systems that we have for regulating conflict and talking about conflict have not worked effectively here. The OSCE Summit could not be timed better for a closed-door, honest evaluation of these issues.

Olcott emphasized that no one knows what will happen in Kyrgyzstan, the situation can degenerate in multiple ways. It also depended on the maturity of Kyrgyzstan's population to accept that transition will be slow. Democracy does not make you rich, it just gives you a greater direct relationship with

government.

The maturity of Kyrgyzstan's elite is also a question — are they willing not to be part of government, are they willing to educate themselves and the population about what it takes to pull the country out of the economic situation? Lots of people understand but will they be heard? Will Kyrgyz accept the belt tightening that has to happen? The Kyrgyz are very outspoken politically but expectations are unrealistic, for example expectations for what controlling corruption means.

Regarding the donors' package for Kyrgyzstan, Olcott said that she did not think it was a generous package but rather begins or continues processes. She emphasized that talking about economic recovery in highly positive ways would be misleading. The international community cannot be the source of Kyrgyz economic recovery. Until the population and government understands the trajectory of economic development realistically there will always be a gap between public expectations and what the government can deliver, especially in a parliamentary democracy where you can turn out political leaders quickly.

Olcott said that the decision of Uzbekistan's President Karimov to open the border was critical during the Kyrgyzstan crisis as it helped to get people out. Otherwise the conflict would not have ended in three days. She said she did not believe the clash between ethnic Kyrgyz and Uzbek was inevitable and it is not inevitable that it returns, but the tension should not be underestimated. It is important to be aware that the June events were shocking, and reconciliation in the south will be slow.

Afghanistan

Ilves concluded his presentation on Afghanistan by saying that what holds Central Asia together is a common Soviet past, but that would not necessarily be the case in the future and Central Asia need not be defined only by the past.

Tesoriere remarked that Ilves had succeeded in demystifying Afghanistan, which is often viewed by outsiders in blinkered terms of Orientalism or terrorism. Ilves had graphically reminded us of the centrality of the people living in Afghanistan, the human factor.

Ryabkov said by looking at the relative recent history of Afghanistan one realizes that many of the problems stem from specific international contexts and decisions made outside the country, decisions that were not particularly good for the country itself. We have to think about our responsibility towards Afghanistan and also other countries that may become the object of decisions on the international level.

On international intervention in Afghanistan, MacFarlane commented that hostile public opinion and cuts in defence spending would certainly impact on the UK's presence in Afghanistan. It would take NATO a while to recover from its experience in Afghanistan and it would not go outside its area again for a long time. In terms of Russia and China as potential alternative international actors in Afghanistan, MacFarlane commented that the US has been talking about how Russia can assist and assumed there must be some discussion with China as well. However, Russia has already been to Afghanistan and left in defeat. The Russian government would have public opinion problems if it engaged and therefore is cautious. As China grows in economic stature and power it has been extremely cautious about any deployment in its immediate neighbourhood to avoid scaring its neighbours.

When asked what is stopping Afghan civilians from opposing the government and international forces, Ilves observed that Afghans had lived through a lot — two *coups d'état*, Soviet occupation, the Mujahidin, the Taliban and the NATO invasion — and the population is very tired. On the prospects for peace if President Karzai negotiates with the Taliban, Ilves observed that the values of the insur-

gents are very different to those of the government, and therefore it is difficult to envisage a solution.

Responding to an observation that the cultivation of opium has gone up to 800 metric tonnes per year since the Taliban fell from power, Ilves said that Afghan farmers, who produce 90 percent of the world's opium, were too often blamed. If there was no foreign demand they would grow other crops instead. Regarding lower production under the Taliban, he pointed out that that had come at a human cost and reminded participants of the brutal enforcement methods of the Taliban. It is an economic problem and without a viable state mechanism such problems will only increase.

Suleimenov pointed out that Afghanistan is one of the OSCE's 12 Partners for Co-operation. A recent workshop organized by another OSCE Partner, Thailand, with Afghan participation showed how that country has succeeded in reducing opium cultivation and this could provide lessons for Afghanistan.

