# PHASES OF FORMING AND PRINCIPLES OF ACTIVITY: FROM CSCE TO OSCE

*This article gives information about all phases of forming the OSCE. This Organization traces its origins to the détente phase of the early 1970s, when the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE) was created to serve as a multilateral forum for dialogue and negotiation between East and West.*

*The OSCE develops from its beginnings in 1975 as a Conference that helped to bring together the Cold War rivals, into the world's largest regional security organization, whose activities promote peace and stability from Vancouver to Vladivostock.*

At the beginning of the new millennium, taking into consideration new challenges and threats of our time, there is the task of exceptional importance i.e. creation of an effective European security architecture. Although, the danger of large-scale armed conflict as well as the Cold War is considered to belong to the past, difference of interests and contradictions between the individual countries (especially the newly formed ones) cannot be fully overcome. This is a potential source of conflicts, especially national–ethnic ones [5].

The history of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) has its roots in the period of détente at the beginning of the 1970s, when the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) was founded to serve as a multilateral forum for dialogue and negotiation between East and West. The result of two years of meetings in Helsinki and Geneva was the Helsinki Final Act, an agreement signed on August 1, 1975[9].

The idea of convening an all-European conference on security was suggested by the Soviet Union back in the 1950s. The first concrete proposal in this regard refers to 1954, when the Soviet Union proposed to draw up an agreement for a period of 50 years, which would be signed by all European states and would rely on a permanent organizational structure.

T. T. Kabdulov states in his article that the purpose of "the all-European treaty on collective security" is to ensure the peaceful coexistence of European countries by creating a unifying collective security system [7]. The participants "... can be all European countries, regardless their social structure, which approve the goals and accept the obligations provided for by the Treaty" [11].

Thus, we support the idea that a party to the treaty can be any state, which is European, approves the goals of the Treaty, and accepts the obligations provided for by the treaty.

Since this proposal implied recognition of the German Democratic Republic, closed the way of the Federal Republic of Germany to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and implied separation of the European security from the US security, the Western powers considered it to be unacceptable. However, with the improvement of the political climate in the

late 1960s, the NATO member countries began considering the issue of the expansion of the detente process in Europe.

The proposal to convene the meeting was laid out in the "Declaration on Strengthening Peace and Security in Europe", adopted in 1966 in Bucharest, by the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact. This proposal was later developed in a number of joint documents of the states parties to the Warsaw Pact, it became one of the central tasks of their foreign policy, an important factor in the political life of Europe [10].

As T. T. Kabdulov states, using this Declaration, the socialist countries offered a long-term program for creating the European security system of states regardless their social system. As it was stated in the Declaration, "the problem of European security can be solved by joint efforts of the European countries, all social forces standing for peace, regardless of their ideological, religious or other beliefs"[7].

The necessity of convening the All-European Conference was dictated by a number of objective factors. In this case, the task of ensuring a firm and long-lasting peace on the continent prevailed. Wars in Europe, as we know, turned into a nationwide disaster. Only in the last three centuries, the weapons were used here for more than 170 times [2].

We note that in this way the very decisive point has come when humankind has to make a responsible decision that would contribute to easing the tension in Europe.

Although the majority of neutral and nonaligned European countries welcomed this idea, NATO reacted cautiously to it. In 1969, the Alliance expressed its willingness to participate in such a meeting subject to certain conditions: full participation of the United States and Canada, confirmation of the legal status of Berlin, discussion of problems of non-nuclear disarmament in Europe and inclusion of human rights issues in the conference agenda. In the early 1970s, the existing obstacles were overcome: the Soviet Union agreed to the participation of the US and Canada in the conference, the participants signed a quadripartite agreement stating the status of Berlin, West Germany entered into agreements with the Soviet Union, Poland and East Germany, it was agreed to begin negotiations on mutual and balanced reduction of armed forces; the creation of a favorable environment was also encouraged by Willy Brandt's "Ostpolitik" and the summit meeting between Nixon and Brezhnev in May 1972. It was time to convene the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE). Finland offered to host the informal preparatory negotiations.

Only at the end of 1970, it was possible to state that the contacts between European countries found a quite wide ground for mutual understanding on key issues for the preparation of the Conference. The leaders of many European countries formed an opinion: it was time to move on to a new stage i.e. collective, multilateral consultations for further promotion of the Conference issues and final approval of all matters [6].

These negotiations began on November 22, 1972, in Helsinki suburb, where they continued until June 8, 1973 (these negotiations were informally called Dipoli negotiations after the name of the suburb, where meetings had been held). They resulted in the adoption of the Final Recommendations of the Helsinki Consultations (also known as the "Blue Book"), which defined in details the practical aspects of the Conference carried out in three phases: its agenda, list of participants, the date and place of holding, rules of procedure and financing procedure as well as discussion of issues referring to: 1) security in Europe, 2) cooperation in economy, science and technology and environment, 3) cooperation in humanitarian and other areas, 4) next steps after the Conference.

We also cannot but agree with L. S. Voronkov, who suggests in his work that the Helsinki Final Act, signed on August 1, 1975, by the Soviet Union, the United States, Canada and 33 European countries consists of three baskets.

