

ADVANCING U.S. INTERESTS  
THROUGH THE OSCE

---

---

HEARING  
BEFORE THE  
COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND  
COOPERATION IN EUROPE

ONE HUNDRED EIGHTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

SEPTEMBER 15, 2004

Printed for the use of the  
Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe

[CSCE 108-2-9]



Available via <http://www.csce.gov>

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

96-192 PDF

WASHINGTON : 2015

---

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Publishing Office  
Internet: [bookstore.gpo.gov](http://bookstore.gpo.gov) Phone: toll free (866) 512-1800; DC area (202) 512-1800  
Fax: (202) 512-2104 Mail: Stop IDCC, Washington, DC 20402-0001

COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH COMMISSIONERS

HOUSE

CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, New Jersey,  
*Chairman*  
FRANK R. WOLF, Virginia  
JOSEPH R. PITTS, Pennsylvania  
ROBERT B. ADERHOLT, Alabama  
ANNE M. NORTHUP, Kentucky  
BENJAMIN L. CARDIN, Maryland  
LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER,  
New York  
ALCEE L. HASTINGS, Florida  
MIKE McINTYRE, North Carolina

SENATE

BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL, Colorado  
*Co-Chairman*  
SAM BROWNBACK, Kansas  
GORDON H. SMITH, Oregon  
KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON, Texas  
SAXBY CHAMBLISS, Georgia  
CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut  
BOB GRAHAM, Florida  
RUSSELL D. FEINGOLD, Wisconsin  
HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON, New York

EXECUTIVE BRANCH COMMISSIONERS

LORNE W. CRANER, Department of State  
VACANT, Department of Commerce  
WILLIAM HENRY LASH III, Department of Commerce

**ADVANCING U.S. INTERESTS  
THROUGH THE OSCE**

**SEPTEMBER 15, 2004**

**COMMISSIONERS**

	Page
Hon. Christopher H. Smith, Chairman, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe .....	1
Hon. Benjamin L. Cardin, Ranking Member, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe .....	5
Hon. Mike McIntyre, Commissioner, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe .....	7
Hon. Alcee L. Hastings, Commissioner, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe .....	7
Hon. Joseph R. Pitts, Commissioner, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe .....	28

**WITNESSES**

Hon. Jerry Grafstein, Member, Senate of Canada, and Treasurer, OSCE Parliamentary Assembly .....	2
A. Elizabeth Jones, Assistant Secretary of State for European and Eurasian Affairs .....	9
Stephen G. Rademaker, Assistant Secretary of State for Arms Control .....	12
Michael G. Kozak, Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor .....	14

**APPENDICES**

Prepared statement of Hon. Christopher H. Smith .....	42
Prepared statement of Hon. Ben Nighthorse Campbell .....	44
Prepared statement of Hon. Benjamin L. Cardin .....	46
Prepared statement of Hon. Joseph R. Pitts .....	47
Prepared statement of A. Elizabeth Jones .....	48
Prepared statement of Stephen G. Rademaker .....	56
Prepared statement of Michael G. Kozak .....	61

## ADVANCING U.S. INTERESTS THROUGH THE OSCE

September 15, 2004

COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE  
WASHINGTON, DC

The hearing was held at 10 a.m. in room 334, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC, Hon. Christopher H. Smith, Chairman, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, presiding.

*Commissioners present:* Hon. Christopher H. Smith, Chairman, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe; Hon. Benjamin L. Cardin, Ranking Member, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe; Hon. Mike McIntyre, Commissioner, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe; Hon. Alcee L. Hastings, Commissioner, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe; and Hon. Joseph R. Pitts, Commissioner, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

*Witnesses present:* Hon. Jerry Grafstein, Member, Senate of Canada, and Treasurer, OSCE Parliamentary Assembly; A. Elizabeth Jones, Assistant Secretary of State for European and Eurasian Affairs; Stephen G. Rademaker, Assistant Secretary of State for Arms Control; and Michael G. Kozak, Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor.

### HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, CHAIRMAN, COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

Mr. SMITH. The hearing will come to order. And before we begin our proceedings, I would like to extend a very warm welcome to Jerry Grafstein, a member of the Senate in Canada, a good friend. We have worked very closely together on a number of OSCE issues, particularly in the Parliamentary Assembly. He's served as our treasurer, which has kept us in the black for quite a long time, but has been doing a great job on a number of issues. We've worked very closely on issues such as anti-Semitism, trafficking and all of the important human rights issues. And I'd like to yield to Jerry just if he'd like to say anything.

But you are more than welcome.

He has been here before when we had our summit on trafficking. About a year ago, Jerry was a very able and very important participant. And he was one of the co-leaders of the effort to bring human trafficking—to bring anti-Semitism, I should say, forward in the OSCE countries and was very active in the Berlin conference, the Vienna conference and, of course, our parliamentary assemblies.

So I yield to my good friend, Jerry Grafstein.

**HON. JERRY GRAFSTEIN, MEMBER, SENATE OF CANADA, AND  
TREASURER, OSCE PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY**

Mr. GRAFSTEIN. Thank you very much. I'm delighted to be here. I wasn't planning to come and attend, but I was at a Canada-U.S. interparliamentary meeting the last couple of days here in Washington. I'm Co-Chairman of the Canada-U.S. Interparliamentary Group, and I'm also the number two officer at the OSCE and have been active there for 10 years and have been on our parliamentary committee for that length of time.

I discovered at the OSCE that it is the most important institution in the world, international institution, after the United Nations. And I think we do quiet and effective work. Our problem is that our profile and the knowledge of both our publics, both here in Canada and in the United States, is not very well known.

And I guess that's the deficit, Chris, that you and I share. We haven't done as good a job of publicizing the OSCE. I thought maybe one of the things we could do is change the acronyms. We could just call it great and just leave it at that.

But I want to commend the Helsinki Commission, all the members, Chris and others in the United States. Because over and over again from my observation—and it's been an important issue of human rights, whether it's human trafficking or anti-Semitism or the issues that I'm interested in, which is economic development in the Middle East—I turn to my American colleagues for leadership and for comfort. And so, I just want to commend everybody on the Commission and particularly your staff who have done such a fabulous job.

If I have some problems in terms of giving out some information or a factum, I just call Chris or the staff here at the Commission. And they've done a superb job. So I'm proud, really proud to be a member of the OSCE. But I'm even prouder of my American colleagues who time and time again have shown leadership where there was no leadership at the OSCE. So I want to commend them. And I'm here to listen with great interest to what your officials have to say and hopefully participate.

Thank you.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you very much, Senator Grafstein. And again, thank you for joining us today.

I would like to say before I begin my opening statement just how grateful we are to the department for designating countries that absolutely ought to be on the countries of particular concern list, including Saudi Arabia, Vietnam and Eritrea. I think the additions of those countries to the list of egregious violators when it comes to religious freedom and the important determination has been made by the determination is to be heralded and to be commended because the facts are overwhelming.

We recently had the Human Rights In Vietnam Act up on the floor of the House. I was a prime sponsor of it. And doing the research and the work on it—and it's been passed before only to die over on the Senate side, which may happen again this year—but what was very clear is that there has been a demonstrable decline in religious freedom in Vietnam. There has been a ratcheting up,

particularly against the Montagnard, against evangelicals, against the Buddhist church and anyone who is not aligned with the government.

The most recent enactment of legislation in Vietnam which will further tighten and circumscribe the ability of people to exercise their faith goes into effect in just a couple of months. And that will make it even worse. So I want to commend the department and President Bush for those designations. They are well received by the human rights community, I can assure you.

And I thank you, Beth. And I thank all of you for that.

I am very happy to welcome you to this Helsinki Commission hearing on advancing U.S. interests through the OSCE. I'm very pleased to have several distinguished panelists present today and look forward to hearing their testimonies.

The title of this hearing is no accident. Since its inception nearly 30 years ago, the OSCE has been one of the staunchest allies of the beliefs and goals of the United States and our friends like Canada and the United Kingdom. It has multiplied the avenues through which we can promote the rule of law and human rights. It pioneered the broad definition of security that recognizes true stability does not depend on stockpiles of arms or standing armies, but on democratic principles, respect for fundamental human rights and good neighborly conduct.

It legitimized the idea that a nation's domestic policies are the rightful concern of other OSCE states. As it reinforced these critical standards, the organization also evolved into a strong and flexible body with arguably more tools for addressing regional problems than any other international institution. And I think Jerry made a very good point about this being such an important and yet under-heralded organization.

The broad membership, the clearly articulated principles, the well-designed political structure make the OSCE an especially appropriate partner of the United States. Today we have the opportunity to hear the State Department's vision on how this organization can be most effectively utilized and how these key policy makers intend to initiate activities and support policies through the OSCE that will advance U.S. objectives.

Let me say at the outset how appreciative I am of the diligence and dogged persistence of the U.S. ambassador to the OSCE, Ambassador Steven Minikes. He has done a tremendous job and deserves much credit and recognition for his leadership in Vienna. I note parenthetically that when we hold our parliamentary assemblies and our winter conferences, Steve is there right next to us advising, providing very useful counsel and insights. And we deeply appreciate that.

This year we had an excellent example of how the initiative can be seized to make impressive contributions to the well-being of the entire region while focusing on issues of particular concern to the U.S. The arms control bureau of the State Department deserves praise for seeing the opportunities afforded at the OSCE to contribute to hard security issues. They presided over a strong U.S. chairman of the Forum for Security Cooperation, helping to revitalize that part of the organization. They used it to pass agreements on management and destruction of excess ammunition, ex-

port controls on manned portable air defense systems and the transfer of light arms.

The work of the FSC complimented that undertaking of the organization as a whole to conform travel documents, to address proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and to discuss better cooperation on border security and the control of shipping containers.

Every one of these key concerns to the United States and everyone is a transnational issue requiring that we address it multilaterally. This is the kind of robust use of the OSCE that is in our interest and that we would like to see supported throughout the U.S. Government.

Over the past 30 years, there has also been great growth and development in the human dimension, an area of keen interest to this commission. Next month, the OSCE will hold the annual Human Dimension Implementation Meeting in Warsaw. This meeting is a regular opportunity for the participating States to review each other's compliance with our mutual Helsinki commitments, to encourage better implementation, and publicly question activities that are not consistent with the strong standards of the OSCE.

We look forward to a strong presence and participation at this conference and to hearing the Department's priorities for that meeting. We hope that the same sense of priority and urgency that characterized human rights advocacy during the Cold War will not lag now at a time when we see examples of the starkest disregard of human dignity, and our nation and regions suffer acts so brutal that they were unthinkable only a few years ago.

Understanding that upholding human rights is not only the policy that is ethically consistent with our ideals, but is fundamentally linked to our national and regional security, has never been more important than now. If a nation disregards public opinion and the oppression of its own citizens, it will also ignore violations to the security of its neighbors. As we came to see in the Balkans, we ignore the warning signs of abusive acts at our own peril.

We have a great deal of work to do in this field. The lives of many are still on the line in the countries of Central Asia and periodically elsewhere in the OSCE, especially if one is a democratic activist, outspoken journalist or religious proponent. The creeping shadow of a rising anti-Semitism continues to threaten Europe. And the blight of trafficking in human beings is increasing.

Addressing economic development and environmental challenges is also important. These are linked to fundamental matters of opportunity and trust in government and to stabilizing societies through the confident forum of economic well being.

My good friend and colleague Ben Cardin, who has a special role in this area, will elaborate more on this topic. But just let me mention that it has never been more timely, and the less developed areas of the OSCE need consistent attention if we are not going to see political will undermined by the impatience that comes from economic necessity.

We also hope to hear what the administration's focus is for the forthcoming Sofia Ministerial Meeting in December. The issue that probably will have the greatest impact on the evolution of the organization and on our ability to further U.S. interests through it is the selection of the next Secretary General. Members of this com-

mission are actively interested in seeing a strong leader in this office.

As you know, we have written to Secretary Powell on the matter and will be following up in the near future. The world has changed in recent years for all of us. As the OSCE takes on daunting challenges, it will benefit from a potent public face and a strong managing hand to compliment the political role of the rotating chairmanship.

Other important issues that should be considered in Sofia include addressing expanded election commitments such as electronic voting and voting rights of internally displaced persons, enhancing the capability to fight human trafficking, continuing efforts on anti-Semitism, the appropriate role of the Mediterranean partners, and addressing the concerns in the statement of July 8th by the nine CIS members.

Regarding the current discussions concerning refining and strengthening the OSCE, I look forward to the administration's views on the various comments by the Chair-in-Office, Bulgaria's foreign minister, Solomon Passy. He has expressed support for a quote, "better thematic as well as geographical balance within the OSCE," as also called for by nine CIS countries.

Ambassador Passy has also proposed relocating meetings of the economic forum to Central Asia from Vienna and the HDIM to South Caucasus. Structurally, he has also advocated stronger political leadership for the Secretary General and the Chair-in-Office and deeper inclusion of the Parliamentary Assembly of the OSCE.

Again, we have a very fine set of panelists.

And I'd like to recognize my good friend and ranking member of the Commission, Ben Cardin, for any opening comments he might have.

**HON. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN, RANKING MEMBER, COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE**

Mr. CARDIN. Well, thank you very much, Chairman Smith. And I thank you very much for convening this hearing to give us an opportunity to meet with our representatives to review the role that the United States should be playing in the OSCE and to look at ways that we can improve the effectiveness of the U.S. participation.

And as you know, the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe is unique in that it is an independent commission. And we're very pleased to have representatives from the executive department as well as the legislative department serving together as commissioners to carry out the mission of the United States in the OSCE.

I also want to welcome Senator Grafstein to our Commission here today. The United States has no greater friend in the OSCE than Senator Grafstein. He's been a constant supporter and we've worked together on strategies to set priorities within the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly to advance the interests of both of our countries. So it's a pleasure once again.

But he's a frequent guest here, so we can't give him too good of an introduction every time because our hearings will get longer and longer. But it's a pleasure to have Senator Grafstein with us today.

Mr. Chairman, let me just very briefly comment as to where I think we've been and where we need to review.

The OSCE was very helpful in the Cold War, bringing an end to the Cold War. It's the largest regional organization. It gives us the ability to communicate with all of Europe and now Central Asia and to advance U.S. interests.

We now need to look at what should the current role be. And we have seen it being very helpful to us as we've dealt with issues such as trafficking of human beings, anti-Semitism, in dealing with a whole range of issues, including building democratic institutions in countries that need that type of attention, which is certainly in the U.S. interest.

So the OSCE is perhaps even more important today than it was before the fall of the Soviet Union. I'm very honored to chair the Committee of the Second Committee which deals with economics and the environment in the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly. And I appreciate the support I've received from Ambassador Minikes and Assistant Secretary Bill Lash from Commerce, who is a member of our Commission, as we have developed strategies understanding the relationship between economic development, human rights and security issues, that they're all tied together. We need to make advancements in all of those issues.

The Maastricht document on economics was, of course, the first major document in over a decade which really spells out, I think, the priorities of our country and where we need to be in leadership, particularly in fighting corruption and developing strategies to fight corruption.

In Edinburgh we reinforced that in the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly and reinforced the calling of a meeting of the Ministers of Justice and Interior to develop an anti-corruption strategy. And I hope that we will find the support to get that moving in all of the, including state, to make sure we get that moving. I think it's extremely important that we advance the anti-corruption agendas and the building of the economies, particularly in the emerging democracies of Europe and Central Asia. It's an important priority, and I hope that we can develop a common strategy.

I want to mention one other point, if I might, Mr. Chairman. And I think there's clearly need for improvement in the relationship between the executive branch and the congressional members of the Commission as it relates to charges that are brought against the United States. In the last several years, we have received international interest in the way that we treat unlawful combatants, particularly in Guantanamo Bay and now in Iraq. And we've had a relationship with the executive branch in visiting Guantanamo Bay and getting information.

But quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, I don't think that relationship has been as strong as it should be. And the trust has not been there so that we have the information we need in order to represent the interests of this country in our international meetings. And I would hope there would be more confidence expressed by the executive branch. After all, we're in the Commission together—and that we open up more to the types of charges that are brought internationally so that we can represent this nation as strongly as we possibly can.

So I think there's room for improvement. I hope that this hearing will help us establish that close relationship that has existed traditionally between the executive branch, the legislative branch in the OSCE work. And I look forward to hearing from our witnesses.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you very much, Commissioner Cardin.  
Commissioner McIntyre.

**HON. MIKE McINTYRE, COMMISSIONER, COMMISSION ON  
SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE**

Mr. MCINTYRE. Thank you very much. As the newest member of the Commission, I particularly was proud of the work that our United States delegation did over in Edinburgh, Scotland and proud of our colleague, Alcee Hastings', election and the unity and bipartisan effort of our work together. And I look forward to today's hearing and in the interest of time will defer any further comments until a later statement. But thank you all for letting us join with you today.

Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SMITH. I'd like to recognize the president of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, Alcee Hastings, for any comment he might have.

**HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS, COMMISSIONER, COMMISSION ON  
SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE**

Mr. HASTINGS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I echo Mike's sentiments about time and Ben's sentiment about Jerry Grafstein. Thank you for holding this hearing. And, Jerry, I'll extend to you an invitation, if we can catch up, to have an opportunity to talk with you personally at some point today. I look forward to hearing from our witnesses, particularly Ms. Jones, who I'm hopeful I'll be able to stay long enough to ask a couple of questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you very much, Mr. Hastings.

Now, I'd like to introduce our very distinguished panel. But before doing that, just note that the new Foreign Minister of Montenegro is here, Vlahovic. Mr. Vlahovic, if you wouldn't mind just acknowledging. Thank you for being here. And we just wish you well, and we look forward to working with you. I would note parenthetically we're very pleased working with Montenegro and Serbia, that there has been real movement in the area of human trafficking. And I know that's of high interest to you.

As you know, you used to be on that tier three, egregious violator, which you took some very, very profound actions to crack down on trafficking. And I know you're working on prosecution. So we deeply appreciate that. Everyone who cares about human rights are grateful for what you're doing.

Let me now introduce Assistant Secretary Elizabeth Jones who was sworn in as Assistant Secretary for European/Eurasian Affairs on May 31st of 2001. She joined the foreign service in 1970. Her overseas assignments concentrated in the Middle East, South Asia and Germany include Kabul, Islamabad, New Delhi, Baghdad, Cairo, Beirut, Tunis, West Berlin, Bonn.