On the level of success of NGOs in Afghanistan, Ilves pointed out that there are a lot of people trying to help and doing difficult work, but that questions of corruption as well as very poor conditions mean that progress is difficult.

Education

Ryabkov, commenting on the tendency to view the situation in countries from the point of view of political actors, emphasized that in Central Asia one could find a whole class of people, most of them very young, with a positive, broad and tolerant approach to political issues. Their thinking is not shaped by politically narrow notions but broad values that are also the values of the OSCE, including concern for tolerance and human rights.

This new class of people appeared because the last 20 years — apart from many strategic shifts — has also brought a lot of new educational opportunities for the region. Looking at the crisis in Kyrgyzstan, which involves a number of socio-economic dimensions, one of the positive rays of hope is that channels for education and therefore channels for dialogue have been established. Ryabkov emphasized that it was possible to speak about the problems from different angles and to disagree, as during the discussions today. That was not the case 20 years ago. We still have ethnic conflict, we still have poverty — maybe more — and we still have all these problems. But what we also have now are these educational opportunities.

Regarding perspectives for Central Asia, Ryabkov remarked that for better or worse, things change slower than we want, maybe for the better as we would maybe make more mistakes if things were easier to change. Nevertheless, one lesson might follow: when we think about development efforts in the region, we will probably require a lot of patience. This patience and readiness to wait for results, for a longer time than one, two or three years, will pay off.

Responding to a question about prospects for Afghanistan, Ilves said it was up to Afghans like the students who are receiving a good education at the OSCE Academy to work for the future of their country. He emphasized that Afghans have to decide their own future, and that there is a lot of goodwill on the part of the international community to support them in this endeavour.

Tesoriere emphasized that the issues discussed today clearly point up that there are unattended issues and problems on the near horizon. A sharper focus on the allocation and management of resources might sound mundane but, whatever Central Asia may or may not do in 20 years, the equitable and sensible management of resources was pivotal for stability and progress.

Finally, there needs to be an emphasis on people. Achievement has to work for people. Tesoriere concluded by saying he did not know what the vision for the next 20 years would be, but wider peer

exchange helped inform good decisions and was needed. It is one of the great qualities of the OSCE to put people and decision-makers alongside each other and not to be over-prescriptive but to share information and let people draw their own conclusions.

*Report by Sarah Crozier and Sonya Yee, Press and
Public Information Section, OSCE Secretariat*

Annex II

Charter of Paris for a New Europe

Paris 1990

Meeting of the Heads of State or Government of the participating States of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE): Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Cyprus, Czech and Slovak Federal Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Holy See, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy -European Community, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, San Marino, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom, United States of America and Yugoslavia

Paris, 19 - 21 November 1990

A new era of Democracy, Peace and Unity

We, the Heads of State or Government of the States participating in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, have assembled in Paris at a time of profound change and historic expectations. The era of confrontation and division of Europe has ended. We declare that henceforth our relations will be founded on respect and co-operation.

Europe is liberating itself from the legacy of the past. The courage of men and women, the strength of the will of the peoples and the power of the ideas of the Helsinki Final Act have opened a new era of democracy, peace and unity in Europe.

Ours is a time for fulfilling the hopes and expectations our peoples have cherished for decades: steadfast commitment to democracy based on human rights and fundamental freedoms; prosperity through economic liberty and social justice; and equal security for all our countries.

The Ten Principles of the Final Act will guide us towards this ambitious future, just as they have lighted our way towards better relations for the past fifteen years. Full implementation of all CSCE commitments must form the basis for the initiatives we are now taking to enable our nations to live in accordance with their aspirations.

Human Rights, Democracy and Rule of Law

We undertake to build, consolidate and strengthen democracy as the only system of government of our nations. In this endeavour, we will abide by the following:

Human rights and fundamental freedoms are the birthright of all human beings, are inalienable and are guaranteed by law. Their protection and promotion is the first responsibility of government. Respect for them is an essential safeguard against an overmighty State. Their observance and full exercise are the foundation of freedom, justice and peace.

Democratic government is based on the will of the people, expressed regularly through free and fair elections. Democracy has as its foundation respect for the human person and the rule of law. Democracy is the best safeguard of freedom of expression, tolerance of all groups of society, and equality of opportunity for each person.

