

Adam Daniel Rotfeld

*The key-note address to the
opening session of the 2012
OSCE Human Dimension
Implementation Meeting
(Warsaw, September 24,
2012)*

Human Security Dimension —an unfinished business

1. Introductory remarks

In his Foreword to the Report of the Global Commission on Elections, Democracy and Security Kofi Annan noted: “Elections are the indispensable root of democracy. They are now almost universal. Since 2000, all but 11 countries have held national elections. But to be credible, we need to see high standards before, during and after votes are cast. Oppositions organizations must be free to organize and campaign without fear. (...) When the electorate believes that elections have been free and fair, they can be a powerful catalyst for governance, greater security and human development”. In other words, it is not enough for governments to create institutions. Politicians must respect and safeguard the independence and professionalism of election officials, judges and courts.

In this context I would like to remind you the words of memorable speech delivered in Berlin in December 1989 by U.S. Secretary of State James Baker. He said: “Free men and free governments, are the building blocks of a Europe whole and free.” The Europe 2012 correspond only in part to the James Baker project. Not all Europe is united and free.

Not every country in the Euro-Atlantic region shares the universal values of political pluralism, free market, the rule of law, media freedom and respect for human rights. Even if accepted in declaratory way, they are rejected in political practice. If common values—aside from common interests—fail to be respected, the security community will simply be a façade.

2. The emerging new security system

New security systems do not emerge from “round-table” discussions, even if these attract the most prominent participants. Their visions, concepts and proposals may indeed be drawn upon by politicians, as

helping to systematize and harmonize various, often contradictory, state interests. But the decisive factor is about properly identifying and reconciling three fundamental elements, which are characteristic of any security system. These are: *interests, values and power*.

The emerging new Euro-Atlantic security system is based rather on interdependence than on dependence and balance of power and equilibrium. The human dimension of security means that system established within the OSCE area reflects the political philosophy of inclusiveness instead of exclusiveness as it was the case in the past—in the period of Cold War and partition of Europe. In general, nowadays, geopolitics and military aspects of security lost their significance in relations among the OSCE member States. Although on peripheries geopolitical thinking still prevails. The essence of the Euro-Atlantic common security space has to be founded on mutual trust and confidence based on the truth.

The Paris Charter for a New Europe (November 1990), better than any other document, identifies the important new feature of an emerging international system, a feature which boils down to this simple observation: in the 21st century, international security in the global and regional dimension—especially European—is contingent more on the situation *within the states* than *between them*.

The nature of conflicts has changed, and it is about time to draw conclusions from this. Discussions about the new system must not ignore the circumstance that over the past twenty years nearly all armed conflicts have broken out *within the states* and not *between them*. From a strictly military point of view, these are usually low-intensity conflicts. Increasingly, they are of an asymmetrical nature, where parties include not only states but also non-state actors.

The main characteristic of the new security environment is the erosion of the state institutions. The role it has played for over 350 years as part of the Westphalian system is changing in a fundamental way. The classic definition of the state includes three elements: a well-defined territory and population and effective authority (a government). According to international law, whose foundation in international relations is the UN Charter, territorial sovereignty and the principle of the sovereign equality of states prevent any intervention in matters of the discrete internal competence of any state. In reality, during the years that have passed since June 1945—the date of the signing of the UN Charter—there have been several significant changes. The three classic criteria (territory, population and effective power) forming the definition of a state should be—and in essence have been, through the adoption of various treaties and conventions—amended to include some additional requirements:

- State authority has to be not only effective, but its execution pursuant to internal law has to rest on rules and norms arising from obligations under international law (this applies particularly to respect for human rights and the rights of minorities).
- States are subject to appraisal and accountability by their own societies and international institutions (such as the UN Human Rights Council on the global scale or the OSCE including ODIHR and some other OSCE bodies and the Council of Europe on the regional scale) and are accountable to them.

The current situation is more complex and should not be based on any oversimplified models. As a rule, models are useful in theoretical deliberations, such as in the pure sciences—mathematics, physics and chemistry. Yet international politics and European security operate by different rules. In 21st-century relations among states, respecting norms and principles and ensuring the security of the different states have to be harmonized with respect for the universal values of the rule of law in the internal domestic governance of states as the main factor of stability and international security.

3. A New Agenda

Unconventional problems and situations call for unconventional solutions. In practice this means that we need to realize that just as the world is diversified, the methods for neutralizing risks and threats are complex. International security necessitates a holistic approach, not only encompassing the political and military dimension (as was the case in the past), but also taking into account economics, information technology, and civilizational issues, and allowing nations to protect and cultivate their identities. For the OSCE countries, the key criterion is respect for the *rule of law*. It seems to me that for some countries their verbal declarations do not correspond with their internal and external political practice. As the result, quite often the main threat is connected with a kind of a *cognitive dissonance*: misperception, miscalculation and misinterpretation of their geopolitical role and weight accompanied by disrespect for universal values and violation of the rule of law.

No doubts, the democratic system, political pluralism and rules of law have to be taken seriously and not as a façade or an empty shell. And have to be respected by all the States.

Problem is broader. We are living in a time when politicians often know how to fix difficult problems, but later have trouble winning at the polls. Genuine leaders, like Churchill, de Gaulle, de Gasperi, Brandt—took

decisions in line with long-term national, European and global interests. They took the right decisions—but often lost power as a result. This is why many leaders nowadays find themselves in difficult straits.

What is more disturbing—some politicians consider power a value in itself. Some of them often resort to populist rhetoric and nationalism, the others try to eliminate their political opponents violating the rules of law and democratic procedures. As the result we are confronted with a real threat of a kind of “re-nationalization” of universal norms and security policies not only outside but also inside of the Euro-Atlantic region. In effect, instead of stabilization, we have more uncertainty, insecurity and unpredictability.

The world is changed. Bipolarity is replaced neither by unipolarity nor by multipolarity.

In his recently published book, an American security analyst, Charles Kupchan shared with us his remarkable future-oriented reflection based on the evaluation of the present situation:

“The world is barreling toward not just multipolarity, but also multiple versions of modernity—a politically diverse landscape in which the Western model will offer only one of many competing conceptions of domestic and international order (...). Perhaps the defining challenge for the West and the rising rest is managing this global turn and peacefully arriving at the next world by design. The alternative is a competitive anarchy arrived at by default as multiple centers of power and the differing conceptions of order they represent vie for primacy.” Kupchan is right: the next coming world will be dominated by no country or region. He contends that the next world will have no center of gravity. “It will be no one’s world”.

To understand properly the emerging Euro-Atlantic security system is not enough to be focused on the shifting balance of power but on what such shifts in power will mean for how the world works. In other words, the key elements of the human security is not an equilibrium and military factors, but system based on respect and implementation of universal common values—the rule of law and respect of democratic governance.

The creation of such a genuine security community is feasible.

In our time, respect for values matters more than geopolitics in a search for completion the James Baker Project *A Europe whole and free*.

Adam Daniel Rotfeld – former Minister of Foreign Affairs, professor at the Warsaw University.