She has served as ambassador to the Republic of Kazakhstan in Washington. She was the Lebanon desk officer, Deputy Director for

Lebanon, Jordan, Syria and Iraq, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary in the Near East bureau. She has also served as Executive Assistant Secretary to Warren Christopher and directed the office of the Caspian base in energy diplomacy.

Beth Jones was born in Germany while her parents were assigned there with the U.S. foreign service. She attended high schools in Moscow and West Berlin while her parents were on diplomatic assignments there. She graduated from Swarthmore College and earned a Masters Degree from Boston University. Ambassador Jones speaks Russian, German and Arabic. She is married and has two children. We hope she'll speak English today.

Assistant Secretary Stephen Rademaker—as Jerry Grafstein mentioned a moment ago, how important staff is. I know because I serve on the International Relations Committee. Steve was the general counsel for the House International Relations Committee and wrote, literally penned much of the legislation that came out of that committee, particularly under Mr. Gilman who served as chairman, was extraordinarily gifted.

And some of his background includes that he was the chief counsel as well to the House Select Committee on Homeland Security. He held positions, as I mentioned, on the House Committee of International Relations, including deputy staff director, chief counsel and minority chief. From 1992 to 1993, Mr. Rademaker served as general counsel of the Peace Corps. He has held a joint appointment as Associate Counsel to the President in the Office of Counsel to the President and as Deputy Legal Adviser to the National Security Council, served as Special Assistant to the Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, and Counsel to the Vice Chairman of the U.S. International Trade Commission.

In 1986, he was a law clerk for the Honorable James L. Buckley of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. From 1984 to 1986, he was associate at the Washington, D.C. law firm of Covington and Burling. Mr. Rademaker has received from the University of Virginia a B.A. with highest distinction, a J.D. and M.A. in foreign affairs.

Acting Assistant Secretary Michael Kozak will be our next witness. He is the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Democracy, Human Rights and Labor. He assumed his position in September of 2003. He has served as ambassador to Belarus, chief of the U.S. intersections in Cuba, Principal Deputy Legal Adviser of the Department of State and Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American affairs.

Ambassador Kozak was assistant to U.S. negotiator for Panama for the canal treaties under President Nixon, Ford and Carter and participated in the multilateral efforts to mediate an end to the Nicaraguan civil war in 1978 to 1979. He was a member of the U.S. mediation team that implemented the Egypt/Israel peace treaty and sought a solution to the conflict in Lebanon.

Ambassador Kozak served as a special presidential envoy while dealing with the crisis in Panama provoked by General Noriega's attempt to overthrow the constitutional government. As a special negotiator for Haiti, Mr. Kozak helped coordinate the U.S. policy to restore democratically elected government. In 1996, he was named as Chief of the U.S. diplomatic mission in Cuba. In 2000,

Michael Kozak was named to serve as U.S. Ambassador, like I said, to Belarus.

Secretary Jones, if you could make your presentation.

**A. ELIZABETH JONES, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR EUROPEAN AND EURASIAN AFFAIRS**

Sec. JONES. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. I very much appreciate the opportunity as do my colleagues to appear before the Commission again this year. We want very much to focus on how we would like to work with the Commission and work in the OSCE to advance U.S. policy objectives. We believe that the OSCE has made major contributions toward democracy, peace and stability across Europe throughout its tenure, but especially through the past year.

At the same time, I would like to say that the OSCE's success is really not possible without the strong congressional support that you represent. We want to thank especially the Helsinki Commission and the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly. And at this juncture, I'd like especially to congratulate Congressman Hastings for his election as the President of the Parliamentary Assembly. We look forward very much to working with you to support the assembly's meeting next year.

We share very much the enthusiasm of the Commission for the OSCE. At the same time, we feel very strongly that strong U.S. leadership is key to the OSCE's contribution to the U.S. goal of a Europe whole, free and at peace. Virtually everything we do with the Commission and in the OSCE is focused on that goal. To that end, the OSCE agenda is our agenda. We believe that our participation advances U.S. interests in promoting democracy, human rights, good governance and arms control. And we believe the OSCE has a very important and rich role in helping to fight the global war on terror.

The OSCE is unique in its capabilities in the way that they add value for the United States. We think that the OSCE is a model of effective multi-lateralism in the way that President Bush spoke of it last winter. Two particular examples I'd like to cite. One is in burden sharing.

The OSCE allows the U.S. to share cost, to coordinate and avoid duplication in our policy efforts. The OSCE can bring the weight of 55 nations to bear on problems that no one country can solve alone. The other great strength of the OSCE is its field missions and ODIHR. There are 17 field missions from Albania to Uzbekistan that work every day for democracy and the other baskets in which the OSCE focuses. The ODIHR is the most respected election observer organization in Europe and Eurasia.

We also believe the OSCE is a relative bargain for the United States. We pay about 10 percent, just over 10 percent of the costs. And we reap tremendous benefits, possibly up to 100 percent.

I'd like to highlight two big successes of the OSCE to demonstrate what it can do. These have occurred in the past 12 months. And it demonstrates the force multiplier that the OSCE provides. In Georgia, the OSCE election monitoring was a voice of the international community on the flawed elections that took place there last November. It was the OSCE that helped leverage over

\$7 million in European aid for new elections that took place earlier this year in Georgia. OSCE monitoring was key to establishing the new government's legitimacy.

Another big success was the Berlin anti-Semitism conference. It was a landmark event in raising European awareness of the problem. It set the stage for follow-up on law enforcement, on legislation and education in this important area.

I would like especially to applaud you, Mr. Chairman, Congressmen Cardin and Hastings for joining the Secretary in making the conference a success. There are many other unsung OSCE successes from Kosovo police training to progress toward all 55 OSCE members acceding to the U.N. terrorism related conventions.

At the same time, OSCE is adapting a new agenda. U.S. leadership has helped form that agenda and is focusing on practical outcomes for these particular goals. On trafficking in persons, which you have each mentioned, we should take credit for creation of a special representative on trafficking. This was a U.S. initiative. The U.S. is now helping to shape the OSCE work plan on trafficking. The OSCE's new code of conduct for its missions is really a model for other international organizations.

Tolerance is also an area in which we should take considerable credit. The high profile racism, anti-Semitism conferences were U.S. initiatives. We're now pushing for more expert level followup from trafficking and hate crimes to increasing training for police.

Counterterrorism is another area where we've taken a leadership role, particularly in the adoption of tougher travel document security measures and stricter controls on MANPADS. At the same time, the OSCE is working hard on the traditional core mission of democracy and human rights with election observation where ODIHR provides impartial monitoring of elections in Macedonia, Serbia and Russia and is again setting the international standard for those elections.

I already mentioned the field missions. The largest OSCE field mission is in Kosovo to help and implement the U.N. Security Council enforce standards. Smaller missions are in Minsk and Ashkabad that are reaching out to the next generation of civil society. And I can't applaud those initiatives enough.

Looking ahead, the OSCE has an ambitious agenda which is at the same time key to U.S. policy objectives in election monitoring. We're sending our first election assistance team outside of Europe and Eurasia to Afghanistan to provide support for the historic presidential elections there next month. The OSCE will monitor important contests this fall in Ukraine and many other places.

On our tolerance agenda, the OSCE is pioneering in its work on fighting intolerance, which continues with the racism conference that took place in Brussels yesterday and the day before. The U.S. leadership is very evident in the fact that HUD Secretary Jackson led the delegation.

Sofia is our next ministerial of the OSCE. We are very much working with the Chairman-in-Office, Solomon Passy, to assure practical outcomes for that ministerial in December. We hope to reach agreement on establishing a Special Representative for anti-Semitism at this ministerial to further combat and to take further steps to combat racism.

We will also push again for Russia to fulfill its Istanbul commitment. And we expect the ministerial to endorse OSCE work on shipping container security and destruction of excess stockpiles of ammunition and weapons. There are three challenges that we need to resolve this fall to keep the OSCE healthy and productive. You've mentioned each of these, and we look forward to having a discussion on how best to move forward on each of them. The budget is a particular concern of ours. We need responsible approaches to resolve differences before the Sofia revision of the OSCE's two scales of assessment.

Russia and others seek radical reduction in contributions. We back adjustments based on previously agreed upon parameters, which include ceilings and floors based on capacity to pay.

You mentioned the importance of selecting the next secretary general. We completely agree that this is important. Chairman in office Passy has made some suggestions, and others have made suggestions to change the way the secretary general is—the secretary general's role, change the level of the secretary general, which we believe needs careful consideration because it has very important implications.

Changing the balance between the Secretary General and the Chairman-in-Office could change the OSCE. That needs careful thought. At the same time, we believe it's essential to keep the OSCE's flexibility by minimized and central control within the organization.

The C.S. has called for change in the OSCE. Russia and others have been critical of some of the field operations and of ODHIR. We believe that the OSCE core mission remains fostering democratic change as the only way to defeat underlying causes of instability. The U.S. has been flexible. We've supported Russia's effort to strengthen the OSCE's economic and security work. But we will not agree to reforms that weaken the OSCE's human dimension work.

The bottom line for us, Mr. Chairman, is that we believe the OSCE's record of achievement over the past year is very impressive. Thank you very much for your mentioning of Ambassador Minikes and the very strong leadership role he has played in ensuring this. We certainly agree with that. And we work with him on a daily basis. I, in fact, was on the phone with him this morning to be sure we were in concert on the kinds of things that we would be discussing today.

We think that the OSCE's agenda for this year is ambitious. We are leading that agenda. The OSCE deserves continued U.S. support because of its contributions to U.S. objectives. Those contributions are substantial. The OSCE does face challenges ahead. We want to make sure that the OSCE remains a creative, flexible organization able to advance U.S. interests and the interests of all members of the organization.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you very much, Ambassador Jones. And appreciate your testimony. Secretary Rademaker.

**STEPHEN G. RADEMAKER, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE  
FOR ARMS CONTROL**

Sec. RADEMAKER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's a pleasure to be back here with the commission. It's my first appearance before the Commission, but I'm certainly no stranger to the Commission and its work having worked with you and your former ranking member, Mr. Hoyer, for many years as well as some of the outstanding members of your staff. So it is a great pleasure for me to be back here in a slightly different capacity today.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, the regional structure—well, first of all, let me say I do have a prepared statement, which I'm submitting for the record. But I will not sit here and read it to you. I'll touch on some of the key points in my oral presentation.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, there is a regional structure of conventional arms control and CSBMs in place in Europe that goes far beyond what we see in any other part of the world. And in large measure, this is a legacy of the Helsinki Final Act, which in its basket three provided a starting point for the evolution that's occurred over the last 30 years. And from basket three, we moved on to things like the conventional armed forces in Europe agreement, the open skies agreement and most recently, the Vienna document of 1999, all of which have enhanced and broadened the range of arms control and CSBMs in place in Europe.

The OSCE is deeply involved in all of these matters. And on a day-to-day basis, the OSCE manages the arms control and CSBM issues through what is known as the Forum for Security Cooperation, which within the State Department is managed by the Bureau of Arms Control.

The FSC has weekly meetings in Vienna. And the second item on the agenda of every meeting is something called security dialogue, which is an opportunity for any member of the OSCE to raise any security issue of concern to them. And many countries take advantage of this, and it's a very useful opportunity to draw attention to emerging problems and to get countries thinking about possible solutions to such problems.

Another very important thing that the FSC does is that every year in March it has an implementation assessment meeting which systematically reviews the implementation of and compliance with all of the various commitments that countries within the OSCE have made to each other with respect to arms control and transparency. The principle focus is on the implementation of the Vienna doctrine of 1999, which is, as you know, a transparency document providing for information exchanges and a system of inspection and evaluation visits of respected militaries within Europe.

The annual assessment meeting also looks at implementation of the various documents that have been adopted through the Forum for Security Cooperation: the 1994 code of conduct on the political and military aspects of security, which is about the relationship of a military to the rest of society in a democracy; the 2000 document on small arms and light weapons; the 2003 document on stockpiles of conventional arms. Under these last two, there's a prospect of assistance to countries that need assistance in getting rid of small arms and dealing with excess stocks of ammunition. And the OSCE

has received a number of requests for assistance in this area, which it's currently working on.

As you noted, Mr. Chairman, the United States chaired the FSC in the fall of 2003. And the philosophy of our chairmanship was exactly what you suggested. I like the term you used: robust use of the OSCE. That is the way we approached our chairmanship. And we believe we were very successful.

During our chairmanship, we were able to bring about the adoption of the document on stockpiles, which I referred to a moment ago. We also had a three-part agenda that we promoted during our chairmanship: first, non-proliferation; second, addressing the problem of MANPADS; and third, dealing with civil military emergency preparedness.

The way we addressed these three things was by taking advantage of the security dialogue portion of the FSC agenda in a systematic way during our chairmanship provide presentations on these various issues and get the other countries thinking about each of these three areas.

We were especially successful when it came to MANPADS because what we did was lay the groundwork for adoption by the OSCE of the Wassenaar Arrangement Export Control regime with regard to MANPADS. This was something that had the effect of doubling the number of countries around the world that adhere to the Wassenaar Arrangement Export Control standards for MANPADS. And so, we do believe that made a material contribution to controlling this threat, which, of course, is one of our great concerns when it comes to potential terrorist attacks on civilians.

I did want to mention the adapted CFE treaty, that is, the revised Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe. As you probably know, this is one of our biggest frustrations when it comes to arms control in Europe. The adapted CFE treaty was signed in November of 1999. And almost five years have gone by. We have not yet ratified the adapted CFE treaty and it has not come into effect because all of us within NATO agreed that we did not want to proceed to ratification until Russia had implemented its Istanbul commitments with respect to withdrawing its forces from Moldova and setting a deadline for closing bases in Georgia.

Five years have gone by and Russia still has not implemented these commitments. And, as I said, it is a source of great frustration. The OSCE is working very hard on this problem. This is a priority for Ambassador Minikes. He devotes a lot of effort to this.

The OSCE has established a voluntary fund to try and deal with the financial aspect of bringing about implementation of the Istanbul commitments. But notwithstanding these efforts, we haven't seen much progress. And this is of concern to us.

You may have noticed the defense minister of Russia gave a speech last February in which he hinted that if the adapted treaty was not soon brought into effect, Russia might reconsider its adherence to the existing CFE treaty, which, of course, would be of great concern to us. But this should not be misunderstood as a lack of Russian interest in the adapted CFE treaty because just this year, the Russian Government proceeding in the direction of ratification of the adapted treaty.

The state duma, the federation council approved a law which was signed by President Putin in July to provide for ratification of the adapted CFE treaty. So Russia remains interested in this, they just haven't taken the steps that need to be taken to make it possible for the rest of us to ratify the adapted treaty. And we will continue to send the message to Russia that there is no shortcut to entry into force of this very important treaty that does not involve full implementation by them of the Istanbul commitments.

One final point that I wanted to make that I know is of interest to some members of the Commission is the degree to which the OSCE and this web of arms control and CSBMs that is in place in Europe can serve as a model for other regions in the world. And we believe that it can serve as a model. Interestingly, the region of the world that has gone furthest in trying to adopt some of the measures that are currently in place in Europe is the Western Hemisphere. Through the OAS in 2003, there was a declaration of security in the Americas which drew heavily from the Vienna document of 1999. There is not an institutionalized relationship between the OSCE and the OAS. And I think the explanation for that is that we don't really need one. Two of the most important OSCE members, the United States and Canada, are also members of the OAS. There are nearly a dozen other OSCE members who are observers at the OAS. And so, there is a lot of day-to-day interaction between the two organizations. And I think that's been very helpful in enabling the OAS to adopt some of the measures that the OSCE pioneered.

Asia also has a strong interest in some of the accomplishments that have been realized within Europe. There is a more formalized dialogue between the OSCE and some of its Asian partners. There have been two workshops held in South Korea in 2000 and 2001 to look at possible application of Vienna document concepts in Asia. And then in Tokyo in March of this year, the Japanese Government hosted a conference with the OSCE to look at the same question.

In the Middle East, there is an annual meeting between the OSCE and the Mediterranean partners. But I guess I would say candidly that we're not as far advanced in working with Middle Eastern countries as we are in the Western Hemisphere and in Asia in exploring the applicability of OSCE models to other regions. But we do have an office within the arms control bureau that is in the business of promoting CSBMs all over the world. And I can assure you that they work closely with our experts on the OSCE to continue pursuing this question of what we can learn from the European experience.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman

Mr. SMITH. Secretary Rademaker, thank you very much for your testimony and your leadership. Ambassador Kozak.

**MICHAEL G. KOZAK, ACTING ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF  
STATE FOR DEMOCRACY, HUMAN RIGHTS, AND LABOR**

Sec. KOZAK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I particularly wanted to thank you and your colleagues for your long-standing commitment to the hard work of human rights and democracy. I'm also pleased to be joining some old compatriots in that same struggle, Beth Jones and Steve Rademaker at this important hearing.

As with Secretary Rademaker, this is my first appearance as a witness before this Commission. But it's not the first time I've had the pleasure of working with you and with your excellent staff. I see Dorothy and Ron and Orest, too. We spent many long times together when I was working on Belarus.

And I think for me that was one of the greatest demonstrations of the value of the OSCE. That tiny OSCE mission in Belarus and Minsk was really the beacon of hope for human rights activists and democracy activists in that country. And it really shows what a small commitment of OSCE resources can do.

Next year will mark the 30th anniversary of the Helsinki Final Act. And I remember former Secretary Schultz saying that at the time it was signed, no one really realized the potential impact of the human rights provisions of that document. In fact, he said that in his opinion, it was one of the crucial turning points of the Cold War when at Helsinki we made it OK to talk to the Soviets about human rights. Before that, they would brush aside references to human rights and democracy as an intervention in internal affairs.

The fact that the democratically elected Government of Bulgaria is now serving as the OSCE Chair-in-Office, something unimaginable in 1975, shows just how far we have come. If other countries have mature democratic processes, life becomes relatively easy for the United States because the people in those countries will use those processes for correcting any errors of policy or management before they become big problems for the international community. So I think there's a very good practical side to why we want to be promoting democracy through organizations such as the OSCE.

Unfortunately, despite the huge advances in Eastern Europe, democracy—and until recently in Russia itself—a democracy deficit continues to plague many countries of the OSCE. Since the Commission's last hearing, we've seen seriously flawed elections or worse in a number of countries. But we have seen progress, too.