Democracy, with its representative and pluralist character, entails accountability to the electorate, the obligation of public authorities to comply with the law and justice administered impartially. No one will be above the law.

We affirm that, without discrimination,

every individual has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion or belief,
freedom of expression,
freedom of association and peaceful assembly,
freedom of movement;

no one will be:

subject to arbitrary arrest or detention,
subject to torture or other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment;

everyone also has the right:

to know and act upon his rights,
to participate in free and fair elections,
to fair and public trial if charged with an offence,
to own property alone or in association and to exercise individual enterprise,
to enjoy his economic, social and cultural rights.

We affirm that the ethnic, cultural, linguistic and religious identity of national minorities will be protected and that persons belonging to national minorities have the right freely to express, preserve and develop that identity without any discrimination and in full equality before the law.

We will ensure that everyone will enjoy recourse to effective remedies, national or international, against any violation of his rights.

Full respect for these precepts is the bedrock on which we will seek to construct the new Europe.

Our States will co-operate and support each other with the aim of making democratic gains irreversible.

Economic Liberty and Responsibility

Economic liberty, social justice and environmental responsibility are indispensable for prosperity.

The free will of the individual, exercised in democracy and protected by the rule of law, forms the necessary basis for successful economic and social development. We will promote economic activity which respects and upholds human dignity.

Freedom and political pluralism are necessary elements in our common objective of developing market economies towards sustainable economic growth, prosperity, social justice, expanding employment and efficient use of economic resources. The success of the transition to market economy by countries making efforts to this effect is important and in the interest of us all. It will enable us to share a higher level of prosperity which is our common objective. We will co-operate to this end.

Protection of the environment is a shared responsibility of all our nations. While supporting national and regional efforts in this field, we must also look to the pressing need for joint action on a wider scale.

Friendly Relations among Participating States

Now that a new era is dawning in Europe, we are determined to expand and strengthen friendly relations and co-operation among the States of Europe, the United States of America and Canada, and to promote friendship among our peoples.

To uphold and promote democracy, peace and unity in Europe, we solemnly pledge our full commitment to the Ten Principles of the Helsinki Final Act. We affirm the continuing validity of the Ten Principles and our determination to put them into practice. All the Principles apply equally and unreservedly, each of them being interpreted taking into account the others. They form the basis for our relations.

In accordance with our obligations under the Charter of the United Nations and commitments under the Helsinki Final Act, we renew our pledge to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or from acting in any other manner inconsistent with the principles or purposes of those documents.

We recall that non-compliance with obligations under the Charter of the United Nations constitutes a violation of international law.

We reaffirm our commitment to settle disputes by peaceful means. We decide to develop mechanisms for the prevention and resolution of conflicts among the participating States.

With the ending of the division of Europe, we will strive for a new quality in our security relations while fully respecting each other's freedom of choice in that respect.

Security is indivisible and the security of every participating State is inseparably linked to that of all the others. We therefore pledge to co-operate in strengthening confidence and security among us and in promoting arms control and disarmament.

We welcome the Joint Declaration of Twenty-Two States on the improvement of their relations.

Our relations will rest on our common adherence to democratic values and to human rights and fundamental freedoms. We are convinced that in order to strengthen peace and security among our States, the advancement of democracy, and respect for and effective exercise of human rights, are indispensable. We reaffirm the equal rights of peoples and their right to self-determination in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations and with the relevant norms of international law, including those relating to territorial integrity of States.

We are determined to enhance political consultation and to widen co-operation to solve economic, social, environmental, cultural and humanitarian problems. This common resolve and our growing interdependence will help to overcome the mistrust of decades, to increase stability and to build a united Europe.

We want Europe to be a source of peace, open to dialogue and to co-operation with other countries, welcoming exchanges and involved in the search for common responses to the challenges of the future.

Security

Friendly relations among us will benefit from the consolidation of democracy and improved security.

We welcome the signature of the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe by twenty-two participating States, which will lead to lower levels of armed forces. We endorse the adoption of a substantial new set of Confidence- and Security-building Measures which will lead to increased transparency and confidence among all participating States. These are important steps towards enhanced stability and security in Europe.

