

One institution within the OSCE - the Forum for Security Cooperation (FSC) - took the lead in providing a consultative arena where this regime could be defined. Its accomplishments (e.g. updating the CSBM regime with the Vienna Documents of 1994 and 1999 and creating a Code of Conduct on Politico-Military Aspects of Security) are impressive. By 1999, the basic normative and implementation frameworks for cooperative security in Europe were in place. Although there remain problems with the implementation of the CSBM regime, its completion raises the question of whether the FSC has outlived its usefulness, or whether it continues to have an important role in the evolution of the architecture for European security.

With these considerations in mind, this paper examines the role of the FSC in evolving transatlantic security relations. It begins with a brief conceptual discussion of the changing nature of European security. It proceeds to an account of the purposes and history of the Forum. It then turns to a more explicit consideration of current and prospective security challenges in Europe, and of the evolving institutional landscape of European security. It concludes with a discussion of options for Canada and other OSCE governments with regard to the FSC.

II. European Security: A Conceptual Framework

The end of the Cold War sparked at least two kinds of conceptual debates about European security. The first involved an extension of the concept of security both *downward* - from nation-states to groups and individuals - and *horizontally* - from purely military concerns to economic, political, social and environmental threats.¹ The other more ambitious strategy attempted to rethink the very notion of "national security" and move toward more holistic ideas of "common security".

These two debates challenged scholars and policy-makers to approach the evolving security landscape in Europe with a new framework. The result is a multidimensional approach that emphasises:

- *co-operative security* rather than the search for unilateral advantage;
- the development of *international norms* rather than the pursuit of national interest; and
- the safety and well being of individuals (*human security*) as well as the security of nation-states.

In short, the subjective world of security studies has evolved to match the objective transformations in post Cold War Europe.

There has been a parallel evolution in Canadian discourse and policy on security issues, with the lead being taken by DFAIT and the current Minister, The Hon. Lloyd Axworthy.² Indeed, on

¹ Emma Rothschild, "What is Security?", *Daedalus* (Summer, 1995), Vol. 124, No. 3, pp. 53-98.

² See, for example, DFAIT, *Human Security: Safety for People in a Changing World* (Ottawa: DFAIT, April 1999).