The reaction of the Georgian people to the blatant fraud committed in Georgia's parliamentary elections shows the governments that engage in efforts to manipulate electoral process do so at their own peril. ODHIR involvement in assisting Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan to revise their electoral laws in the past year have been remarkably successful. While none of their respective laws are fully compliant with OSCE commitments, they have all been brought far closer to meeting international standards. Rule of law based on democratic principles and commitments is another lynch pin of democratic society. Here the OSCE is helping by analyzing participating states' legislation and recommending amendments to meet OSCE standards.

The OSCE can also bolster participating states' capacity to enforce the law consistently and impartially. ODHIR has had several notable success stories in Central Asia, especially in Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan, where governments have transferred authority for prison administration to the Ministries of Justice. There can be no democracy without media freedom. And unfortunately the situation for journalists and some OSCE participating States has worsened since the last hearing. Ukraine and Belarus have intensified their assault on the independent media in the runup to the October elections in those countries by harassing, intimidating, fighting, and at

times imprisoning independent journalists, and by closing down independent media outlets.

Turkmenistan recently took steps to clamp down further, if that's possible, creating a national press service to supervise print media. Actions in Russia over the past few years also raise serious questions about its commitment to media freedom.

Miklos Haraszti, the new representative for media freedom of OSCE, has made it one of his first major initiatives to urge governments to decriminalize the libel laws. Having watched the Belarusian Government use such laws to criminalize policy differences, I can only wish Mr. Haraszti the greatest success in this endeavor. The U.S. has made an extra budgetary contribution to this project.

Active civil society is one of the most important components in a thriving democracy. NGOs continue their courageous work despite harassment in several countries. In fiscal year 2004, the U.S. provided over \$400 million to support democratic development in the OSCE region. Our assistance is described in some length in the book, "Supporting Human Rights and Democracy," a report that we do annually to the Congress. I think there are copies available here at the hearing room.

Religious freedom is fundamental to democratic development. As we speak, Secretary Powell and Ambassador Hanford are presenting the CPC designations, announcing them publicly that you mentioned earlier, Mr. Chairman. And I think those speak for themselves. That countries like Saudi Arabia are on that list shows that the President's statement that the Middle East was no longer immune to discussion of human rights is proving out in practice.

They also are presenting as we speak the International Religious Freedom Report, which is, again, another report required by law and which we all worked very hard on. So I think that will be the news on the religious freedom front today rather than anything I say, is what they have to say and what we have had to do on religious freedom. And I think as you look at that report, you can see quite a bit of detail on the state of religious freedom within the OSCE region as well as the rest of the world.

All OSCE States must continue to root out extremism and terrorism. We all have a responsibility to assure that human rights are protected even as we combat terrorism. And in this respect, the deplorable treatment of Iraqi detainees at the hands of U.S. military personnel in Iraq was a stain on the honor of our Nation. When President Bush expressed his deep disgust and regret about the events at Abu Ghraib, it wasn't just his personal reaction as a matter of principle. It was also his reaction as the head of state of a country that holds itself to the same high standard to which we hold others.

As President Bush said, one of the key differences between democracies and dictatorships is that free countries confront such abuses openly and directly. We expose the truth, hold all who bear responsibility fully accountable, and bring them to justice and then take action to be sure that abuses don't recur. We take our OSCE commitment seriously, and we will keep the OSCE apprised as investigations proceed. We're also organizing a site event at the upcoming human dimension conference in Warsaw where we will ad-

dress the issue of prisoner abuse and U.S. measures to bring about accountability.

U.S. supports OSCE's effort to eliminate all forms of torture. As that word is defined in the convention against torture, in President Bush's statement on torture victims' day and by common sense. We will continue to press individual OSCE participating States to end torture as a matter of policy and to hold human rights abusers accountable.

A crucial component in the fight against terrorism is promotion of tolerance. As Secretary Jones just elaborated in her testimony, we applaud the OSCE's efforts to fight racism, anti-Semitism, religious intolerance and other forms of xenophobia and discrimination. Much remains to be done, however, and we look forward to the naming of special representatives to further our collective efforts in this regard.

One lesson I learned during my time in Belarus is that the OSCE is only as strong as its participating States. When the Chair-in-Office and members give field missions their full backing, they are able effectively to challenge repressive regimes and to bring about hope and progress. When the Chair-in-Office and other member states try to appease a repressive regime, more repression and more illegitimate demands are the inevitable result.

This means that member States must use the full range of incentives, both positive and negative, available to them to encourage democratic progress and to deter abuses of OSCE personnel as the responsibility of all of us. In this regard, some seem to have accepted the charge of double standards that have been made against ODHIR. This is a red herring. There's only one standard for democratic elections based on the criteria set out in the OSCE commitments stipulated in the 1990 Copenhagen document and the 1991 Moscow document and reaffirmed in the charter for European security adopted at the Istanbul summit. The fact that one member can always claim that someone else is worse than they are, if accepted, would be a race for the anti-democratic bottom.

To me, one of perhaps the most disturbing developments in the past year was the July declaration signed by nine members of the Commonwealth of Independent States. It seems to call into question the right of OSCE to raise human rights issues. And in rhetoric reminiscent of not only the Soviet Union, but other dictatorships such as Pinochet's Chile and the generals in Argentina, deems discussion of human rights to be a breach of principles of non-interference in the internal affairs and respect for sovereignty of states.

This reversion to pre-Helsinki Final Act paths cannot be allowed to stand. In 1991, OSCE participating States agreed in the document on Moscow meeting that the participating States emphasized that issues relating to human rights, fundamental freedoms, democracy and the rule of law are of international concern as respect for these rights and freedom constitutes one and the same foundations of the international order.

We had it right then. We must not allow a return to a pre-Helsinki version of the world now in which self-determination and non-

intervention were perverted into a shield behind which dictators at the right and the left had the freedom to deprive their own peoples of freedom without fear of criticism from the rest of the world. In his memoirs, former Secretary of State Schultz said, "We had insisted that we would not settle simply for words on human rights. We insisted on deeds." On its 30th anniversary, we must insist that the promises of human rights for all citizens embodied in the Helsinki Final Act and subsequent commitments of the OSCE are echoed in deed throughout the OSCE region.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Ambassador, thank you very much for your testimony.

And just to lead with your last point, one of your last points, first, I'm very grateful for your strong statement on the statement made by the nine presidents. And I would just point out that we did a response to that as well.

I mean, we've heard that of not being criticized for human rights abuses. That's the same old, tired out, worn out line that we've heard from PRC, Vietnam, North Korea, South Africa during apartheid years and, of course, the Soviet Union. So we've made a very strong, and use the word again, robust response to the nine presidents. It does raise some very serious problems.

Armenia, Belarus, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, the Russian Federation, Tajikistan, Ukraine and Uzbekistan all signed it. And we know that the Kazakhstan wants to be the Chair-in-Office for the year 2009.

And perhaps Ambassador Jones or you might want to respond. Because I thought that was where would they take the OSCE. And that decision, as you know, needs to be made in the year 2006. So if that's the direction, we need to put a tourniquet on that kind of thinking because I think it's very, very injurious to any human rights discussion.

I would also want to raise the issue of trafficking. And I want to publicly and very strongly commend the President for his leadership on human trafficking. As you know, I was the prime sponsor of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 and the reauthorization of 2003 signed by President Bush, the other signed by President Clinton. And Steve Rademaker will remember that we had unbelievable pushback on the naming of names, the non-humanitarian aid sanctions.

Humanitarian aid obviously should flow in an unfettered way to any country because we care about those who are distressed and disenfranchised and hurting. But certainly military aid and other kinds of aids ought to be used as sticks for countries that refuse to respect their own people, especially the women who are being trafficked.

And I would point out that the naming of names has worked, I think, has proven that smart sanctions work. When you get good friends like Turkey, Greece, Russia, Israel, South Korea, all being designated as tier three countries and then getting off the list because of their actions to crack down. Serbia and Montenegro are on that as well, and raided brothels, closed them, began prosecuting the traffickers and protecting the victims. It proves that when we put our money where our mouth is, we can get real results.

I would point out that Bangladesh even now is doing—has avoided sanctions, unlike Venezuela and Cuba and others who are on tier three, because they stepped up to the plate and began a very serious and hopefully sustained effort to stop trafficking within their environs. So I want to thank the President for doing so.

I raise this especially because, as Steve Rademaker mentioned a moment ago, we used our chairmanship very effectively when it came to arms control and security issues. We will be chairing the Security Council at the U.N.—and Secretary Jones, you might want to speak to this—in just a couple of months. My hope is, especially given the President's very strong statements last year at the U.N. on trafficking, that we will use that chairmanship to really take the human trafficking issue and put that center stage again as we chair that to show that we mean business.

We're doing it, you're doing it. I would also point out and I would hope that all the countries of the world would take note, we're attacking it within our own country as well. The rescue and restore efforts being rolled out by the Justice Department, Health and Human Services, the State Department, everyone working with the local government, state and local law enforcement is working very well.

The Tampa speech as well as that meeting—I was at the Newark, New Jersey rollout, and I just have nothing but accolades and praise for the very serious and often under-heralded efforts by the president with regards to trafficking. Please use that security council chairmanship to take that issue and just get it right smack dab in front of everybody again and say, "We mean business."

On anti-Semitism, if I could, the thoughts about Cordoba, whether or not we are pushing for a followup there to the Berlin conference. And also, if you would, the idea that has been pushed, that I think is a good idea, of having a more regularized mechanism for the Chair-in-Office, a special envoy or some other office to monitor anti-Semitism.

And then finally—and then I will go to my colleagues, but I have a number of questions. The 9/11 Commission and the some 30-odd hearings that were held—I chaired two of them myself for the International Relations Committee and for the Veterans Affairs—it became very clear. One issue that you might want to speak to.

The 9/11 Commission said that travel documents are like weapons for the terrorists. A very good and I think profound statement made by that commission. In looking over the conventions of the U.N., it's very clear that there are some 12 conventions that deal with terrorism, the money laundering and then the financing one of 1999, I think, being the most recent. None of them speak to travel documents.

And I know that the department is working on biometrics and a lot of other very important initiatives. But it seems to me U.N. Security Council resolutions don't have the weight that a convention might have. And it's something we might think about. You might want to touch on it.

And again, one thing that all of us are concerned about, and that is the whole issue of—and the commission, the 9/11 Commission, spoke to this—a more robust work within the Middle East in terms

of public diplomacy. The OSCE might offer the model. We have Mediterranean partners. Six members of the Middle East are a part of that, including Israel, Jordan, Egypt. What could be done, in your view, to expand OSCE principles? Don't rewrite them. Take those and say, "Here's something we need to invite you to become more of a part of."

All of us, Alcee, all of us that are on the Commission care—and Ben Cardin—deeply about this. We even had a hearing with Sharansky and many others, as you know, on June 15th to explore this as a way of trying to get them to be—you know, get the good infection [ph] about democracy and human rights observance.

Sec. JONES. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Let me go first to your first question about Kazakhstan and its desire to—its proposal that it be accepted as the Chair-in-Office and what that means in terms of their having signed this CIS statement. As Secretary Mike Kozak said, we have serious problems with the CIS statement. There is no double standard in the OSCE. There is no double standard in ODHIR.

Each of the countries who signed this document signed up to adhere to the principles of the OSCE when they first joined the organization. And Mike read out what that means. We have since then, not least because of the very strong statements and communications from the commission itself to each of these governments, but we have separately on a bilateral basis had conversations with each of these governments about what does this mean.

I look forward to pursuing these questions with colleagues of those countries when I meet with them, several of us, meet with them next week in New York where we'll have a lot of meetings on the margins of the General Assembly during leaders week.

In terms of Kazakhstan's desire to be selected for Chair-in-Office in 2009, we've been very forthright in telling President Nazarbayev and his colleagues that one of the principle criteria is adhering to all of the OSCE principles. As Mike said, Kazakhstan has done a very good job of getting back on track in assuring that it does adhere to these principles in some of the actions that it's taken over the past year, getting very close to OSCE principles and OSCE requirements.

There's still a bit to go. And, as I say, we look forward to those kinds of conversations next week to push forward on exactly the kinds of things that we think are necessary. We have a very, very robust conversation with the Kazakhstanis, both bilaterally in terms of Washington, but also our embassy in Almaty is very active on the subject, as is Ambassador Minikes.

On trafficking in persons, the OSCE itself, thanks to the leadership of the Dutch Chairmanship-in-Office last year, put forward a proposal that the OSCE itself have a trafficking in persons mandate. They have done that. There is a person now assigned, appointed to lead this effort within the OSCE. It's an extremely good way to press and encourage OSCE member States to assure that they have the right kind of legislation, that they have their programs, that we share best practices and how to address each of the areas that are so important to us in pursuing trafficking in persons.

In terms of your recommendation of using our security council chairmanship to pursue trafficking, I will certainly discuss this with my colleagues in the international organizations bureau and with, of course, Ambassador Danforth as well as Secretary Powell to see how that might best be done.

I addressed in my statement, as you will see in my formal written statement, the issue of U.S. support for the Cordoba conference that Spain has proposed. We look forward to using that as an expert level discussion to assure followup to the extremely good recommendations that have been made and proposals that have been put forward by the anti-Semitism conference.

We do support naming a special representative, provided this is resources neutral. We think a special representative can be very aggressive without a lot of administrative underpinning, shall we say, in making sure that governments understand what it is that they've agreed to, understand what's been put forward and to provide the kind of support that's necessary to make sure that legislation, training, education on these issues is pursued in the way that it should.

On travel documents and the security of travel documents, this is a very strong element in the OSCE's efforts in the FSC. It's also an issue that's under very detailed, very detailed conversation between the United States and the European Union, for example, through home and justice affairs. There are conversations underway right now between us and Russia on a bilateral basis on how to assure greater security of travel documents, airline security, those kinds of issues.

The biometrics issue was one that is of significant importance to Secretary Ridge, that he is pursuing personally in a very aggressive way. And I'm very grateful for your mentioning of it in this context. It gives us a greater oomph to push this forward because it is something that we would like to make sure that all member states of the OSCE take as seriously as the rest of us do.

On the OSCE and how it can be used in the Middle East, you mentioned very rightly that there are conversations with the Mediterranean dialogue [ph] their way to expand these principles. That's actually exactly the theory, the principles behind the President's recommendation to his G-8 colleagues, the kinds of proposals that we've made in the U.S./E.U. context, the kinds of proposals we've made to NATO. That's why in the three summits that we had this year in June the G-8 adopted the broader Middle East and North Africa initiative. Those are the principles that we have borrowed or used from the OSCE to put forward as suggestions to the broader Middle East and North Africa countries as ideas that they can use to develop a stronger civil society, they can use to work with in democratic reforms and human rights reforms. That's exactly the idea without expanding the organization itself.

There is a considerable discussion underway now as to how to operationalize it, if I can put it that way, the kinds of—these principles. There will be a planning meeting of the forum for the future at the general assembly that Secretary Powell will participate in with his colleagues. There's a lot of work underway to try to use these kinds of principles to pursue democracy, human rights, civil society in the broader Middle East and North Africa.

So I thank you for your appreciation of the importance of this issue. Thank you.

Mr. CARDIN. Let me yield first to Mr. Hastings. I think he has a time problem.

Mr. HASTINGS. Thank you. I have a meeting with the vice president of the foreign affairs committee of Austria and need to rush away. I'm sorry I'm not going to get to get with you, Jerry. Thanks so much.

Mr. Chairman, I'm appreciative of all of the testimony that the witnesses have presented to us here this morning in very concise fashion. And I'll try to be likewise. And I appreciate you holding this meeting.

I also just will take a personal liberty in a friend of mine and a friend of this organization who used to be a high staffer in the Parliamentary Assembly's staff in Copenhagen, has now moved to America. And I see his interest continues. But Eric Rudenshiold, who is a resource for us, has an extensive amount of understanding of the OSCE process. And I just take note of the fact that he's in the audience.

Ms. Secretary, thank you so very much for all of your assertions. I agree with the chairman in all of his assessments and your responses to them. I'm deeply appreciative. I certainly am very, very mindful of the need for transformation of the OSCE. Last Wednesday, I had a very good meeting with Secretary Powell in discussing a lot of the issues. And please convey to him my strong appreciation for the statement regarding the Gulf War. We talked about that briefly unrelated to OSCE activities.

Also, the shaping up of the election observer mission of OSCE—we had very brief discussions regarding that. And I explained to the secretary my view as the President of the Parliamentary Assembly. First, I wanted to make him fully aware of the fact that as the president and as a political functionary in my other responsibility that I have requested Chairman Passy to designate another person whom he has designated to lead the Parliamentary Assembly's observer mission. And that's Barbara Haering from Switzerland.

And at my request, Chairman Passy did make that appointment. I say all of that because we come to today and appreciating very much our state having fulfilled the U.S. obligation to invite election observers from the OSCE. I do need to have some assurances that the State Department is going to follow its practices regarding visa fees and visas and grant them in an expeditious manner for OSCE parliamentarians and their staffs. I think in all other election observations by the OSCE, that has been the case. And I don't need a response from you, but I do need to put it on your radar screen because it's something that's critical.

Right now, I need, for example, for Ms. Haering to be expedited to get here to do the assessment for the Parliamentary Assembly. Which brings me to my next observation. With my colleagues, the chairman of this Commission and my colleagues, the treasurer of the Parliamentary Assembly from Canada here and chairman of the important committee of the OSCE which I now am privileged to be president of, Mr. Cardin, I'm sure they all will take note of my parochial interest, not me as a congressperson, but as a Par-

liamentary Assembly member, in asserting very strongly the role that the Parliamentary Assembly plays in election observation.

When I read your printed remarks, I note the absence and the highlighting of ODHIR's responsibility, which I do not minimize by any stretch of the imagination. I consider it extremely important. But as one, along with Jerry, for example, we were in Russia and we observed the Russian election. ODHIR was there. But the Parliamentary Assembly was there in a rather substantial kind and led by then-President Bruce George. We, too, had exacting responsibilities.

Well, when it comes to America and the shaping of the kind of observer mission, if you take the political tensions off the table, it seems to me only fairness or fairness dictates to us that this is an opportunity—and this is what I said to Secretary Powell—take Hastings out of the picture.

This is an opportunity, number one, for an extraordinary bipartisan effort to assure and ensure that those observers see the full panoply, not one person's side or the other person's side or ideologically, but that they do what they can do best. That's important, in my judgment. And I will be speaking with Speaker Hastert specifically to make sure that we do everything for any briefers, either by ODHIR or the P.A. or combined that they are totally bipartisan without any hesitancy whatsoever.