The first "basket" referred to general issues related to the problems of European security. The second "basket" dealt with issues of economic, scientific and technical cooperation and cooperation in the field of ecology and environmental conservation. The third “basket” included humanitarian issues and the problem of protection of human rights (Principles VII, VIII and XI). It caused the greatest resistance from the Soviet Union since the formulation of the problem transferred the ideological conflict between two blocs into a completely different plane. The issue of protection of political rights and freedoms of citizens was a “weak point” of the Soviet system, and the signature of the Helsinki Final Act became the international recognition of the right to existence of the dissident movement and political opposition in the USSR, though it had never been implemented in practice. Later, the US administration used it repeatedly to pile diplomatic pressure on the Soviet Union [4].

According to many analysts, the adoption of the Final Act not only symbolized the era of “détente” but also led to the “re-ideologization” of confrontation between East and West by transferring it into the plane of human rights protection. Nevertheless, the very fact of convening the Conference contributed to overcoming the tension in the Old World and establishing a regime of relatively free exchange of ideas, information, and free movement of people. Helsinki Act became the basis for the adoption of all subsequent basic documents of this organization.

We share the viewpoint expressed by Yu. M. Kolosov and E. S. Krivchikova that the Conference on Security and Cooperation will be held in three stages: the first stage is carried out at the level of ministers for foreign affairs; the second stage includes the work of special committees and subcommittees. The states participants will be represented in these bodies by delegates and experts; the third stage will be approval of final documents of the Conference. The level of representation at the third stage will be determined by the states participants during the Conference until the completion of the second stage [8].

We also agree with Speech at the Seminar on the "Contribution of the OSCE to Security of Smaller States" Nicosia, 15 January 1996. The Charter of Paris of 1990 pronounced "the end of the era of confrontation and division. The Summit declared that henceforth the relations among OSCE States "will be based on respect and co-operation". Indeed, the Cold War period was not particularly conducive to a meaningful role for smaller States. The main, determinant factor in European, and indeed world, politics was the East-West divide. The Soviet dominance over the Central and Eastern European countries restricted the possibilities of their people to express their sovereign will. In the mainstream of European dialogue was group-to-group talk, with the key roles assigned to the superpowers. When concrete preparations for the Conference on Security and Co-operation started in the early 70s, a platform was established allowing smaller States to articulate their interests and manifest their identity. Neutral and non-aligned States took up the role of"honest brokers" between East and West. They co-ordinated informal negotiations and as a rule were expected to come up with compromise proposals serving as the basis for agreement. This was a difficult and responsible role. Much of the credit for leading the dialogue between East and West to concrete results and providing dynamism to the CSCE process is owed to the neutral and non-aligned States, most of them smaller States. East-West détente, of which the CSCE was an integral part, led to a situation allowing several Central and Eastern European States to restore their historical links with Western Europe and express their particular security concerns. The end of the Cold War brought about a pluralistic structure of international relations. In Helsinki in 1975, 35 countries participated in the CSCE; the OSCE has since grown to 54 members by incorporating new States established after the dissolution of the Soviet Union and the former Yugoslavia, and the split-up of Czechoslovakia. All or almost all of them are medium and small States. Central and Eastern Europe regained full sovereignty. These States embarked on the process of building their new identity and strengthening their stability. In the post-Paris CSCE/OSCE, the NNA countries lost their strategic role as there was no longer a need for an "honest East-West broker". But the new environment offers smaller States other possibilities relevant to their individual and specific interests. The OSCE does not, of course, have a particular policy or programme addressing the security problems of smaller States. Except for a special programme to foster the integration into the OSCE of the so-called "recently admitted participating States", there are no projects designed to meet concerns of only a group of States. The particular expectations of smaller States are addressed as an integral part of the overall OSCE stabilization strategy. The OSCE's goal, as confirmed at the 1994 Budapest Summit, is "a community of nations with no divisions, old or new, in which the sovereign equality and the independence of all States are fully respected, there are no spheres of influence and the human rights and fundamental freedoms of all individuals, regardless of race, colour, sex, language, religion, social origin or of belonging to a minority are rigorously protected". These elements of a security order correspond fully to the aspirations and expectations of

smaller States. This should inspire them to participate actively in its full implementation. The OSCE thus contributes in many practical ways to enhanced security of smaller States by – fostering dialogue; – ensuring that the OSCE consultation and decision-making process is open to participation of all its members; – developing norms of behaviour based on partnership and equality; – offering possibilities for smaller States to contribute directly to security-building [3].

The OSCE traces its origins to the détente phase of the early 1970s, when the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE) was created to serve as a multilateral forum for dialogue and negotiation between East and West. Meeting over two years in Helsinki and Geneva, the CSCE reached agreement on the Helsinki Final Act, which was signed on 1 August 1975.

This document contained a number of key commitments on polito-military, economic and environmental and human rights issues that became central to the so-called 'Helsinki process'. It also established ten fundamental principles (the 'Decalogue') governing the behaviour of States towards their citizens, as well as towards each other.