The unprecedented reduction in armed forces resulting from the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe, together with new approaches to security and cooperation within the CSCE process, will lead to a new perception of security in Europe and a new dimension in our relations. In this context we fully recognize the freedom of States to choose their own security arrangements.

Unity

Europe whole and free is calling for a new beginning. We invite our peoples to join in this great endeavour.

We note with great satisfaction the Treaty on the Final Settlement with respect to Germany signed in Moscow on 12 September 1990 and sincerely welcome the fact that the German people have united to become one State in accordance with the principles of the Final Act of the Conference on

Security and Co-operation in Europe and in full accord with their neighbours. The establishment of the national unity of Germany is an important contribution to a just and lasting order of peace for a united, democratic Europe aware of its responsibility for stability, peace and co-operation.

The participation of both North American and European States is a fundamental characteristic of the CSCE; it underlies its past achievements and is essential to the future of the CSCE process. An abiding adherence to shared values and our common heritage are the ties which bind us together. With all the rich diversity of our nations, we are united in our commitment to expand our co-operation in all fields. The challenges confronting us can only be met by common action, co-operation and solidarity.

The CSCE and the World

The destiny of our nations is linked to that of all other nations. We support fully the United Nations and the enhancement of its role in promoting international peace, security and justice. We reaffirm our commitment to the principles and purposes of the United Nations as enshrined in the Charter and condemn all violations of these principles. We recognize with satisfaction the growing role of the United Nations in world affairs and its increasing effectiveness, fostered by the improvement in relations among our States.

Aware of the dire needs of a great part of the world, we commit ourselves to solidarity with all other countries. Therefore, we issue a call from Paris today to all the nations of the world. We stand ready to join with any and all States in common efforts to protect and advance the community of fundamental human values.

Guidelines for the future

Proceeding from our firm commitment to the full implementation of all CSCE principles and provisions, we now resolve to give a new impetus to a balanced and comprehensive development of our co-operation in order to address the needs and aspirations of our peoples.

Human Dimension

We declare our respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms to be irrevocable. We will fully implement and build upon the provisions relating to the human dimension of the CSCE.

Proceeding from the Document of the Copenhagen Meeting of the Conference on the Human Dimension, we will cooperate to strengthen democratic institutions and to promote the application of the rule of law. To that end, we decide to convene a seminar of experts in Oslo from 4 to 15 November 1991.

Determined to foster the rich contribution of national minorities to the life of our societies, we undertake further to improve their situation. We reaffirm our deep conviction that friendly relations among our peoples, as well as peace, justice, stability and democracy, require that the ethnic, cultural, linguistic and religious identity of national minorities be protected and conditions for the promotion of that identity be created. We declare that questions related to national minorities can only be satisfactorily resolved in a democratic political framework. We further acknowledge that the rights of persons belonging to national minorities must be fully respected as part of universal human rights. Being aware of the urgent need for increased cooperation on, as well as better protection of, national minorities, we decide to convene a meeting of experts on national minorities to be held in Geneva from 1 to 19 July 1991.

We express our determination to combat all forms of racial and ethnic hatred, antisemitism, xenophobia and discrimination against anyone as well as persecution on religious and ideological grounds.

In accordance with our CSCE commitments, we stress that free movement and contacts among our citizens as well as the free flow of information and ideas are crucial for the maintenance and

development of free societies and flourishing cultures. We welcome increased tourism and visits among our countries.

The human dimension mechanism has proved its usefulness, and we are consequently determined to expand it to include new procedures involving, *inter alia*, the services of experts or a roster of eminent persons experienced in human rights issues which could be raised under the mechanism. We shall provide, in the context of the mechanism, for individuals to be involved in the protection of their rights. Therefore, we undertake to develop further our commitments in this respect, in particular at the Moscow Meeting of the Conference on the Human Dimension, without prejudice to obligations under existing international instruments to which our States may be parties.