Now, I'm just back from Belgium yesterday where I attended the racism and xenophobia conference, which I think went extremely well. I had the good fortune of meeting Ben's friend Cardinal Keeler and countless others that were there from America. Secretary Jackson, who led the delegation at the insistence of President Bush, and I had a number of meetings. But more important to the issue at hand, I met with Chairman Passy. I met with Jan Kubis, the Secretary General, there in Vienna. I met with Ambassador Minikes. And all of us in full agreement that the observer mission should be robust.

I also met with Christian Strohal from ODHIR. I gather from mine and Christian's meetings and the manner in which the run-up to whatever election observation is going to take place that Christian has a different view. I hope that you can help me and Secretary Powell can help me in having him dispel the notion that observing an election in America is any different than observing an election in Russia.

I think America's credibility stands to be enhanced immensely. I think the OSCE's credibility in election observation will be enhanced immensely. In addition to appointing Barbara Haering, Chairman Passy also appointed Igor Oshtash from the Ukraine, interestingly, on my behalf, to observe the elections in Kazakhstan that are impending and others as well for Belarus. And we know that these things are taking place.

This country's elections are important. Every person, every foreign minister, all the functionaries that I talked to in Belgium over the last four days were interested in the American elections. Contrary to some, not for the purpose of coming here to run any election—Jerry and I didn't run any election in Russia. We didn't receive interference or cause interference. The speaker at that time of the duma briefed us as well as other functionaries. And I, quite

frankly, am at a loss to understand why existing political tensions, which are natural in an election year, would cause us to minimize the kind of observation.

Now, I know that Secretary Powell doesn't control that, nor do you, nor do I. But the fact of the matter is that where our good offices can be influential in allowing for America's credibility to be enhanced, I see that as my responsibility. And I'm very protective of the role that we play in the Parliamentary Assembly. And I would assert to you that in election observation, ODHIR has a lot to learn from what we do. And what I said to Strohal was, "Tell me what election you got elected to." And he understood me very well.

Parliamentarians are accustomed to being elected. And whether they are from Kazakhstan or other places, fairness only dictates that we balance our observation. And I would like your reaction to my much too lengthy statement.

Sec. JONES. Thank you very much for raising this question. Let me just address right away we will do our very best on the visa question to work to make sure that people get their visas at the appropriate moment. We'll want to work with you to make sure we know who they are in enough advance so that we can do that.

In terms of ODHIR and the importance of their Parliamentary Assembly being election observers, let me first say that I am very apologetic that I did not include that in my formal statement. I should have. We certainly recognize the importance of the members of the Parliamentary Assembly being observers, because, just as you say, you have personal experience with how this is meant to work.

I might also say that the issue of the United States inviting ODHIR, inviting the OSCE to provide observers in U.S. elections is an invitation that we have extended through several American elections now for the past four, five times. It's something that we believe is part of our membership obligations in the OSCE. We certainly signed up to this. This is something that we expect each and every other member to offer. And we are very, in fact, very proud to show election observers from wherever they may come how it is that we do assure a free, fair, transparent election in the United States of America.

In addition, there are technological improvements that we've made that are of great interest to other countries who are looking at doing the same kinds of things and they would like to learn from the experience of the United States and various other states as to what the lessons learned are from technological advancements. And we will be very interested in showing the election observers that will be coming how this works. But I completely agree with you, Congressman Hastings. This is something that we are proud of. It enhances the credibility of the United States. It enhances the credibility of the OSCE for us to participate as forthrightly and as proudly as we should.

Mr. HASTINGS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CARDIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Secretary Kozak, I want to follow up on your comments about the concerns about how we have treated, allegations made of how we have treated unlawful combatants, the problems in Iraq, which

we have acknowledged. I very much appreciate your comments about the importance at the human dimension meeting in Warsaw to have a side event initiated by the United States. I think that's an excellent strategy, and I commend you for that.

And I also thank you for your commitment to keep us apprised as investigations continue. I assume that includes the Commission, when you mention the OSCE, that you'll keep our Commission advised as to how the investigations are going and what they discover.

I want to raise Guantanamo Bay for a moment, if I might. We were charged at a meeting of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly by our colleagues challenging the manner in which we were treating the detainees in Guantanamo Bay. As a result of that, Chairman Smith and myself visited Guantanamo Bay, had a chance to see firsthand the manner in which we were treating the detainees there. We issued a report to the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly. And we emphasized the point that it's U.S. policy that we will not use torture. And it was verified by the State Department and by the administration that torture was not used.

Just recently, there was a press account—and I want to stress a press account—by three British subjects who were at Guantanamo Bay that they, in fact, were tortured and pretty specific as to the type of conduct that they were subjected to at Guantanamo Bay. And they also indicated in their report that other detainees were subject to similar types of methods that would be considered torture.

My question to you is whether we've heard from the British Government concerning these concerns. And secondly, regardless of whether we've heard from the British Government or not, has there been any followup to investigate these charges to see whether there was any truth in the allegations that were made by these subjects.

Sec. KOZAK. Well, first let me hit the last part of your question, Mr. Cardin. Let me qualify this by saying I don't think any of us are involved with the detention policy, and so, our knowledge is very limited. I get at more from the side that we—the same way you do. Other governments are asking us about it and comparing what we're asking them to do with what we ask for ourselves.

I do not know whether the British government has raised this with us. We will check and get you an answer on that point. I do know that the British government as well as the governments, I think, of every other nationality of persons detained at Guantanamo have had access to their nationals there as well, of course, as the Red Cross has.

And obviously there are a lot of motives for making allegations and so on. But the statement about torture, I think, clearly is policy. We went through some effort in the statement that was made on victim torture day that the President put out. And I think the effort there was to be as crystal clear as anyone can be that we do know what torture means. There isn't some new definition of it and that that's what's prohibited.

Now, obviously you get into fine points of, you know, if somebody has to stand for an hour in the sun in the line is that a torture or not.

Mr. CARDIN. You're absolutely correct. I agree with your answer. And the nuances here are going to be difficult for us to evaluate. The charges made by the press account was very direct torture well beyond just deprivation of sleep. Although deprivation of sleep was one of the allegations. It went to physical abuse. It went to other types of torture. And I guess my concern is I hope that we take these allegations seriously and find out whether, in fact, there's any truth to these. The way that we handled the problems in Iraq by confronting them directly, to me, is the only way that we can handle these types of allegations.

Sec. KOZAK. I absolutely agree with you on that, sir. And one of the things I've been rather proud of, we had a similar spate of things coming out of the U.N. Commission on Human Rights, a little bit apart from this committee's jurisdiction, but still, the substance of it is exactly the same. And they did a report on Iraq that was—they had the High Commissioner for Human Rights or the Acting High Commissioner charge this. And we got a ton of questions, requests for information. Then we got a draft report and were asked to give comments on it in 24 hours.

An interesting process in that what I saw, even people who have worked in this area for years pushing other people to be forthcoming. And we're saying, "How can they say that? This isn't true. That's not true." And I said, "Look, the issue is not whether it's true or not. The issue is how we react to it. And if we just go back and say you can't ask me this because it's not true, that's exactly the kind of response we don't want to get from other people."

What we want to do here is set an example. And I think we did. We went back on each case in that report where there were allegations of abuse beyond the ones we knew about already and said, "Please give us specifics so that we can look at this. It's not enough to tell us that somebody alleges that American soldiers shot up a car full of innocent people at a checkpoint. Where did this happen, when did it happen so that we can go follow it up?"

It turned out in all but one case that they mentioned they didn't have that kind of information. And in the other case, we are following it up and trying to investigate and get more information where there was enough to identify a particular individual and particular time and place of the alleged abuse. So it's a process, as you mentioned.

But I think our goal in this—first, our policy on torture is absolutely clear. And certainly physical torture is prohibited. If somebody's doing it, we want to know about it. We want to investigate it. We want to follow up. If someone wants to ask us about it, we're going to go back and ask for the particulars that allow us to take action on it. And I think that's the only way we can be and maintain our credibility.

Mr. CARDIN. I appreciate that. And I support that policy. And I hope that you will check to make sure that we followed up in regards to these allegations in regards to Guantanamo Bay.

Sec. KOZAK. I will.

Mr. CARDIN. Let me follow-up on the chairman's point about the 9/11 Commission report, which I thought is right on target. I believe we've had a lot of discussion here, a lot of hearings taking place. And I expect Congress will take some action before we ad-

journal this year to implement some of the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission report, particularly as it relates to the national intelligence director.

But a significant part of this report deals with we need to win not only the act of war against terrorists and we have to be strong militarily in that regard, we also have to win the war of ideas. And that was perhaps the strongest weapon we had during the Cold War. Our values won out. And the people of East Berlin saw what was happening in West Berlin, and the Iron Curtain literally fell down, the Berlin Wall collapsed. We won the war of ideas.

And we need to do the same thing in the Middle East. And that is why all of us are so passionate about this process that started in 1975 that no one really expected to be how it is today. But it sort of developed into a very important, effective tool for the battle of ideas. So I would just encourage the State Department to be more aggressive in trying to get more players, in the Middle East particularly, to be engaged in the Helsinki process, whether within OSCE or similar types of organizations. I think it's probably best within OSCE, because to try to reinvent it would probably take too long, but to expand it.

As you know, we have the initiative—and Senator Grafstein's been one of the leaders on it—to expand the OSCE with our Mediterranean partners and to have higher expectations and greater participation. And I think the rewards could be great, including listening to the 9/11 Commission report and its recommendations. And I know the administration is doing this. And I just want you to know that this is one of our highest priorities. And anything that we can do on the Commission to assist in this effort and within the Parliamentary Assembly we will do.

The last issue I want to raise deals with the economic issues, if I might. And that is, I mentioned in my opening statement that there's been in the last 12 months a lot of the tension spent within OSCE on the economic dimension starting in Maastricht, including the work of the Parliamentary Assembly. And probably the highest priority is to try to deal with corruption. Corruption, like your observations—at least it's our observations—that it's still widespread, particularly in the emerging states, and that it's a real impediment to the development of all three areas of our concern.

So that the Maastricht document talked about developing strategies to fight corruption. We specifically in Edinburgh passed a resolution calling for the high-level meeting to develop a strategy to fight corruption. And I would just like your observations as to whether you believe this is a very high priority or just maybe not as high a priority. And if it is a high priority, what steps are we taking to develop a strategy or a position? And do we support a high-level meeting of ministers in order to advance this issue?

Sec. JONES. The issue of fighting corruption is a very big issue for the United States. It's one where, including especially in the countries of the OSCE, which I know the most about, we believe it's really a key to success. You can't have prosperity, you can't have democracy, you can't have a rule of law if corruption is a big issue in any of these countries.

It's something that I know the E.U. was particularly concerned about and really focused on as it worked with the 10 new members

of the European Union to get them ready for European Union membership. And it's an area in which the E.U. keeps working on with the countries that are coming down the pike in getting ready for close association with the European Union.

It's also an issue that is worked on in detail by the OECD. The reason I mention that is that we want to be sure that what the OSCE does is complimentary to the work that's already going on with the E.U. and with the OECD on counter corruption, anti-corruption measures.

That said, we have some very good programs, bilaterally and through the OSCE, to try to address the particular issues that are related to corruption. And what we're working on with the OSCE is, again, to develop the institutions that are strong enough to counter corruption and sort of close down the loopholes, close down the opportunities for corrupt officials to be able to take advantage of institutions, to develop legislation that makes it harder for corrupt officials or corrupt people to work in countries and take advantage of situations, to make sure that the legal systems will support a transparent free market economy, which is, after all, the goal of the countries of the OSCE and of the United States itself. I can't speak to the question of whether a high-level meeting will happen. It's something that's under discussion. And I would like to offer to get back to you on how that conversation is developing within the OSCE, if I might.

Mr. CARDIN. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SMITH. Commissioner Pitts.

**HON. JOSEPH R. PITTS, COMMISSIONER, COMMISSION ON  
SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE**

Mr. PITTS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you for holding this important and timely hearing. As our nation engages in the war against terror, it is vital that we build and strengthen relationships we have with friends and allies around the world I would like to submit my opening statement for the record.

Mr. SMITH. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. PITTS. And I have three questions for the panel. And any of you can respond. It often seems that the OSCE takes a back seat to NATO when U.S. policy toward Europe is considered while, for their part, E.U. countries concentrate their own attention mainly on the countries preparing to join the E.U. The first question is what can be done to empower and reinvigorate the OSCE. How much might the E.U. be prepared to help us do that? And do you see Russia as a potential partner or obstacle in that endeavor.

Secondly, I'd like to ask about the work of the Coordinator on Economic Environmental Activities, the High Commissioner on National Minorities, the Representative on Freedom of the Media. Their activities are usually conducted in a quiet and behind-the-scenes manner. My question is how do you keep track of their activities? Are you satisfied that these positions have justified their existence through particular accomplishments? And if not, how would you reform them so that they would be improved? Or should they be eliminated altogether?

My third question has to do with terrorist financing. The OECD's financial action task force, the OSCE's Bucharest Action Plan and

Action Against Terrorism Unit have provided technical assistance to assist law enforcement and regulatory authorities in terrorist financing investigations. How effective are these multilateral efforts, including the UNSCR and the U.N. Counterterrorism Committee to develop common standards and jointly freeze financial assets of terrorists? How can they be made more effective, for instance, in addressing key outstanding issues such as how they raise money, from whom, and how they spend the money?

So if we can start with the OSCE and NATO question, I'd appreciate it

Sec. JONES. I would put it this way, the OSCE and NATO are very different organizations. NATO certainly is an organization of like-minded countries, but it has a military operational focus. The OSCE, because it has the three dimensions, has a broader focus. And we find it an organization that is very flexible. It's very easy to move quickly with the OSCE.

I use Macedonia as a very good example three years ago when we suddenly needed to have observers to make sure that the agreements that were reached at Ohrid could be implemented properly. It was the OSCE that was able to put forward those observers within days. And it was something that really helped the security situation in Macedonia.

The European Union in addition, of course, has focused on the programs, legislation development, et cetera, that was necessary to make it possible for these 10 new countries to join, to be invited to join the European Union as happened earlier this year. But I would argue there are very many of the developments, very many of the improvements that the E.U. pressed on these countries that are very much in line with the improvements that all of us wanted. In fact, we take great credit, we're very proud of the collaboration that we undertook with the E.U. in very many of these areas to make sure that we were all focused in the same direction on fighting corruption, on border security, on rule of law issues, on developing democracy, on making sure that there could be vetting for security officials and that kind of thing.

The European Union, now that it has enlarged, is even more interested in its new borders, in the countries around its new borders, so is taking an even more active role in the OSCE as an organization—of course, the member states do in any case—in working with the OSCE, with us in the OSCE to address some of the pros and conflicts to the instability kinds of issues that we think are very, very important to address.

Whether it be Moldova, Transnistria where we have—I'd like to really commend the leadership of the head of mission there, Ambassador Bill Hill, for really pushing the initiatives, coming up with ideas for how to address the outstanding issues related to the frozen conflict there between Transnistria and Moldova. The same thing I would like to commend in terms of greater E.U. participation, interest, activism in looking at how to assure a resolution of the issues in Georgia involving both South Ossetia and Abkhazia. Nagorno-Karabakh we already have a very good participation by a European Union member State, by France, as a co-chair with the United States and Russia in trying to push for improvements there.

I really look at these three organizations as being very complimentary to each other. There is a way that each of them can work together. There's a niche for each of them. And we constantly are looking for ways to increase the ability of all of us to do the work that we think is necessary by taking advantage of the best parts of each of these organizations to achieve U.S. goals and the goals that we have set together with the European Union, with NATO, with OECD and, frankly, also with the Council of Europe.

On the national minorities question that you asked and the free media, we really appreciate the very hard work that the representatives for each of these special focuses undertake. We stay in very close touch with them. They come regularly to Washington to talk with us. They are constantly in conversation with Ambassador Minikes in Vienna.

They report back to the perm representatives. And they stay in touch with our embassies, with the U.S. embassies, as they travel in each of the countries where they have particular issues that they're working on to pursue. So I use every opportunity myself to stay in touch with them and to see them at the margins of the general assembly or at OSCE meetings when they come to Washington. So I really have a great respect for the ability of these extremely capable people to do the kind of work that they are meant to do and to do it in a way that achieves the objective and gets the changes and behavior that we're looking for.

On terrorist financing, we think that the FDS [ph] is a very productive organization. The work in the U.N. Security Council in the U.N. to pursue terrorist financing are all ways that we work to look at ways and to designate organizations, to designate people whom the international community should assure can no longer provide financing to terrorists. There are people who know a lot more about exactly how they all work than I do, but those are mechanisms that we use very, very regularly and that the member states use very, very regularly.

Countries from all over the world, governments from all over the world are constantly bringing forward names of people, names of organizations that they'd have considered by the U.N., by us on a bilateral basis to assure that terrorist financing cannot continue and that the international community takes as tough a measure as they possibly can to make sure that these organizations, that these people cannot continue to use international banking services to support terrorist organizations or terrorist events.

Mr. PITTS. Thank you. Anyone else have anything to add? Secretary Kozak.

Sec. KOZAK. I'd just say on the media freedom representative and the way they work, I had a chance to watch this firsthand in Belarus. And it's true that when they have a government that's being cooperative that they tend to do it behind the scenes and low key for obvious reasons. They get to hear our suggestions on your media law. The government goes and takes the measures, and then the government takes credit itself for doing the right thing.

But in places like Belarus where they got nothing but grief from the regime in power for a long time with the predecessor represented in Mr. Duve, the government said he could visit but he couldn't bring his assistant who was an American who observed

previously at our embassy there. Now I see with Mr. Hardy [ph] they've changed the pretext, but the result is the same.

But in those cases, as Beth was saying, they got information from us, they got information from other member state embassies and then they published reports and denounced what was going on in a very public way. So they are able to play it both, sort of, the behind the scenes, private incremental improvement track or if that's not working, public pressure. And I think they made a pretty good job of it.

Mr. PITTS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you very much. Senator Grafstein. Senator Grafstein?

Mr. GRAFSTEIN. Well, I'm really privileged to ask our friendly neighbor, the United States, and their key people at the State Department some questions about an interest of mine which I share with all of the parliamentarians on this side, the goals and the objectives and the processes of the Helsinki Accord. And we agree with everything you've said, certainly I do, with respect to its importance and its growing importance. I only give you just one current example.

Because of leadership of Representative Smith and Cardin and Alcee Hastings and others, anti-Semitism became an issue and was really, in effect, by the Parliamentary Assembly. And I was delighted when Secretary General Kofi Annan, when there was tremendous infighting about having a conference, focused purely on anti-Semitism took our resolution, which we worked so hard on, and used that. And he gave us credit for that. So sometimes a junior organization like the OSCE can impact the major organization.