Until 1990, the CSCE functioned mainly as a series of meetings and conferences that built on and extended the participating States' commitments, while periodically reviewing their implementation. However, with the end of the Cold War, the Paris Summit of November 1990 set the CSCE on a new course. In the Charter of Paris for a New Europe, the CSCE was called upon to play its part in managing the historic change taking place in Europe and responding to the new challenges of the post-Cold War period, which led to its acquiring permanent institutions and operational capabilities. In the Charter of Paris, the Heads of State or Government of the CSCE also specifically called for the creation of a CSCE parliamentary Assembly.

In April 1991, at the invitation of the Spanish Parliament, high-level parliamentary leaders from all CSCE participating States gathered in Madrid for the particular purpose of creating a CSCE Parliamentary Assembly, as requested by their respective Heads of State or Government. The result of the meeting was the Madrid Declaration, which set forth the basic rules of procedure, working methods, size, mandate and distribution of votes of the Assembly.

At its Berlin Meeting in 1991, the CSCE Ministerial Council welcomed the establishment of the Parliamentary Assembly and stated that the Ministers looked forward to the "collective expression" of the views of the Parliamentary Assembly on security and co-operation in Europe as well as on the future development of the CSCE.

In July 1992, the first formal session of the Parliamentary Assembly was held in Budapest. The Assembly decided, inter alia, to accept an invitation of the Danish Parliament to establish an International Secretariat in Copenhagen.

At at its Prague Meeting the same year, the CSCE took a direct step towards active dialogue by announcing that the Chairman-in-Office would be prepared to make himself

available to report to the Assembly on the work of the CSCE, to answer parliamentarians' questions in this regard and to take note of parliamentarians' views for subsequent transmission to the Ministerial Council. It has since become a tradition for the Chairman-in-Office to address the Parliamentary Assembly and answer direct questions from the parliamentarians.

In 1994, the CSCE was renamed the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe due to the expanded role of the organization.

The CSCE-OSCE Summits in Helsinki (1992), Budapest (1994) and Istanbul (1999) reaffirmed the participating States' interest in the active participation of parliamentarians in the OSCE process and mandated the Chairman-in-Office to maintain close contacts with the Parliamentary Assembly, to draw its recommendations to the attention of the Permanent Council and to inform the parliamentarians of OSCE activities.

"The Parliamentary Assembly has developed into one of the most important OSCE institutions continuously providing new ideas and proposals," said the heads of OSCE governments at the close of the 1999 Istanbul Summit. "We welcome this increasing role, particularly in the field of democratic development and election monitoring. We call on the Parliamentary Assembly to develop its activities further as a key component in our efforts to promote democracy, prosperity and increased confidence within and between participating States."[9].

In our opinion, CSCE and OSCE have developed in a drawn out process, interwoven into Euro-Atlantic history. Sometimes we tend to forget, that democracy did not yet have a place in the 1975 Helsinki Final Act. It was only at the CSCE Summit in Paris in 1990 that heads of state and government agreed to accept “democracy as the only form of government of our nations”. 1. It was also only in the same “Charter of Paris for a New Europe” that the CSCE developed the concept of comprehensive security. Thus a direct link was established between political-military security and democratic government. For us today – at least at the conceptual level - this linkage sounds completely natural. Almost two decades after the end of East-West confrontation we 2know: Democratic government is in need of further strengthening and consolidation. I am deeply convinced: This is a conditio sine qua non for comprehensive and indivisible security between Vancouver and Vladivostok [1].

*References:*


1. PC.NGO/13/08 21 July 2008.CHECK AGAINST DELIVERY CiO Seminar on Election Related Issues Vienna, 21 - 22 July 2008 Opening Session Wilhelm Höynck, Dr.iur Former OSCE Secretary General.
2. Ropers N., Schlotter P. Regimeanalyse und KSZEProcess// Regime in den internationalen Beziehungen / Ed.by KohlerKoch B. BadenBaden, 1989
3. Speech at the Seminar on the "Contribution of the OSCE to Security of Smaller States" Nicosia, 15 January 1996. The Historic Change in Europe and the Role of Smaller States.
4. Воронков Л. Хельсинский процесс и европейская безопасность. Что дальше? Москва: МГИМО – Университет , 2012
5. Гарипов Р. Правовые основы деятельности ОБСЕ по обеспечению европейской безопасности в рамках военно-политического измерения. Автореф. дис. на соискание уч. степени. Казань, 2004
6. Заключительные рекомендации консультаций в Хельсинки В: От Хельсинки до Будапешта: История СБСЕ/ОБСЕ в документах 1973- 1994.Том I. Москва, 1996
7. Кабдулов Т. История создания и международно-правовой статус ОБСЕ. В: Вестник КАСУ, 2010, №4
8. Колосов Ю., Кривчикова Э. Международное право. Москва: МГИМО, 2001
9. Краткая история ОБСЕ. http://www.oscepa.org/about-osce-pa/history-rus (Дата посещения 17. 08. 2015)
10. Пономарев Г. Общеевропейское совещание исторический рубеж. Москва,1975.

Уранов Г., Рахманинов Ю. Европа: безопасность и сотрудничество. Москва, 1974