We recognize the important contribution of the Council of Europe to the promotion of human rights and the principles of democracy and the rule of law as well as to the development of cultural co-operation. We welcome moves by several participating States to join the Council of Europe and adhere to its European Convention on Human Rights. We welcome as well the readiness of the Council of Europe to make its experience available to the CSCE.

Security

The changing political and military environment in Europe opens new possibilities for common efforts in the field of military security. We will build on the important achievements attained in the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe and in the Negotiations on Confidence- and Security-building Measures. We undertake to continue the CSBM negotiations under the same mandate, and to seek to conclude them no later than the Follow-up Meeting of the CSCE to be held in Helsinki in 1992. We also welcome the decision of the participating States concerned to continue the CFE negotiation under the same mandate and to seek to conclude it no later than the Helsinki Follow-up Meeting.

Following a period for national preparations, we look forward to a more structured cooperation among all participating States on security matters, and to discussions and consultations among the thirty-four participating States aimed at establishing by 1992, from the conclusion of the Helsinki Follow-up Meeting, new negotiations on disarmament and confidence and security building open to all participating States.

We call for the earliest possible conclusion of the Convention on an effectively verifiable, global and comprehensive ban on chemical weapons, and we intend to be original signatories to it.

We reaffirm the importance of the Open Skies initiative and call for the successful conclusion of the negotiations as soon as possible.

Although the threat of conflict in Europe has diminished, other dangers threaten the stability of our societies. We are determined to co-operate in defending democratic institutions against activities which violate the independence, sovereign equality or territorial integrity of the participating States. These include illegal activities involving outside pressure, coercion and subversion.

We unreservedly condemn, as criminal, all acts, methods and practices of terrorism and express our determination to work for its eradication both bilaterally and through multilateral co-operation. We will also join together in combating illicit trafficking in drugs.

Being aware that an essential complement to the duty of States to refrain from the threat or use of force is the peaceful settlement of disputes, both being essential factors for the maintenance and consolidation of international peace and security, we will not only seek effective ways of preventing, through political means, conflicts which may yet emerge, but also define, in conformity with international law, appropriate mechanisms for the peaceful resolution of any disputes which may arise. Accordingly, we undertake to seek new forms of co-operation in this area, in particular a range of methods for the peaceful settlement of disputes, including mandatory third-party involvement. We stress that full use should be made in this context of the opportunity of the Meeting on the Peaceful Settlement of Disputes which will be convened in Valletta at the beginning of 1991. The Council of Ministers for Foreign Affairs will take into account the Report of the Valletta Meeting.

Economic Co-operation

We stress that economic co-operation based on market economy constitutes an essential element of our relations and will be instrumental in the construction of a prosperous and united Europe. Democratic institutions and economic liberty foster economic and social progress, as recognized in the Document of the Bonn Conference on Economic Co-operation, the results of which we strongly support.

We underline that co-operation in the economic field, science and technology is now an important pillar of the CSCE. The participating States should periodically review progress and give new impulses in these fields.

We are convinced that our overall economic co-operation should be expanded, free enterprise encouraged and trade increased and diversified according to GATT rules. We will promote social justice and progress and further the welfare of our peoples. We recognize in this context the importance of effective policies to address the problem of unemployment.

We reaffirm the need to continue to support democratic countries in transition towards the establishment of market economy and the creation of the basis for self-sustained economic and social growth, as already undertaken by the Group of twenty-four countries. We further underline the necessity of their increased integration, involving the acceptance of disciplines as well as benefits, into the international economic and financial system.

We consider that increased emphasis on economic co-operation within the CSCE process should take into account the interests of developing participating States.

We recall the link between respect for and promotion of human rights and fundamental freedoms and scientific progress. Co-operation in the field of science and technology will play an essential role in economic and social development. Therefore, it must evolve towards a greater sharing of appropriate scientific and technological information and knowledge with a view to overcoming the technological gap which exists among the participating States. We further encourage the participating States to work together in order to develop human potential and the spirit of free enterprise.

We are determined to give the necessary impetus to co-operation among our States in the fields of energy, transport and tourism for economic and social development. We welcome, in particular, practical steps to create optimal conditions for the economic and rational development of energy resources, with due regard for environmental considerations.