I just want to make two comments and bring your attention to some activities that I think we're doing that help you in your work. From my observation—and I've noted it again in the questions this morning—the work of the parliamentary dimension, the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, is sometimes neglected by our various ministries. The two examples that you give, the Georgian election monitoring example, that was led by Bruce George, the president of the OSCE. And I was the deputy on both of those missions.

And quite frankly, I think we led those missions. The ODHIR was there. They were very supportive. They were excellent. But quite frankly, I think that parliamentarians have a lot more experience in connection with elections and what's important and what's not important in order to instigate the parliamentary process.

And again, when you mentioned Ambassador Hill, he's done a fabulous job. But I'm also—and Kiljunen of Finland—leads the parliamentary side of the Moldova Transnistria problem. And I happen to be on that as well, so I can speak from firsthand experience that there the leadership of Mr. Kiljunen has been outstanding. And I would just hope that when you take a look at the information you garner from your minister, from your diplomats, you would take into account the fact that the OSCE has two dimensions.

There's the ministerial side, and there's also the parliamentary side. And we've been working very hard, as Chris will tell you and as Ben will tell you, to make sure that the two institutions, one in Vienna and ours at Copenhagen, work together. We now, in effect,

have an ambassador there. We now have a full-time ambassador and officer, Ambassador Nothelle, precisely to make sure that the two arms of the OSCE work in harmony together. We have the same objectives. Our processes are different. That's a comment.

Secondly, on corruption, again, parliamentarians have taken a huge lead in examining and focusing on parliamentary corruption, which is a huge part of the overall problem. And I must say that progress has been made, remarkable progress has been made with the organization called GOPAC. It was started in Ottawa several years ago, the chairmen of it, worldwide. It's the Global Organization of Parliamentarians Against Corruption. The head of that is John Williams, M.P., from Canada. The vice chairman is Roy Cullen. And we are trying to integrate that process into the OSCE as well so that we compliment each other. So I just bring that to your attention. It's remarkable work, and it works at the parliamentary level.

My final comment and question—I only have really one question—is the Middle East. Again, we have been engaged in trying to move forward a Middle East agenda. And I think we've concluded, many parliamentarians have concluded, that the political track is stuck. It's very hard to move it for all of the things that we know. But the economic track, which is the second basket of the OSCE, is open.

And hence, we've been focused, Representative Cardin and myself have been focused, on the economic dimension of the Middle East. And I'm pleased to say that I've just returned from a conference in England where I talked about the OSCE as an instigator of economic reform in the Middle East, Arab Middle East. And it was very well received. And that paper, I'll send it along to you.

So my question is that has the department, has the Secretary of State looked at the question of the economic reforms necessary in the Arab Middle East in order to instigate civil society and democracy. Now, I've read with great care the G-8, the last G-8, declaration, which I think is good. I think the President's leadership on economic assistance and democratic development in that part of the world, the \$150 million, is excellent. I think it's too little. But I would wonder whether or not you've got a coherent strategy for following up on the economic dimension as it applies to the Middle East.

And I conclude with this one fact: The region in the world that suffered the most as a result of September 11th—and I call this the auto-da-fe of September 11th—was the Arab Middle East. Their economies are suffering. And we're sitting on a time bomb there unless we really address the economic problems in that region of the world. So it's a question for you. And we intend to follow this up.

Ben and I fostered a resolution at the OSCE, was unanimously approved at the Parliamentary Assembly in Edinburgh. I've given a paper on that, and we intend to follow that up in Rhodes at the end of this month. So that's my question. Are you in sync with us on that? And how can we help each other to foster that priority?

Sec. JONES. Senator, thank you very much for your comments. I very much appreciate the participation of the Parliamentary Assembly in the work of the OSCE. And I should have acknowledged

that with greater clarity. But it is something that we do recognize and very, very much appreciate. Because, just as you said and some of your other colleagues in the commission said, there's nothing that substitutes for personal experience and knowing what is right, what makes sense, what is important and what is somewhat less important in an election.

Mr. GRAFSTEIN. Just a comment on that, I was here [ph] making that speech here because I intend to make it in Ottawa next week to my own government. So you're not alone.

Sec. JONES. I'll just make a brief comment on the economic track for the Middle East reform. As my colleagues in the Middle East bureau began working to develop some of the ideas on reform in the Middle East, thinking about all the baskets that made the most sense, we took a look, of course, at a U.N. report that really focused on political reform, economic reform and education reform. So those were the three areas that we also adopted as the areas that we should concentrate on in working with reformers in the Middle East.

My colleagues in the Middle East bureau have done that, have been doing that. And the results of some of those conversations is what informed the G-8 in putting forward the proposals that came out of the G-8 summit, which, thank you very much for your attention to those.

I can't tell you right at this very moment how those will be developed. My colleagues in the Middle East bureau are a little bit more focused on some of the details of that. But as I said earlier, the next step in pursuing some of these issues, as with the forum for the future event, sort of, pioneering event that will take place in New York—and then there'll be hopefully a followup conference that we'll still be working on. But our Middle East colleagues completely recognize that it takes all three areas in order to make progress, including the economic one.

And my colleague, Assistant Secretary Rademaker, would like to also offer some comments on how in another area we are using OSCE mechanisms to work with the Middle East.

Sec. RADEMAKER. Thank you. A number of you have raised this question of the applicability of the OSCE and its experiences to the Middle East. And I just wanted to volunteer the comment that the core of the OSCE's approach to security is an integrated one where human rights and democracy are integrated with increasing economic freedom and security and confidence-building measures. And this approach was extraordinarily successful over the last 30 years in bringing about the end of the Cold War and the demise of the Soviet Union, the advent of freedom in Central and Eastern Europe.

The effort that's now underway through the G-8 with regard to the Middle East has at its core the same basic idea. And so, it simply has to be the case that there are lessons that can be learned from the OSCE that are of application in the Middle East. And I think those of you who have raised this issue are correctly focused on that possibility. And you are asking very good questions. You're asking the right questions.

We've seen from our experience in the Western Hemisphere that when the political environment is ripe for it, there is a desire to

look—there can be a desire to look to the OSCE and its experiences and draw from it. And that’s precisely what’s happened in the security area in the Western Hemisphere over the last few years.

We have within the arms control bureau an office that’s devoted to promoting these kinds of confidence and security building measures around the world. They were very much involved in the efforts that have taken place over the last few years here in the Western Hemisphere. They are also active in Asia and in the Middle East.

And they will continue pursuing this. I think your comments will inspire us to redouble our efforts to see what we can draw from—Senator, your comments about the economic dimension I think are very well taken. And we’ll take a second look at whether we can draw anything from that. But we do have people that are focused on this, and we will be glad to report back to you at some point in the future on how we’re coming.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you, Senator Grafstein.

I just have a few followup questions and final questions.

Secretary Rademaker—and to all of you—one of the great leadership initiatives that the Bush administration has undertaken is the attempt to have a zero tolerance policy. As a matter of fact, President Bush issued a zero tolerance policy, vis-a-vis, trafficking in our military. The Trafficking in Victims Protection Act of 2003 actually empowers the Department of State and all of the agencies of government to not only do whatever it can to go after those who are complicit in trafficking, but to take away contracts from contractors, vendors with whom we buy their goods and services if they are complicit in trafficking.

But does zero tolerance policy which has now been adopted by NATO at U.S. leadership—Nicholas Burns has done a marvelous job. Elizabeth Pryor, who used to work there at that shop, has been working, as well as Maureen Walsh and many on our staff to try to—you know, the peacemakers or peacekeepers certainly when they are deployed become a ripe target for the traffickers to bring in women who are then exploited. And it seems to me that the next step is the U.N., to make sure that their deployments hopefully have a zero tolerance policy.

My question to you, Mr. Rademaker, is the forum for security and cooperation in Vienna perhaps another venue that ought to be utilized to take this message, that I don’t want to hear this “boys will be boys” garbage. These are women who are being exploited. They’re being raped. And again, the administration has a sterling record in saying we will not allow this to happen.

We have a joint hearing with the Armed Services Committee on September 21st at which we will look at what the Department of Defense, the Wolfowitz memo, how it’s being implemented. General LaPorte, our former Supreme Allied Commander for South Korea, has done a magnificent job, as has his staff, in implementing a zero tolerance policy. Joseph Schmitz, the I.G., has done some very groundbreaking work for the Department of Defense in terms of both Bosnia and South Korea.

And my point is—every avenue or venue that can be utilized—and certainly I think you probably have already thought of this. But that might be an area, you know, the security cooperation forum in Vienna for doing this as well. Because obviously there are

some countries like the Ukraine, not part of NATO. They've sent peacekeepers to trouble there is that could be brought into this.

If you could.

Sec. RADEMAKER. Well, Mr. Chairman, let me begin by stating the obvious, which is that you provided outstanding leadership on this question of trafficking. You know and I know that the Congress passes lots of bills and lots of resolutions year in and year out. And many of them don't make a big difference in the real world.

But the work that you and some of your colleagues did in the area of trafficking leading up to the enactment of the Trafficking in Victims Protection Act was an example where the action of Congress really has made a difference. You have changed U.S. foreign policy. And as a result, I think life is slowly being made better for a lot of victims of trafficking around the world.

With regard to your specific idea of using the Forum for Security Cooperation to raise awareness and begin talking about ways to address some of the problems that we've seen with peacekeepers in places like Bosnia, this is not something that we have talked about. But I do think it's a very creative suggestion. And so, what I would like to do is take it back, and I will give it very favorable consideration.

Because, as I noted in my remarks, the forum for security cooperation is a valuable tool because it is so flexible. And I think that very flexibility would enable it to accommodate this issue, which is something that should be a priority. And we can help make it a priority.

Mr. SMITH. I appreciate that very much, Mr. Secretary.

Sec. JONES. Could I just add?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Sec. JONES. I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. I actually brought with me the decision that was taken at the NATO summit by the leaders on exactly this trafficking question just to demonstrate the importance that all of NATO attaches to this. And thank you for recognizing the leadership role that Ambassador Nick Burns played in this.

I also wanted—I just did a quick look again—there are two things that you mentioned that are specifically addressed in this. Number one, this applies to partners as well. So Ukraine would have to adhere to the principles that are enunciated in this document. And it also applies to contractors. This is something in which NATO—there is a specific sub-paragraph that speaks to NATO contractors and asks them to participate and pursue the anti-trafficking policy that NATO has adopted.

In terms of Bosnia itself, if I could just say that the former ambassador to Moldova played a very aggressive role, Ambassador Pamela Smith, in talking with NATO about this in the first instance and specifically about how this plays out and what kinds of policies might be, at best, most appropriately be taken in Bosnia to assure adherence to these principles. So let me just assure you that this is something that's very much on the agenda at NATO. And we're ramping up at the OSCE as well with a new representative who's been named to pursue this specifically.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you very much, Ms. Ambassador. Let me ask you on the issue of Kosovo. You know, many of us were concerned about the spike of violence. As a matter of fact, Archbishop Arthemdja had visited with many of us and said not only are very important Orthodox Christian sites being destroyed, people are being killed. And then there was that flareup of violence. What is being done to ensure that the minority rights and the return processes are being respected?

And just let me ask you a couple of other questions. Yesterday I was part of a forum on the upcoming Ukrainian elections. And I know a number of people, Richard Armitage and others, have made their way to the Ukraine to raise concerns about the lack of free media, that especially the broadcast media has been very severely censored or biased, I should say. And, you know, a free and fair election isn't just, as we all know, on the day of the election. It's everything that leads up to it.

And the same goes for Belarus.

And, Mr. Ambassador, you might want to speak to this as well, where we've got the parliamentary elections coming up and Lukashenko looking to extend his ability to stay in office, become another one of those presidents for life. We're trying still to get the Belarus Democracy Act up on the floor. It has been blocked. I don't know why. We passed it out of committee several weeks ago. And that would only be of some minor, certainly of no impact, on the immediate term. But on the intermediate term, it might, in terms of empowering civil society and the like.

But my question is if these elections are adjudicated to be unfair and far less than OSCE standards and international standards, will there be any penalty. The concern is that, you know, we issue reports, we make comments. But at the end of the day, people like Lukashenko just fold their arms and say, "Go ahead, hit me. You haven't even laid a glove on me."

And I'm concerned, especially again, with the Ukraine, a country, you know, rich in people and culture and political and geopolitical importance. This election is probably in the process of being hijacked. And corruption obviously remains a very real concern there.

So if you could touch on those issues, I would appreciate it.

Sec. JONES. On Kosovo, all of us share your deep concern about what happened on March 17th. That was a terrible turn of events. We are now, however, very encouraged by the activism, the initiatives that have been undertaken by the new senior representative for Kosovo that has been appointed by Secretary General Kofi Annan, Mr. Jessen-Petersen. He will be joined very shortly by, I believe, an extremely good American deputy, Ambassador Larry Rossin.

We have had the international members of groups that work, particularly, to support the UNMIC efforts to pursue standards and to pursue implementation of standards in Kosovo, are very encouraged by the great activism of the new UNMIC secretary general, senior representative, especially in connection with how much they're pushing, as have we, the rebuilding of the churches and schools and buildings, houses, et cetera, that were damaged so severely in the March 17th disturbances.

There will be a series of meetings next week in New York among the countries that are most concerned about Kosovo, most concerned about pushing for progress in Kosovo. So we look forward to really grinding down through some of these issues. The most important part of this is to demonstrate to the Kosovars of whatever religion that it is up to them to take responsibility, that that is the essence of the standards that we're pushing to try to turn over as much responsibility to them as possible so that they can take charge of this territory.

On the Ukrainian elections, I can only tell you how much—you know we've worked very hard to make clear to every possible element of Ukrainian leadership, Ukrainian civil society, free media, et cetera, that the future of the Ukraine, the future of Ukraine's integration into trans-Atlantic and European institutions depends on a free and fair election. And just as you very rightly said, this is exactly the point that we've been pressing.

Free and fair elections don't just happen on election day. They happen in all of the processes related to elections that take place months, if not years, before. We have been, frankly, working with the Ukrainian government on Ukrainian elections for three years on the upcoming Ukrainian. And, you know, to the point that at times they said, "It's too early. It's too early." I said, "No, it's not." It's not too early to make sure that the institutions are in place, that it is clear to everybody in the presidential administration throughout the country that they may not misuse presidential administration apparatus to promote one candidate over another, that there must be equal access by the candidates to the media. The exercise of free media, permission to allow media to operate is an element of assuring a free and fair election.

Mr. Armitage was there in March pursuing this. I had the opportunity to address this question with a delegation of senior Ukrainians who came just this week, the former foreign ministers Linko [ph] and a member of the presidential administration, Mr. Fiealko [ph] to make exactly those points. Most importantly, virtually every single leader at the NATO Ukraine meeting at the summit in Istanbul made exactly those same points, exactly those points. So it's abundantly clear to the Ukrainian leadership what it is that we're talking about, what it is that's necessary to assure a free and fair election and how critical this is to Ukraine's stated desires to be further integrated into Europe and the trans-Atlantic community.

Mr. SMITH. Ambassador, would you want to take on Belarus?

Sec. KOZAK. Well, you're quite right, Mr. Chairman, that, you know, there's a crucial election coming up in Belarus at the middle of this coming month that now includes this referendum on amending the constitution to get rid of the term limits and allowing President Lukashenko run for yet another term. I think some of the conditions for the election are terrible. We've all seen them. Media has been heavily repressed, fines, criminal libels. Political leaders have been put in jail as a way of intimidating them. The control of the election machinery remains in the hands of the government.

But there have been some positive developments in Belarus as well. Over the last several years, working through our party institutes, NDI and IRI and with the Europeans and with the OSCE,

with the field mission there, a lot of training has gone on of pro-democratic type forces. And even before Lukashenko announced this referendum, the polling that we were seeing was showing the opposition, generic opposition candidates being within four points of pro-Lukashenko candidates in the parliamentary election despite all of these disadvantages. In part, that's because they've been forced to go out and do it the old fashioned way of knocking on doors and talking to people, which, as you know, has its effect.

He's got a big challenge on this referendum. The Belarussian constitution requires that a majority of registered voters vote in favor of a referendum for it to pass. So if you figure he's got 70 percent turnout, which is about normal there—even if he got 70 percent of the vote, he'd still fail on the referendum in an honest count.

In the last year, I don't think his numbers have been above 30 percent in terms of people saying they either favor strongly or might possibly favor his being allowed to run again. Consistently over 50 percent have said they're against it. So it's going to take some powerful and obvious fraud. It's not, you know, shifting numbers by 5 percent or something here. It's going to take some major stuff and I think bears watching.

I think the key—you asked the question what's the penalty. There's not much way to penalize the country more than he's already penalized it himself through self-isolation from not only the Western world, but from even what's going on in the immediate region. But there may be ways—and this is something we need to look at more generally—of how do we hold people accountable, people who participate in election fraud, people who should be ensuring genuine elections and fair conditions and so on but instead use their authority the other way. And you had mentioned earlier the value of targeted sanctions. There may be some percentage to working it there.

I have watched in this particular case, I would say if the people in the bureaucracy in Belarus had their choice, there would have been a different president a long time ago. But they're afraid. They're afraid of losing their jobs. They're afraid of what happens to their families. And maybe if they had to worry about concerns in the other direction of not carrying out fraud, they might be more inclined to do their job honestly.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you very much, Mr. Ambassador. I just have two final short questions. And we, the Commission, deeply appreciate your patience. But these issues are very important to our Commission and I know to you.

One of the recommendations that came out of the Berlin conference, though, in the implementation area had to do with hate crimes and the whole issue of law enforcement. We're working with Ambassador Ed O'Donnell on a provision or an idea that Paul Goldenberg from the American Jewish Committee is working up, and our Commission, that would establish a "trainers of the trainers," so that police and law enforcement personnel would be trained by those who know it intimately, but it would be peer-to-peer type of training.

It will take some money, and it's not yet to the point of final completion. But I would just strongly encourage you, Madam Secretary,

Madam Ambassador, to look very favorably on this. Because I think, you know, the more we have this kind of training, you know, a well trained policeman knowing—and this is part of the problem. Very often acts of anti-Semitic crime are just thought of as mere vandalism when it's very clear that it's something that goes far beyond that. And this would apply to all hate crimes. So I would ask you to take a good look at that recommendation.

