

so doing, the very process builds or sustains confidence, while promoting learning and adaptation and the creation of communities of expertise.

### *Revitalization*

*"[T]he changing situation in the OSCE area highlighted the need for activating the other main function of the FSC as per its original mandate, namely consultation, goal-oriented continuing dialogue and co-operation in the field of security" ... As an inclusive forum, the FSC should be used by participating states for security dialogue in a flexible and innovative manner to respond to emerging challenges and to promote comprehensive security in the OSCE area"*<sup>42</sup>

One suspects that arguments emphasizing the intrinsic value of dialogue may encounter a degree of skepticism from diplomats whose time is limited and whose budgets are overstretched and who operate in a "results-oriented" environment. And it is quite likely that, in concrete terms, the utility of the FSC as currently configured will diminish as the focus of security shifts to problems that it has little role or background in addressing.

This raises the third option - the revitalization of the FSC's security dialogue. This would require a willingness to blur the boundary between the political/security, human, and economic dimensions of the OSCE, to increase the FSC's involvement in sub-regional issues, and to broaden the FSC's mandate to include such issues as internal conflict, transnational security issues, and the security implications of transition processes. It is abundantly clear that on many of these important issues, common perspectives are few and far between. This has been underlined recently in the clear differences of view between the Russian Federation and many other members of the OSCE on the applicability of international norms to internal conflict. A reasonably open dialogue around them might promote greater unity of perspective.

Likewise, despite the growing experience of inter-institutional co-operation in peace-building operations, there remain tensions among the organizations involved, disagreements over the distribution of roles and, underlying these, quite different institutional cultures. Moreover, as noted, the evolution of CFSP/ESDI suggests that the institutional landscape of European security is evolving in important ways, with important potential implications for other organizations in the region. There may consequently be some value in the mounting of sustained dialogue on such questions. The OSCE is a promising place for this to occur, given its inclusiveness and regional legitimacy. The FSC potentially has the advantage of greater informality than other organs within the organization. It is worth stressing that despite the breadth of the organization's membership, some critical players would have to be added. There is good reason for arguing that in such a dialogue, the UN, NATO, and the EU should have representation as collective entities with

---

<sup>42</sup> "Report of the Rapporteur on the Review of the Implementation of All OSCE Principles and Commitments Relating to the Politico-Military Aspects of Security," OSCE Review Conference 1999 (20 September-1 October and 8-10 November, 1999), p.50. <http://www.osce.org/docs/english/1990-1999/rcs/istarev99e.htm>.