We recognize the important role of the European Community in the political and economic development of Europe. International economic organizations such as the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (ECE), the Bretton Woods Institutions, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (ECD), the European Free Trade Association (EFTA) and the International Chamber of Commerce (ICC) also have a significant task in promoting economic co-operation, which will be further enhanced by the establishment of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD). In order to pursue our objectives, we stress the necessity for effective co-ordination of the activities of these organizations and emphasize the need to find methods for all our States to take part in these activities.

Environment

We recognize the urgent need to tackle the problems of the environment and the importance of individual and co-operative efforts in this area. We pledge to intensify our endeavours to protect and improve our environment in order to restore and maintain a sound ecological balance in air, water and soil. Therefore, we are determined to make full use of the CSCE as a framework for the formulation of common environmental commitments and objectives, and thus to pursue the work reflected in the Report of the Sofia Meeting on the Protection of the Environment.

We emphasize the significant role of a well-informed society in enabling the public and individuals to take initiatives to improve the environment. To this end, we commit ourselves to promoting public awareness and education on the environment as well as the public reporting of the environmental impact of policies, projects and programmes.

We attach priority to the introduction of clean and low-waste technology, being aware of the need to support countries which do not yet have their own means for appropriate measures.

We underline that environmental policies should be supported by appropriate legislative measures and administrative structures to ensure their effective implementation.

We stress the need for new measures providing for the systematic evaluation of compliance with the existing commitments and, moreover, for the development of more ambitious commitments with regard to notification and exchange of information about the state of the environment and potential environmental hazards. We also welcome the creation of the European Environment Agency (EEA).

We welcome the operational activities, problem-oriented studies and policy reviews in various existing international organizations engaged in the protection of the environment, such as the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (ECE) and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). We emphasize the need for strengthening their co-operation and for their efficient co-ordination.

Culture

We recognize the essential contribution of our common European culture and our shared values in overcoming the division of the continent. Therefore, we underline our attachment to creative freedom and to the protection and promotion of our cultural and spiritual heritage, in all its richness and diversity.

In view of the recent changes in Europe, we stress the increased importance of the Cracow Symposium and we look forward to its consideration of guidelines for intensified cooperation in the field of culture. We invite the Council of Europe to contribute to this Symposium.

In order to promote greater familiarity amongst our peoples, we favour the establishment of cultural centres in cities of other participating States as well as increased cooperation in the audio-visual field and wider exchange in music, theatre, literature and the arts.

We resolve to make special efforts in our national policies to promote better understanding, in particular among young people, through cultural exchanges, co-operation in all fields of education and, more specifically, through teaching and training in the languages of other participating States. We intend to consider first results of this action at the Helsinki Follow-up Meeting in 1992.

Migrant Workers

We recognize that the issues of migrant workers and their families legally residing in host countries have economic, cultural and social aspects as well as their human dimension. We reaffirm that the protection and promotion of their rights, as well as the implementation of relevant international obligations, is our common concern.

Mediterranean

We consider that the fundamental political changes that have occurred in Europe have a positive relevance to the Mediterranean region. Thus, we will continue efforts to strengthen security and co-operation in the Mediterranean as an important factor for stability in Europe.

We welcome the Report of the Palma de Mallorca Meeting on the Mediterranean, the results of which we all support.

We are concerned with the continuing tensions in the region, and renew our determination to intensify efforts towards finding just, viable and lasting solutions, through peaceful means, to outstanding crucial problems, based on respect for the principles of the Final Act.

We wish to promote favourable conditions for a harmonious development and diversification of relations with the non-participating Mediterranean States. Enhanced cooperation with these States will be pursued with the aim of promoting economic and social development and thereby enhancing stability in the region. To this end, we will strive together with these countries towards a substantial narrowing of the prosperity gap between Europe and its Mediterranean neighbours.

Non-governmental Organizations

We recall the major role that non-governmental organizations, religious and other groups and individuals have played in the achievement of the objectives of the CSCE and will further facilitate their activities for the implementation of the CSCE commitments by the participating States. These organizations, groups and individuals must be involved in an appropriate way in the activities and new structures of the CSCE in order to fulfil their important tasks.