And secondly, and again, this is my final question and then I'll go to Mr. Ben Cardin for anything, and Joe Pitts. Joe's not here. With regards to Kazakhstan, again, I find it extremely disconcerting that they want to be the chairing office for 2009. And again, that has to be done in calendar year 2006. Especially since Nazaviev [ph] actually signed—I think it was before you were ambassador in 1992. And he signed the Helsinki Final Act and all those documents and follow-on agreements that followed, including the Moscow statement in 1991.

Would we be willing to withhold consensus unless they either repudiated that internal affairs and some of those other egregious statements that the group of nine have signed onto? Because that would radically alter the OSCE. If internal affairs can be put forward as a hedge when human rights discussions occur, we would be hindered in our ability to promote human rights.

Sec. JONES. Thank you for your support for police training on hate crimes. That is something that makes a great deal of sense. I don't have it in my head exactly where the process stands on getting that going. But it's certainly an area which France, for example, has been very forthright and very much wants to pursue and is pursuing.

On Kazakhstan and on their desire to be Chairman-in-Office, we've made very clear that Kazakhstan accepts that our support, frankly, support for not just from the United States, but from many, many other member States depends on their adherence to all of the principles of the OSCE. That's certainly a watchword that we have been using for, lo, these many years as a way to discuss with them why it is our business to talk with Kazakhstan or with any other country about democracy issues, human rights issues, economic reform issues, whatever it may be. Because they have taken upon themselves their own free will to sign up for each of the principles, to adhere to each of the principles of the document when they first joined the organization.

I can't tell you that we would withhold because of this reason or that reason. We'll take it all together when we get to that point. But certainly a pledge to adhere to everything, one of the principles, and demonstration of adherence to the principles is what's important.

Mr. CARDIN. Well, let me thank all three of you for your testimonies here today. I wanted to follow up just very quickly on Senator Grafstein's point about the anti-Semitism followup in using the model for the United Nations and what we can expect in the United Nations in regards to following up against anti-Semitism. It's been a rough road there, and I'm just curious as to whether we have a strategy or expectations as to how the United Nations may play a role in the attention that we have brought within the OSCE region to the rise of anti-Semitism.

Sec. KOZAK. Well, Mr. Cardin, we've actually been working in the U.N. for the last few years as well as in OSCE. I'd have to say I think you've made more stellar progress perhaps. But there have been some——

Mr. CARDIN. You actually may have made more progress in the United Nations, considering where they were. I mean, it's——

Sec. KOZAK. Yes, at least it's not Zionism as racism any more. And in fact, we were pleased in this last U.N. Commission of Human Rights session in Geneva this spring. We managed to get good, strong references, condemnations of anti-Semitism into three separate resolutions: a resolution on religious intolerance, a resolution on democracy and racism and another one on the follow-up to the Durban conference, which we don't like the conference, but we do like the reference to anti-Semitism in that document.

We were successful last year in the UNGA in getting two of those resolutions with anti-Semitism references in them. And we're going to go for all three of them this fall as well, and I think with reasonably good prospects. So at least the U.N. organs are making appropriate references and acknowledging the problem as a serious problem. Doing something about it is a different issue. But at least we've got [inaudible].

Mr. CARDIN. We wish you the best in your efforts there. I do think Senator Grafstein's point is correct, though. As OSCE has raised the bar, it makes it a little bit more difficult for the United Nations to continue its path in this regard. So perhaps there's hope.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you very much, Mr. Cardin.

I want to thank our three very distinguished witnesses for your excellent testimony and your great work on behalf of our country. This Commission appreciates it as well as the give and take of, you know, we make recommendations, you make them back. It's the best, I think, in the interest of the executive branch and legislative. So we do thank you for that.

We do have some additional questions that we'd like to submit. We've run out of time. If you could get back to us for the record, we'd appreciate it.

Sec. JONES. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We very much appreciate the interest of the Commission, we truly do.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you.

Sec. JONES. Thank you.

Mr. SMITH. Appreciate it. The hearing's adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 12:19 p.m. the hearing was adjourned.]

# APPENDIX

---

PREPARED STATEMENTS

---

## PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, CHAIRMAN, COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

Ladies and Gentlemen, I want to welcome you to this U.S. Helsinki Commission hearing on "Advancing U.S. Interests through the OSCE." I am very pleased to have several distinguished panelists present today and look forward to hearing their testimonies.

The title of this hearing is no accident. Since its inception nearly thirty years ago, the OSCE has been one of the staunchest allies of the beliefs and goals of the United States. It has multiplied the avenues through which we can promote the rule of law and human rights. It pioneered the broad definition of security that recognizes true stability does not depend on stockpiles of arms or large standing armies, but on democratic principles, respect for human rights and good neighborly conduct. It legitimized the idea that a nation's domestic policies are the rightful concern of other OSCE States. As it reinforced these critical standards, the organization also evolved into a strong and flexible body with arguably more tools for addressing regional problems than any other international institution. The broad membership, the clearly articulated principles and the well-designed political structure make the OSCE an especially appropriate partner of the United States.

Today we have the opportunity to hear the State Department's vision of how this organization can be most effectively utilized, and how these key policymakers intend to initiate activities and support policies through the OSCE that will advance U.S. objectives. Let me say at the outset how appreciative I am of the diligence and dogged persistence of the US Ambassador to the OSCE, Ambassador Stephan Minikes. He has done a tremendous job and deserves much credit and recognition for his leadership in Vienna.

This year we had an excellent example of how the initiative can be seized to make impressive contributions to the well-being of the entire region, while focusing on issues of particular concern to the U.S. The Arms Control Bureau of the State Department deserves praise for seeing the opportunities afforded at the OSCE to contribute to hard security issues. They presided over a strong U.S. chairmanship of the Forum for Security Cooperation, helping to revitalize that part of the organization, then used it to pass agreements on management and destruction of excess ammunition, export controls on man-portable air defense systems and the transfer of light arms. The work in the FSC complimented that undertaken by the organization as a whole to conform travel documents, to address proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and to discuss better cooperation on border security and the control of shipping containers.

Every one of these is of key concern to the U.S. and every one is a transnational issue, requiring that we address it multilaterally. This is the kind of robust use of the OSCE that is in our interest and that we would like to see supported throughout the U.S. Government.

Over the past thirty years there has also been great growth and development in the human dimension, an area of keen interest to this Commission. Next month the OSCE will hold the annual Human Dimension Implementation Meeting in Warsaw. This meeting is a regular opportunity for the participating States to review each other's compliance with our mutual Helsinki commitments, to encourage better implementation and publicly question activities that are not consistent with the strong standards of the OSCE. We look forward to a strong presence and participation at this conference and to hearing the Department's priorities for the meeting.

We hope that the sense of priority and urgency that characterized human rights advocacy during the Cold War will not lag now, at a time when we see examples of the starkest disregard of human dignity, and our nation and region suffer acts so brutal they were unthinkable only a few years ago. Understanding that upholding human rights is not only the policy that is ethically consistent with our ideals, but is fundamentally linked to our national and regional security, has never been more important. If a nation disregards public opinion in the oppression of its own citizens, it will also ignore violations to the security of its neighbors. As we came to see in the Balkans, we ignore the warning signs of abusive acts at our own peril.

We have a great deal of work to do in this field. The lives of many are still on the line in the countries of Central Asia, and periodically elsewhere in the OSCE, especially if one is a democratic activist, outspoken journalist, or religious pro-

ponent. The creeping shadow of a rising anti-Semitism continues to threaten Europe. And the blight of trafficking in human beings is increasing.

Addressing economic development and environmental challenges is also important. These are linked to fundamental matters of opportunity and trust in government and to stabilizing societies through the confidence born of economic well-being. My colleague Ben Cardin, who has a special role in this area, will elaborate more on the topic. Let me just mention that it has never been more timely, and the less developed areas of the OSCE need consistent attention if we are not going to see political will undermined by the impatience that comes from economic necessity.

We also hope to hear what the administration's focus is for the forthcoming Sofia Ministerial Meeting in December. The issue that probably will have the greatest impact on the evolution of the organization and on our ability to further U.S. interests through it, is the selection of the next Secretary General. Members of this Commission are actively interested in seeing a strong leader in this office. As you know, we have written to Secretary Powell on the matter and will be following up in the near future. The world has changed in recent years for all of us. As the OSCE takes on daunting challenges, it will benefit from a potent public face and a strong managing hand to compliment the political role of the rotating Chairmanship.

Other important issues that should be considered in Sofia include: addressing expanded election commitments, such as electronic voting and voting rights of internally displaced persons; enhancing the capability to fight human trafficking; continuing efforts on anti-Semitism; the appropriate role of the Mediterranean Partners; and, addressing the concerns evinced in the statement of July 8 by nine CIS members.

Regarding the current discussions concerning refining and strengthening the OSCE, I look forward to the administration's views on the various comments by the Chairman-in-Office, Bulgaria's Foreign Minister Ambassador Solomon Passy. He has expressed support for a "better thematic as well as geographical balance within the OSCE" as also called for by nine CIS countries. Ambassador Passy has also proposed relocating meetings of the Economic Forum to Central Asia from Vienna, and the HDIM to South Caucasus. Structurally, he has also advocated stronger political leadership for the Secretary General and the Chairman-in-Office, and deeper inclusion of the Parliamentary Assembly of the OSCE.

We have a strong panel to discuss these issues today.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL, CO-CHAIRMAN,  
COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

Mr. Chairman, as President Bush has declared, "By promoting liberty abroad, we will build a safer world. By encouraging liberty at home, we will build a more hopeful America." For nearly three decades, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe has provided a unique framework for advancing democracy, human rights and the rule of law in the expansive OSCE region. Today, comprising 55 countries, the OSCE has proven its ability to adapt to new challenges, even while remaining faithful to the core principles reflected in the Helsinki Final Act and the Charter of Paris. As such, the OSCE is a vital tool for advancing U.S. interests in a region critical to our country.

The mission of the OSCE goes to the heart of the aims laid out in the National Security Strategy, although the organization is not mentioned by name. As the President stated in the introduction of that paper, "In the twenty-first century, only nations that share a commitment to protecting basic human rights and guaranteeing political and economic freedom will be able to unleash the potential of their people and assure their future prosperity."

Notwithstanding the obvious overlap between U.S. interests and the OSCE, the organization is underutilized by policymakers here in Washington. Operating on the basis of consensus, the OSCE has built up an extensive array of commitments ranging from the rights of individuals to profess and practice their faith to the conduct of democratic elections and the treatment of Roma. Recent events have underscored the fact that no country is beyond reproach when it comes to human rights and fundamental freedoms, none.

The OSCE provides a framework within which the United States can and should reinforce points of concern with other participating States. From addressing ongoing repression in Belarus and the critical elections this Fall in Ukraine to concerns over anti-Semitism and related violence throughout the OSCE region, the OSCE is doing important work that other organizations to which the U.S. belongs simply can't. Setting up a zero-sum dynamic between the OSCE and these other institutions makes that much sense, zero.

The comprehensive scope of the OSCE should make it a first thought not an afterthought for U.S. policymakers. Recent moves by Moscow, Minsk and several other capitals to emasculate the OSCE under the guise of so-called reforms, reveal the policymakers there at least recognize the success and potential of the organization. Protestations that the OSCE is somehow imbalanced—paying too much attention to human rights—should be seen as the diversionary tactics that they are. Such pronouncements are further undermined by the fact that some of the most significant advances of late in the OSCE have come in the security dimension, most notably areas such as promoting the use of biometric travel documents, stemming the proliferation of man portable air defense systems (MANPADS), more effective border management and security, and enhancing international container and cargo security.

Setting up a zero-sum dynamic between the security, economic and human dimensions of the OSCE makes that much sense, zero. A more reasoned approach would recognize that many of the challenges the participating States face today are indeed multidimensional in nature.

Efforts to build upon these initiatives in the security dimension should be encouraged. Similarly, creative thinking should also be employed to make better use of the economic dimension. I have repeatedly cited the nexus between international crime and terrorist financing as an area ripe for OSCE engagement, an excellent example of the kind of multidimensional challenges faced by participating States throughout the OSCE region. The Charter of Paris envisioned the possibility of convening meetings of ministers other than foreign ministers. The U.S. should propose that an OSCE ministerial be convened to address the links between terrorism and international crime.

The area of conflict prevention in another example where the OSCE can and should play an important role. In recent weeks disturbing developments in parts of the Republic of Georgia and the Transnistria region of Moldova have threatened to erupt into open conflict. Ironically, as Russian-backed separatists in these regions threaten the territorial integrity of those countries, the war in Chechnya enters its fifth year with death and destruction with the most egregious violations of international humanitarian law anywhere in the OSCE region. The OSCE has proven that it can play a useful role in such conflicts if there is political will to enlist its assistance. Nearly five years after the Istanbul OSCE summit, the Russian Federation has yet to fully implement the commitments it agreed to with respect to its forces in Georgia and Moldova.

Mr. Chairman, in the National Security Strategy President Bush acknowledged that "Our own history is a long struggle to live up to our ideals." Given my own background I can attest to the truth in that statement. This struggle is far from finished and if we are to lead in the promotion of liberty, we must be honest when we have fallen short. I am convinced that by so doing we will contribute to a stronger America at home and abroad.

Earlier this year America lost a true champion of liberty and freedom, President Ronald Reagan. President Reagan effectively used the framework of the OSCE to win the release of hundreds of political prisoners and prisoners of conscience, facilitate the reunification of thousands of divided families, and overcome repression for millions.

Mr. Chairman, the utility of the OSCE as an instrument for change did not collapse under the rubble of the Berlin Wall, rather it has gained access to new avenues to advance democracy and human rights, enhance security, and secure a more prosperous future. As our nation faces new challenges, the task is to use the OSCE more effectively and creatively.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN, RANKING MEMBER,  
COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

Mr. Chairman, let me take this moment to thank you for convening this hearing on this subject at such an important and opportune time. U.S. involvement in the OSCE has always been important to the Organization and to our interests, from the earliest days of the Helsinki process to the most recent meetings in Vienna and elsewhere. U.S. participation in the OSCE was critical to the successful end of the Cold War. Today, however, as the OSCE addresses issues such as anti-Semitism, ending the slavery known as human trafficking, fighting corruption and assisting the developing democracies of Afghanistan and Iraq, our role and the need for U.S. participation has never been more important. This hearing should provide a welcome vehicle for the State Department to lay out its intended objectives for the United States on these and other issues.

During the Annual Session of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly held in Edinburgh, Scotland, last July, I was re-elected as Chair of the Committee on Economic Affairs, Science, Technology and Environment. I will continue to work with my colleagues in the Assembly to develop strategies that we, as parliamentarians, can pursue both in the Assembly and in our own national parliaments to enhance economic progress and environmental protection in the OSCE region. Clearly, our work should also complement and support that of the OSCE and its institutions, and I have consulted with Ambassador Stephan Minikes, the U.S. Ambassador to the OSCE in Vienna, in this regard. I have also consulted with our Commerce Department Helsinki Commissioner, Assistant Secretary Bill Lash, regarding his views on economic challenges in the region.

In Maastricht last December the participating States adopted the OSCE Strategy Document for the Economic and Environmental Dimension. As you know, this is the first major OSCE economic document since the historic 1990 Bonn Document on Economic Cooperation and it calls, inter alia, for combating money laundering, criminalizing the financing of terrorism, strengthening the rule of law and enhancing transparency and the adoption of a long-term strategy to combat corruption. July's Edinburgh Declaration of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly calls on the participating States to convene a meeting of Ministers of Justice and the Interior to initiate the development of a comprehensive and long-term anti-corruption strategy as stated in the Maastricht document. Such a strategy must also include effective means to combat organized crime, money laundering and the financing of terrorists—all interconnected in the operation of transnational criminal organizations.

It is my hope that the United States will work for the organization of an inaugural meeting of OSCE Ministers of Justice, Interior and Finance as well to initiate the development of such a strategy during the upcoming Ministerial Meeting in Sofia, Bulgaria. I look forward to hearing the views of our distinguished panel of witnesses in this regard.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. JOSEPH R. PITTS, COMMISSIONER, COMMISSION ON  
SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

Mr. Chairman, thank you for holding this important and timely hearing on U.S. Policy Towards the OSCE. As our nation engages in the war against terror, it is vital that we use all avenues at our disposal to address the very real threat facing our nation, the nations of Europe, Asia, Africa, and Latin America. In addition, it is vital that our nation builds and strengthens the relationships we have with friends and allies around the world.

In order to focus on terrorism, and other important concerns facing our world today, such as trafficking in persons and religious and ethnic discrimination and persecution, the U.S. government needs to be deeply involved in the various fora of which we are a party. Unfortunately, the US government has not been as involved or present as it could be—in the end that damages our relationships with other nations. Over the last several decades, the Organization on Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) has played an important role in providing stability in volatile situations as well as additional opportunities for diplomacy and the exploration of creative resolutions to pressing issues. I have attended the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly the past several years and have been impressed with the level of participation from OSCE participating nations—however, the US presence tends to be less than it could be—it has only been as strong as it has due to the leadership of Chairman Chris Smith. Thank you, Mr. Chairman for your very able, and strong leadership at the various OSCE meetings.

I would like to take this opportunity to urge the Administration to engage even more fully in the OSCE and with OSCE participating states and partners. Yesterday's Washington Post article and other media outlets' reports reflect President Putin's new plans to deprive the Russian people of their freedoms. The U.S. and other nations need to engage with the Russians NOW. As they tragically did in Russia last week, extremists are attempting to disrupt and dominate politics throughout the world. While our response must be firm, it must also be just. We cannot afford to compromise human rights for the sake of security, or we play into the hands of the terrorist. OSCE nations must not let the extremists and terrorists win.

Unfortunately, as governments crack down on terrorism, there are many peaceful religious believers and citizens who are arrested by officials. Now, more than ever, we must work to ensure that fundamental human rights are protected. Now is the time to help national lawyers, journalists, religious leaders, and others who seek to promote democracy and freedom in their nations. We must support courageous leaders who stand for freedom in the midst of fierce opposition from secret security forces and official government pressure. Now is the time for us to strengthen and build relationships with other nations, to work together to bring safety, security and peace to our world.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I look forward to hearing from our distinguished witnesses.

## PREPARED STATEMENT OF SECRETARY A. ELIZABETH JONES

Senators, Congressmen: I am pleased to be here to discuss the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) and its role in furthering U.S. foreign policy objectives. Since we met last September, the OSCE has made a major contribution toward promoting democracy, peace and stability across Europe and Eurasia. The OSCE's successes would not be possible without support from Members of Congress. I want to thank you for your work through the Helsinki Commission and the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly. They have been key to building a consensus for our shared agenda among the legislatures and publics of the OSCE's 55 participating states. Allow me to congratulate Congressman Hastings on his election as President of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly. We greatly value his continued activism on OSCE issues and the involvement of the parliamentary assembly in election monitoring and other important work.

I share your enthusiasm for the OSCE and its work. The OSCE's support for Georgia's democratic transition over the past year demonstrates how the OSCE and its field missions contribute to creating a democratic and stable Europe, a key U.S. foreign policy objective. Strong U.S. leadership within the organization has advanced fundamental objectives set forth in the President's National Security Strategy of 2002: to promote security through the development of democratic and market-oriented societies, respect for human rights, and tolerance of religious, national, ethnic and racial diversity.

The OSCE is crafting an ambitious agenda for the future, an agenda the United States supports. With U.S. leadership, the OSCE is doing more to promote human rights and democracy, to expand efforts to combat anti-Semitism and intolerance, and to combat trafficking in persons. This month, the OSCE will send its first election assistance team outside Europe and Eurasia to Afghanistan for that country's historic presidential elections.

Today, I would like to address in detail the OSCE's value to the United States, the OSCE's recent accomplishments and plans for the future, and calls to refocus and restructure the OSCE.

*Value of the OSCE for the United States*

U.S. participation in the OSCE advances U.S. interests in promoting democracy, strengthening respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, and advancing arms control, economic prosperity and sustainable environmental policies. The OSCE also has a role to play in helping to win the global war against terrorism, and it is a vehicle for the kind of "effective multilateralism" of which President Bush spoke last November in London. Promoting these interests collectively through the OSCE allows the United States to share both costs and political responsibility with other states and, at the same time, to coordinate actions to avoid duplication and maximize success.

The United States continues to make effective use of the OSCE's flexible and comprehensive approach to security, which recognizes human rights, as well as economic and environmental issues as integral factors in fostering security and stability. Common principles agreed by consensus give the United States and other OSCE participating states shared values and commitments on which to act. The OSCE can bring the weight of 55 nations acting together to bear on problems that no one nation can solve alone. Over the past year, the U.S. has again led the way in proposing practical new issues for the OSCE agenda.

The OSCE has made a significant contribution in the post-Communist era toward achieving America's goal of a free, whole, and peaceful Europe, though much still needs to be done. The OSCE is adapting to new challenges and providing models for addressing tough issues such as intolerance, border management and destruction of Small Arms and Light Weapons, models from which the United Nations and other international organizations draw. At the same time, OSCE resources are modest. Any new initiatives must represent the top priorities of the United States and other participating states.

*Assessment of Recent and Future OSCE Activities*

The Chairman-in-Office plays a crucial role to the OSCE's success, providing political direction while maintaining the organization's flexibility. In 2003, The Netherlands set a commendable standard for the conduct of the OSCE Chairmanship. This year, the United States is working closely with the Bulgarian Chairman-in-Office. The Bulgarian Chair has worked to implement decisions taken at the Maastricht Ministerial and has been receptive to new ideas—many proposed by the United States. We are looking forward to seeing these initiatives come to fruition during the Sofia Ministerial in December and to working with the Slovenian Chairmanship in 2005.

Among the OSCE's most important assets are its 17 field missions on the front lines of democracy and human rights from the Balkans to Central Asia. The U.S. strongly supports OSCE field work and believes that the day-to-day efforts of OSCE missions are critical to promoting OSCE commitments, especially democratic values and international human right standards. Field missions work with host governments, non-governmental organizations and the public to promote pluralism, prosperity and peace. Their work is varied and complements the efforts of U.S. and like-minded European embassies. In some countries, OSCE field missions work with authorities to help them build the capacity to govern more effectively (by training new generations of officials), efficiently (by helping plan and implement administrative reforms) and democratically (by helping to develop legislation, conduct elections and encouraging civic participation in the political process). In other countries, OSCE field missions are the linchpins for international efforts at conflict prevention and post-conflict rehabilitation.

#### *Fight Against Intolerance*

OSCE's pioneering work in fighting racism, anti-Semitism and other forms of intolerance has become the standard by which other organizations' efforts—including those of the United Nations—are measured. The OSCE's work on confronting the roots of intolerance, strengthening respect for freedom of religion and speech, and providing an environment free from fear of persecution or prejudice, are top priorities for the U.S.

The Anti-Semitism Conference in Berlin in April was a spectacular success. The political will harnessed by the Berlin Conference should energize trans-Atlantic cooperation in tackling anti-Semitism and lead to fruitful follow-up for years to come. We are indebted to the German Government for hosting the Conference and to the Bulgarian Chairmanship for its strong support. We are equally thankful to those Americans—the NGO community and Chairman Chris Smith, Congressman Ben Cardin and other Members of Congress—who, along with Secretary Powell and the U.S. delegation led by Ed Koch, took part in the proceedings. The Berlin Declaration, which stated that international developments or political issues, including those in Israel or elsewhere in the Middle East, never justify anti-Semitism, has become a blueprint for future OSCE efforts to combat anti-Semitism. We look forward to the Declaration and the action plan outlined in the April 22 Permanent Council Decision on Combating Anti-Semitism being endorsed by Foreign Ministers in Sofia.

The Conference on Racism, Xenophobia and Discrimination, which has just concluded in Brussels, was equally successful in galvanizing political will within the 55 OSCE participating states to step up efforts to strengthen religious freedom and to combat intolerance. A top notch U.S. delegation, led by Secretary of Housing and Urban Development Alphonso Jackson, demonstrated the importance that the United States attaches to this issue. The OSCE demonstrated its commitment to further action by adopting a series of measures that, we hope, will be endorsed at the Sofia Ministerial.

The Paris Meeting on the Relationship between Hate Speech on the Internet and Hate Crime in June offered experts a chance to share views on hate speech. The U.S. delegation, under the leadership of two Assistant Attorneys General, advocated the need to continue to protect freedom of expression and information and, simultaneously, to confront and denounce the ideas of bigots in the marketplace of free ideas. While some delegations differed on government regulation, there were also broad areas of consensus about strengthening education on combating bias-motivated speech and increasing training for investigators and police to address bias-motivated crimes on the Internet.

#### *Next Steps in Combating Intolerance*

The Berlin and Brussels conferences and the Paris meeting have laid the foundation for an ambitious, long-term OSCE effort for dealing with the roots of intolerance. At the two conferences, fifty-five nations committed to collect hate crime statistics, share that information with the OSCE's Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR), strengthen education to combat intolerance and, consider increasing training for law enforcement and judicial officials on hate crimes legislation. ODIHR has been tasked to track incidents of intolerance and anti-Semitism, report on its findings, and to disseminate best practices for combating acts of intolerance. At the Paris meeting, the U.S. put forward a "Ten-Point Action Plan" that could serve as a basis for combating hate speech on the Internet while protecting freedom of expression and information. We strongly support each of these initiatives and will work to see that they are endorsed at the Sofia Ministerial.

The success of these tolerance initiatives, of course, will depend on their full implementation. There is much to be done: many OSCE participating states do not

have hate crime legislation or systems for tracking hate crime, and ODIHR has had to start almost from scratch in developing its new tolerance program. The U.S. believes that ODIHR is the right institution within the OSCE for promoting tolerance. To ensure that anti-Semitism receives the attention that it merits, we support naming a Special Representative for Anti-Semitism provided this position is resource neutral. This would be a senior person with a mandate to travel and make recommendations. Our view is that such a Special Representative should be modeled on the OSCE's Special Representative for Central Asia with neither dedicated staff nor salary.

#### *Anti-Trafficking Efforts*

As President Bush said before the United Nations General Assembly last September, "There is a special evil in the abuse and exploitation of the most innocent, the most vulnerable of our fellow human beings. And governments that tolerate this trade are tolerating a form of slavery." I am pleased to report that, in response to the sustained efforts of the Administration and the Helsinki Commission, the OSCE has expanded its efforts in the fight against trafficking in human beings. At last December's Maastricht Ministerial, ministers approved an Action Plan on Trafficking and the creation of a Special Representative of the Chairman-in-Office on Trafficking.

The criminal practice of trafficking is transnational, requiring engagement with foreign governments and NGOs. The responsibility to combat human trafficking lies first and foremost with individual governments. But, no nation can fight this problem alone. The OSCE's pan-European membership and broad range of tools can help build practical transnational cooperation in the fight against trafficking.

The Maastricht Action Plan on combating trafficking in human beings envisions police training, legislative advice, and other assistance, which are already being provided by ODIHR and by the OSCE's 17 field missions. As the new Special Representative for Trafficking and her support unit advance their efforts, we expect they will provide the framework and coordination to expand our combined efforts.

The OSCE has taken the lead in the international community in establishing a strong code of conduct for its mission members to ensure that they do not contribute to trafficking. We are pleased that NATO and other international organizations are looking at OSCE policies as a model to address this as well.

The OSCE has also crafted an economic component to its anti-trafficking action plan. It is directed toward at-risk individuals in source countries and at businesses that might be abused by traffickers (hotels and tour operators exploiting the sex trade). The aim is to reduce demand in destination countries by raising awareness about trafficked laborers and sex industry workers.

#### *Election Observations*

This electoral year is a challenging one, even for an organization with as much experience and capability as ODIHR. We commend ODIHR for its excellent and impartial conduct of election observation missions in Georgia, the Russian Federation, Macedonia, and Serbia and Montenegro. I want to single out ODIHR's Herculean efforts in mobilizing resources and personnel on short notice for two seminal national elections in Georgia. ODIHR assisted with programs to organize presidential and parliamentary elections and to provide robust election observation missions that documented notable progress over previous elections.

ODIHR's election observation methodology, based on sound, standardized criteria applied in an objective fashion, enjoys world respect. Upcoming elections in Ukraine, Kazakhstan and Belarus will be key tests of those countries' commitment to democracy. The degree to which these elections are judged to be free and fair will be a critical element for the international community. The ODIHR monitoring missions will play an important role in determining their fairness and we call on all countries in the region to fully support all of ODIHR's election observation and other democracy promoting activities.

Afghanistan is an OSCE Partner for Cooperation and has scheduled its historic first presidential elections for October. The U.S. and other OSCE participating states, three of which share a border with Afghanistan, have a direct interest in seeing democracy, peace and stability take root there. We have strongly supported an OSCE observation role in the upcoming Afghan elections to respond to requests from the Afghan authorities and the UN. The U.S. will contribute to the election support team efforts, and hope others will match our financial support for ODIHR election activities.

To set an example of transparency, we have again invited ODIHR to send an election observation mission to the U.S. for the November elections. U.S. invitations to ODIHR to observe our elections are part of a longstanding policy. In 1990, the

CSCE, the OSCE's predecessor, held a landmark conference to promote human rights. The U.S. and the participating states agreed at that conference to the Copenhagen Document, which included a commitment to invite observers from other participating states to observe national elections. The U.S. was a major advocate of that commitment, since the Berlin Wall had just fallen and many nations were about to hold their first real elections in decades. OSCE participating states reaffirmed this commitment at the OSCE's 1999 Istanbul Summit.

In accordance with this commitment, the U.S. has set an example by inviting ODIHR to observe several past U.S. elections. We believe that election observers from emerging democracies, like the former Communist states of Eastern Europe, who participate in observation missions in the U.S. and other longstanding democracies become more powerful advocates of better election practices in their own countries. ODIHR has monitored two U.S. elections and other established democracies, including the United Kingdom and France, have also hosted ODIHR election missions. We expect each member country to adhere to these principles.

*Conflict Prevention/Resolution and Turkmenistan and Belarus*

The OSCE also plays a critical role in the so-called frozen conflicts, as well as in a few states of concern.

*Moldova and Transnistria*

The OSCE, and in particular the OSCE Mission in Moldova, are working to find long-term solutions to the situation in the breakaway region of Transnistria. The U.S. strongly supports the work of the OSCE in Moldova, which forms part of our own strategy—as well as that of the EU—for finding a peaceful resolution which respects the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Moldova. The situation in Transnistria has deteriorated significantly. The Tiraspol authorities have prolonged their forcible closure and harassment of Latin-script-language schools. They denied the OSCE Mission freedom of movement and refused to allow the OSCE and UNICEF to deliver supplies to an orphanage.

Through the OSCE, we have strongly condemned these actions, and reiterated our demand that the Transnistrians reopen the schools immediately and restore the normal movement of people and goods. The U.S. and the EU have added more Transnistrian officials directly involved with the Latin-script-language school crisis to our visa bans. Russia's engagement is also critical. We have urged the Russian Government to make more of an effort to use its influence with the Transnistrian leadership.

The United States has urged all sides to work transparently with the OSCE to make concrete progress toward a political settlement. We support proposals for international monitoring of the Transnistrian segment of the Moldova-Ukraine border and for an international conference on the Transnistrian conflict. We have also urged the Russian Federation to resume, in cooperation with the OSCE, its withdrawal of arms and ammunition from the region. None of these steps, and certainly no bilateral efforts by individual nations, can substitute for a genuine commitment by all the mediators and the parties to work within the framework of the five-sided talks facilitated by the OSCE. Only through the close cooperation of the international community, including the OSCE, will we reach such a resolution. Transparency in this process is in everyone's interests.

*Georgia, Abkhazia and South Ossetia*

The OSCE Mission to Georgia is another example of how the OSCE is contributing to the President's vision for a Europe whole, free and at peace. We welcome the constructive roles played by the OSCE and its field mission there. The United States supports a peaceful resolution of the South Ossetian conflict that respects the territorial integrity of Georgia. Tensions in South Ossetia escalated in August, but ended with a ceasefire and withdrawal of excess Georgian troops. We have called on all sides to respect all existing agreements and to refrain from carrying out any further military activities in or near the zone of conflict. Recent tensions underscore the need for the sides to move forward with OSCE participation toward demilitarization and a political settlement.

Progress toward a political settlement of the Abkhaz conflict is stalled, with the Abkhaz side withdrawing from the negotiating process in July. As we urge the parties to resume progress toward a settlement, we need to use the OSCE mission in Georgia to further assist the government and the people to concentrate on democratic institution building and economic reform. We believe that the OSCE Border Monitoring Operation should continue beyond the expiration of its mandate in December.

*Adapted CFE and Fulfillment of Istanbul Commitments*

Regarding the Adapted Treaty on Conventional Forces in Europe, we welcomed the Russian Duma's ratification as an indication that Russia shares with the United States and NATO Allies a commitment to CFE. However, the most important step Russia could take to move the Adapted CFE Treaty closer to entry into force is fulfillment of its Istanbul commitments on withdrawal of forces from Georgia and Moldova. Almost five years after the OSCE's Istanbul Summit in 1999, Moscow still has not met those commitments. Russia should complete withdrawal of its military forces from Moldova as soon as possible. Russia needs to reach agreement with the Georgian Government on the withdrawal timetable for its remaining forces on Georgian territory. Only when Russia fulfills its Istanbul commitments will the U.S. and its NATO Allies will be prepared to move forward with ratification of the Adapted CFE Treaty.

*Kosovo*

The March events in Kosovo remind us that the work of the OSCE's largest field mission remains critical to developing the foundation for the democratic, multi-cultural civil society in Kosovo that the United States wants to see. The OSCE is helping Kosovo implement the UN Security Council-endorsed Standards for Kosovo, which are strongly supported by the U.S., and prepare for the mid-2005 Review Date by helping to build democratic institutions and promote human rights. The U.S. has made the conduct of free and fair Kosovo elections this Fall a priority, sending some of our best people to staff OSCE election work there. Participation by all the people of Kosovo—ethnic Albanians, Serbs and all other minorities—will be vital to Kosovo's future. We also continue to support the excellent work of the Kosovo Police Service School. In light of the ongoing security concerns in Kosovo, we envision a further role for the OSCE in police training.

*Turkmenistan*

In Turkmenistan, the expulsion of OSCE Head of Mission Ambassador Badescu was a grave disappointment. Ambassador Badescu and her staff have labored under difficult circumstances to try to keep a line to the outside world open for the people of that country and to engage constructively with Turkmen authorities. The OSCE is the only organization in which Turkmenistan is a full member that is present on the ground in Ashgabat offering the government and people opportunities for concrete cooperation to build a democratic future.

*Belarus*

In Belarus, we are gravely concerned by the government's intensified campaign that restricts citizens from exercising basic human rights freely, such as the right to assemble, speak and study independently of government control. We welcomed the invitation from Belarusian authorities to observe parliamentary elections this fall, but have made it clear that ODIHR must be given full access in order to render an objective evaluation of any election. Furthermore, given the government of Belarus' persistent violations of human rights and democracy, President Lukashenko's recent decree calling for a referendum to eliminate institutional term limits for the presidency and allow him to run again for president in 2006 raises grave doubts whether the results will freely and fairly reflect the views of the Belarusian people. We reiterate our call upon the Government of Belarus to ensure that the Belarusian people are able to debate, vote and have their votes counted according to international democratic standards on October 17 and thereafter by taking immediate steps to uphold Belarus' international democracy and human rights commitments. We will view any election and referendum that does not meet international democratic standards as another attempt to manipulate democratic procedures and the Belarusian Constitution in contravention of democratic principles.

The U.S. strongly supports the OSCE Office in Minsk in its attempts to help Belarusian authorities meet broader OSCE commitments and non-governmental groups to work for the benefit of the country. While the attitude of authorities toward the OSCE has been disappointing, the OSCE Mission is reaching out to the next generation, helping prepare it to play a responsible role in the future.

*OSCE Adaptation to New Economic and Security Challenges*

At last December's Maastricht Ministerial, the OSCE adopted a strategy to address threats to security and stability in the 21st century and an economic strategy to define concrete action in the "Post-Post Cold War era." These strategies are examples of the OSCE responding to new economic and political-military security challenges. At the same time, the OSCE has promoted practical cooperation to assist participating states in combating terrorism, improving police and border management, controlling the availability of small arms and light weapons, and coping with

the task of securing or destroying excess stockpiles of weapons and ammunition, as well as MANPADs.

#### *Energizing the Economic Dimension*

The Economic Strategy Document adopted in Maastricht focuses on steps to improve good governance and transparency to maximize the benefits of economic integration and globalization. This should advance our overall strategy for integration of all European and Eurasian states into the global economy. With the Strategy Document as a tool, OSCE field missions and the Secretariat are developing activities and are working with participating states to continue with anti-money laundering and anti-terrorist financing work.