New structures and institutions of the CSCE Process

Our common efforts to consolidate respect for human rights, democracy and the rule of law, to strengthen peace and to promote unity in Europe require a new quality of political dialogue and co-operation and thus development of the structures of the CSCE.

The intensification of our consultations at all levels is of prime importance in shaping our future relations. To this end, we decide on the following

We, the Heads of State or Government, shall meet next time in Helsinki on the occasion of the CSCE Follow-up Meeting 1992. Thereafter, we will meet on the occasion of subsequent follow-up meetings.

Our Ministers for Foreign Affairs will meet, as a Council, regularly and at least once a year. These meetings will provide the central forum for political consultations within the CSCE process. The Council will consider issues relevant to the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe and take appropriate decisions.

The first meeting of the Council will take place in Berlin.

A Committee of Senior Officials will prepare the meetings of the Council and carry out its decisions. The Committee will review current issues and may take appropriate decisions, including in the form of recommendations to the Council.

Additional meetings of the representatives of the participating States may be agreed upon to discuss questions of urgent concern.

The Council will examine the development of provisions for convening meetings of the Committee of Senior Officials in emergency situations.

Meetings of other Ministers may also be agreed by the participating States.

In order to provide administrative support for these consultations we establish a Secretariat in Prague.

Follow-up meetings of the participating States will be held, as a rule, every two years to allow the participating States to take stock of developments, review the implementation of their commitments and consider further steps in the CSCE process.

We decide to create a Conflict Prevention Centre in Vienna to assist the Council in reducing the risk of conflict.

We decide to establish an Office for Free Elections in Warsaw to facilitate contacts and the exchange of information on elections within participating States.

Recognizing the important role parliamentarians can play in the CSCE process, we call for greater parliamentary involvement in the CSCE, in particular through the creation of a CSCE parliamentary assembly, involving members of parliaments from all participating States. To this end, we urge that contacts be pursued at parliamentary level to discuss the field of activities, working methods and rules of procedure of such a CSCE parliamentary structure, drawing on existing experience and work already undertaken in this field.

We ask our Ministers for Foreign Affairs to review this matter on the occasion of their first meeting as a Council.

* * *

Procedural and organizational modalities relating to certain provisions contained in the Charter of Paris for a New Europe are set out in the Supplementary Document which is adopted together with the Charter of Paris.

We entrust to the Council the further steps which may be required to ensure the implementation of decisions contained in the present document, as well as in the Supplementary Document, and to consider further efforts for the strengthening of security and co-operation in Europe. The Council may adopt any amendment to the supplementary document which it may deem appropriate.

* * *

The original of the Charter of Paris for a New Europe, drawn up in English, French, German, Italian, Russian and Spanish, will be transmitted to the Government of the French Republic, which will retain it in its archives. Each of the participating States will receive from the Government of the French Republic a true copy of the Charter of Paris.

The text of the Charter of Paris will be published in each participating State, which will disseminate it and make it known as widely as possible.

The Government of the French Republic is requested to transmit to the Secretary-General of the United Nations the text of the Charter of Paris for a New Europe which is not eligible for registration under Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations, with a view to its circulation to all the members of the Organization as an official document of the United Nations.

The Government of the French Republic is also requested to transmit the text of the Charter of Paris to all the other international organizations mentioned in the text.

Wherefore, we, the undersigned High Representatives of the participating States, mindful of the high political significance we attach to the results of the Summit Meeting, and declaring our determination to act in accordance with the provisions we have adopted, have subscribed our signatures below :

Done
at Paris,
on 21
November
1990,
in the name of

About the OSCE Academy

The OSCE Academy is a post-graduate institution in Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan for students from Central Asia, including Afghanistan. It runs a one-year Masters programme on political science supported by a scholarship programme as well as professional training courses on conflict prevention, public policy, human rights and journalism. The Academy holds an annual international seminar on security in Central Asia, organized jointly with the Geneva Centre for Security Policy, the Norwegian Institute of International Affairs and the Near East South Asia Centre for Strategic Studies (National Defence University) as well as other conferences, conducts research projects and publishes occasional papers. www.osce-academy.net