On the environment, the OSCE has worked with partner organizations to map environmental hot spots and to work regionally to address environmental problems that could cause friction between states. One of the most successful programs took place in Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan where, despite political tensions, scientists and others worked productively together. This is an excellent example of the OSCE's ability to bring states together to work on issues of mutual concern, where the exercise itself serves as a confidence building measure.

#### *Counter-terrorism*

The United States has worked to have OSCE fill niches in the international community's response to terrorism. The OSCE Action against Terrorism Unit has worked to bring all 55 participating states towards compliance with UN counter-terrorism commitments. There has been major progress by all participating states to ratify and accede to the 12 UN terrorism-related Conventions, as well as on a U.S. initiative to bring "the 55" into compliance with recommendations of the OECD Financial Action Task Force to combat money-laundering and terrorist financing.

The Maastricht Decision on Travel Document Security launched a major OSCE effort that helps U.S. and international efforts to close doors to terrorists. The OSCE's seminar on Travel Document Security was a success in increasing awareness on assistance available to help participating states meet the deadlines for implementing stricter issuance procedures for travel documents and for converting to machine-readable passports.

We were pleased with the Second Annual Security Review Conference. This year's conference both reviewed the implementation of security commitments and considered new ideas. Department of Homeland Security Deputy Secretary Admiral Loy's address to the session laid the groundwork for a series of measures that participating states will, we hope, endorse in the coming months. Admiral Loy urged the OSCE to join the U.S. in making a commitment to share information on lost and stolen passports through Interpol's database, a natural complement to the OSCE Travel Document Security decision adopted in Maastricht. He also proposed that OSCE members take steps to tighten security on container shipments.

#### *Border Management and Security*

The work that the OSCE has launched to follow-up to last year's Ohrid Balkan Border Conference, including training for border officials from Balkan countries, is an impressive start to facilitate secure and free flows of people and goods—a key objective of the U.S. Homeland Security Strategy. The United States has strongly encouraged the OSCE to increase its cooperation with other international organizations where it can best provide value-added training and expertise—a central part of the development of an OSCE border management and security concept. In order to promote coordination, the U.S. took the lead in proposing and defining the parameters for the UN Office on Drugs and Crime-OSCE Border Conference, which took place in Vienna September 7–8. The OSCE does not coordinate assistance, but it can bring together donors to avoid duplication and help to build political support to address border issues among participating states.

Under U.S. leadership, the Forum for Security Cooperation (FSC) has played a positive role as an instrument of the Political-Military Dimension of the OSCE. The FSC made a significant step forward in combating terrorism when it adopted stricter export controls on Man Portable Air Defense Systems (MANPADS) in May. There is much more to be gained as participating states share their experience and best practices on effective implementation of stricter MANPADS controls. The FSC also established principles governing End-Use Certification of small arms and light weapons. Now that work is completed, the FSC is turning to another important initiative—to establishing principles to govern the brokering of small arms and light weapons, an idea that came out of an Economic Dimension seminar on trafficking in arms, demonstrating the value of OSCE's cross-dimensional work. The OSCE's work in this area includes on-the-ground assistance to Belarus under the provisions of the OSCE Document on Small Arms and Light Weapons.

The Cold War left a legacy of excess conventional munitions and weapons, particularly in the countries of the former Soviet Union. The U.S. supports OSCE efforts to destroy these excess stockpiles. The OSCE has already received requests from three participating states for assistance in dealing with excess munitions: Belarus, Ukraine and Russia. The development and execution of these projects represent a major task ahead for the OSCE.

#### *Policing*

Police training is another area of increased OSCE activity, particularly in Central Asia. The OSCE's objective, which the U.S. supports, is to help individual states put in place training and oversight programs that protect citizens while safeguarding their rights and freedoms. Building on the success of training in the Balkans, the OSCE's Special Police Matters Unit has stepped up its efforts with assessment missions to Central Asia and a proposal on conducting OSCE police training in the Georgian conflict areas of Abkhazia and South Ossetia. The Special Police Matters Unit has been active in Kyrgyzstan, where the U.S. has supported the establishment of a police academy. The U.S. supports the work of the Special Police Matters Unit, and we look forward to greater transparency and tighter financial oversight of its fieldwork.

#### *Outreach*

The U.S. supports demand-driven, practical OSCE outreach activities to deepen security cooperation with its partners, whom we encourage to commit voluntarily to implementing OSCE principles and commitments. A first step would be to add substance to the relationship with the OSCE Mediterranean Partners for Cooperation (Algeria, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Morocco and Tunisia), perhaps through ad hoc seminars on human rights and democracy. The OSCE's Action Against Terrorism Unit is also working to organize briefings for the Mediterranean Partners, to encourage them to come into compliance voluntarily with OSCE counter-terrorism commitments. The U.S. does not favor creation of an OSCE-like structure in the Middle East. We do support indigenous reform efforts in the broader Middle East through the G-8 and bilaterally, in concert with the EU.

#### *Sofia Ministerial*

The Sofia Ministerial will take place in December, and the U.S. is working for a practical agenda focused on our top policy priorities. We hope to reach agreement within the OSCE on further steps to combat anti-Semitism, racism, xenophobia and discrimination, agreement on the role the OSCE can play on gender issues, and additional measures in the fight against terrorism. At Sofia, the U.S. will again strongly urge Russia to fulfill its Istanbul commitments. We expect to adopt an OSCE border concept, and to endorse OSCE work on shipping container security, small arms and light weapons, MANPADS, and the destruction of excess stockpiles of ammunition and weapons.

There is one major problem that we hope to resolve by the time of the Sofia ministerial, namely how the OSCE funds itself. A debate has begun about revision of the OSCE's two scales of assessment. Russia, supported by some countries, is seeking a dramatic reduction in its contributions to the OSCE. In our view, proposals to reduce contributions radically cannot be the basis for the kind of serious discussions that are needed among OSCE participating states. The U.S. stands behind the criteria for adjustment of the scales adopted in 2001 and 2002—ceilings and floors on contributions based on capacity to pay. All participating states benefit from the OSCE and all use the organization to advance their national interests. The OSCE achieves results at a comparatively modest cost. We hope that other participating states will adopt responsible approaches and negotiate constructively on this issue in order to avert a budget crisis. We note that the OSCE budget process has improved markedly over the past several years. Systems have been put in place to track budget allocations and expenditures more efficiently, providing more transparency and accountability.

The Sofia Ministerial will also consider the appointment of a new Secretary General to succeed Jan Kubis, who has served ably since 1999. The Secretary General plays a critical role in managing the OSCE, and the U.S. is committed to ensuring that his replacement is the best possible candidate. We welcome your suggestions for potential candidates.

#### *Strengthening OSCE to Deal with Challenges Ahead*

Bulgarian Chairman-in-Office Passy and others have suggested initiatives to strengthen the OSCE to meet the challenges ahead. Some of these initiatives, such as Foreign Minister Passy's idea to move the annual human rights and economic dimension meetings, are good ideas that the United States supports.

Proposals that the OSCE Secretary General should be changed to give the position more of a political role, however, need careful consideration. The Secretary General manages OSCE operations. Political leadership is vested in the rotating Chairman-in-Office, an arrangement that the U.S. supports. We are concerned that changing the balance between the Secretary General and the Chairman-in-Office could change the fundamental nature of the organization. It is essential to preserve the strengths that have set the OSCE apart from other international organizations. Specifically, the OSCE's flexibility, which the Chairman-in-Office system has done much to enhance by minimizing central control and streamlining bureaucracy, has allowed the organization to respond to problems creatively and effectively.

Russia and the other Commonwealth of Independent States also have called for changes at the OSCE, most notably in a July statement that was highly critical of the OSCE's field operations and ODIHR. We note that the U.S. has supported efforts by Russia and others to strengthen work in the OSCE's economic/environmental and political-security dimensions. For example, the U.S. has worked closely with Russia on crafting the OSCE Strategy to Address Security to Stability in the 21st Century, adopted by ministers at the Maastricht Ministerial. The Economic Strategy adopted at the Maastricht was also a Russian initiative supported by the U.S.

The U.S., however, remains steadfast that the OSCE's core mission is helping to foster democratic change, and that two of the OSCE's greatest strengths are its field missions and ODIHR. By helping strengthen democratic institutions and civil societies, OSCE field presences help to defeat the underlying causes of instability.

The July CIS statement's claim is factually inaccurate that political dialogue on democracy and human rights are internal affairs of the concerned states. The CSCE Moscow Document of 1991 states: "The participating states emphasize that issues relating to human rights, fundamental freedoms, democracy and the rule of law are of international concern, as respect for these rights and freedoms constitutes one of the foundations of the international order. They categorically and irrevocably declare that the commitments undertaken in the field of the human dimension of the CSCE are matters of direct and legitimate concern to all participating states and do not belong exclusively to the internal affairs of the State concerned."

#### *Conclusions*

The bottom line remains that the OSCE has been a successful vehicle for managing security challenges over the past three decades. Its record of achievements over the past year is impressive, from Georgia election monitoring to the Berlin anti-Semitism conference; from tougher travel document security commitments to a new Special Representative on Trafficking. The year ahead promises to be just as challenging and diverse, from Afghanistan election monitoring to tougher measures to combat intolerance.

The value of the OSCE to achieving U.S. foreign policy objectives is clear. In promoting democratic development and respect for human rights, the OSCE is second to none. On economic development, the OSCE promotes good governance and helps countries put systems in place to fight corruption. On political-military issues such as the fight against terrorism, border security, small arms and light weapons, and excess stockpiles, the OSCE fills crucial niche gaps. It has proven to be an effective diplomatic tool that complements our bilateral diplomatic and assistance efforts throughout Europe and Eurasia.

The OSCE does face new challenges ahead, both in its missions and in its ability to adapt to changing circumstances. The U.S. will continue to work with its partners within the OSCE to advance the shared objectives of the trans-Atlantic community. Thank you.

## PREPARED STATEMENT OF SECRETARY STEPHEN G. RADEMAKER

Mister Chairman, distinguished members of the Helsinki Commission, I would like to build on the information just presented by my colleague, Assistant Secretary Beth Jones, by addressing, in a bit more detail, some of the security issues facing the OSCE today. I will focus on some of the work being done in the OSCE's Forum for Security Cooperation, or FSC, highlighting the role played by the U.S. Chairmanship of the FSC in late 2003.

Let me mention a few of the security issues we are looking at. Arms control, disarmament and confidence- and security-building measures, or CSBMs; security dialog; Code of Conduct; non-proliferation; terrorism; small arms and light weapons; ammunition stockpiles; MANPADS. Some of these are very familiar to Commission members, as they were addressed by the Helsinki Final Act. Others reflect new concerns in the 21st century. But all are part of the FSC agenda.

Since the FSC was established by the 1992 Helsinki Summit to strengthen security and stability within the OSCE community of states it has done just that. Its work program and the fundamental tasks outlined therein reflect the FSC's commitment to transparency and stability in the traditional political-military sphere of security, where conventional armed forces are involved or affected. The challenge for the political-military dimension in recent years has been to broaden the scope of work to be able to address the range of threats and security issues facing us in the 21st century while, at the same time, complementing the work of the OSCE's Permanent Council in these areas. Let me describe how the FSC is facing both of these aspects under its responsibility.

One enduring legacy of the political-military dimension of the OSCE is the range of CSBMs in place in Europe and Eurasia today. The first such measures date back to Basket One of the 1975 Helsinki Final Act, and the most recent are set forth in the Vienna Document 1999. Implementation of arms control agreements and CSBMs is not a single event frozen in time; it requires constant nurturing and attention. OSCE is a forum designed to provide that enduring attention. Delegations are encouraged to raise implementation issues during FSC meetings, which take place weekly. In addition, the FSC holds annually in March an Implementation Assessment Meeting to review the record of implementation of the Vienna Document and other OSCE security commitments.

The record of implementation and discussions during these annual meetings shows that the Vienna Document 1999 is functioning well and is effectively fulfilling its intended purpose of providing a useful mechanism to enhance transparency and build confidence among the participating states. You are aware that the range of measures in the Vienna Document allows OSCE states to share information about the size of their military forces and defense budgets, and also provides an opportunity to show how some of those forces operate. The underlying premise of these CSBMs, of course, is that transparency about another state's military forces and activities will allow states to avoid possible misinterpretations regarding those forces. We see the success of these measures in their continued, and increased, implementation each year. More states are now conducting Vienna Document inspections and evaluation visits—and not just those countries we think of as traditional arms control states. Just last week, for instance, Albania conducted an inspection in Sweden. The continued importance of maintaining a level of transparency about military forces is reflected in the institution of a number of regional and bilateral arrangements within the OSCE region that complement the Vienna Document by providing for more extensive exchanges of information and additional verification opportunities.

The Vienna Document 1999 and other OSCE documents and commitments deal with the whole OSCE area and all OSCE states. However, some documents of key importance for military security in Europe were adopted by—and apply only to—some of the OSCE participating States. This is the case with the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe, or CFE, and the Treaty on Open Skies. While implementation of these two Treaties is discussed in fora outside of the OSCE, OSCE states have long recognized that vigorous implementation of this type of security agreement can have a positive impact on overall security and stability in Europe, not just the security of those states that are parties to these agreements. Accordingly, OSCE member States regularly address the importance of these two treaties in Ministerial and Summit declarations.

Let me focus briefly on CFE. You will recall that the CFE Treaty, signed in November 1990, established parity in major conventional forces and armaments between East and West—that is, between NATO and the Warsaw Pact—from the Atlantic Ocean to the Ural Mountains. In November 1999, the 30 CFE States Parties signed the Agreement on Adaptation of the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces

in Europe at the OSCE Istanbul Summit. A/CFE, as we refer to the Adaptation Agreement, would supercede the CFE Treaty to take account of the evolving European geo-strategic environment and the end of the Cold War. Following entry into force of the Agreement on Adaptation, other OSCE participating States with territory in the geographic area between the Atlantic Ocean and the Ural Mountains will be able to apply for accession to the Treaty.

At the time A/CFE was signed, Russia made certain commitments to withdraw military forces and equipment from Georgia and Moldova. Specifically, Russia promised at Istanbul to withdraw its CFE treaty-limited equipment, or TLE, from Moldova by the end of 2001 and its forces from Moldova by the end of 2002. With regard to Georgia, Russia promised to withdraw or destroy CFE TLE in Georgia in excess of agreed levels by the end of 2000, to withdraw from and disband two military bases (Vaziani and Gudauta) by July 2001, and to negotiate with Georgia the duration and modalities of other Russian military bases (Batumi and Akhalkalaki) and facilities.

The United States and our NATO Allies, as well as a number of other Treaty partners, have agreed that we will not move to ratify A/CFE until Russia fulfills its Istanbul Summit commitments regarding withdrawal of its forces from Georgia and Moldova. Recognizing the magnitude of this undertaking, the OSCE agreed to establishment of a voluntary fund in order to help with the costs associated with the Russian military withdrawal. As I'm sure you are aware, the United States has contributed significantly to this fund.

Unfortunately, after nearly five years and despite this assistance from the international community, Russia has not yet met its Istanbul commitments. Russia needs to complete withdrawal of its military forces from Moldova as soon as possible and to reach agreement with the Georgian Government on the withdrawal of its remaining forces on Georgian territory. Russia remains eager to bring the A/CFE agreement into force, as evidenced by the Russian State Duma's approval in June of a bill ratifying A/CFE—which was signed into law by President Putin on July 19th. We anticipate that Russia will formally deposit its instrument of ratification of A/CFE in the near future, and then reinvigorate efforts to persuade other CFE states parties to do likewise. Our position is clear, however: there is no shortcut to entry into force of the A/CFE agreement that does not involve full implementation by Russia of the Istanbul commitments. We will continue to urge NATO states to remain firm in pressing for Russian fulfillment of its obligations and to withdraw its forces from both Georgia and Moldova, and we will continue working with the OSCE and other partners to facilitate such withdrawal.

In addition to reviewing implementation of the Vienna Document 1999 and relevant security agreements, the FSC has played a role in developing norms and standards with respect to the political-military dimension. The most significant of these is the Code of Conduct on Politico-Military Aspects of Security adopted by the 1994 Budapest Summit. The Code describes the proper role of the armed forces in a democracy, including civilian control, the necessity for transparency and public access to information related to the armed forces, and the importance of adherence to international humanitarian law. Each year at the FSC, OSCE states provide information on their implementation of the Code of Conduct. This FSC work on the Code of Conduct is augmented by seminars and other events conducted by the OSCE Secretariat and individual states—typically in southeast Europe, Central Asia and the Caucasus—to promote adherence to the principles contained in the Code of Conduct.

The FSC continues to execute effectively its tasks related to conventional armed forces. A significant level of transparency already has been achieved, but this does not mean we no longer need these tools. In fact, the continued successful implementation of these measures provides a fundamental support for the existing stability among OSCE states. The biggest challenge for the FSC in recent years has been to find a way to address new threats and issues while still addressing these “traditional” responsibilities. It was against this backdrop that the U.S. took its turn as Chairman of the FSC from September through December 2003.

A major focus of work in the OSCE last fall was development of the OSCE's Strategy to Address Threats to Security and Stability in the Twenty-First Century, approved at the Maastricht Ministerial last December. In considering the political-military dimension for development of that Strategy, we emphasized the need to broaden the FSC's focus to incorporate new threats and challenges into its already established arms control and CSBM portfolio. The reasons why are simple. Traditional arms control and CSBM measures address inter-state relations and the lawfully constituted armed forces of those states. However, the new threats to security and stability we face in the OSCE region tend to be of an entirely different character: threats posed by non-state actors, threats emerging outside the OSCE region

and exported into it, and threats which are generally not of a conventional military nature, but rather threats of terrorism, proliferation, or organized crime. One could say that we have entered a period in the OSCE when the threats on our borders have diminished, but increasingly we have no borders on our threats.

Building on the work of the OSCE to frame its new Strategy document, the U.S. wanted to enhance the security dialog task of the FSC to broaden the Forum's focus during our chairmanship. The advantage of the security dialog function is that it allows the FSC to thoroughly explore and discuss a topic with no predetermined expectation of follow-up action, such as agreement on new measures. As a result, the FSC can frame the dialog, as appropriate, for any particular topic. The U.S. Mission, working closely with Washington agencies, used our Chairmanship to reinvigorate the security dialog and make it a more useful tool for the OSCE. We focused on three areas that would address U.S. security concerns and help OSCE participating states as well: non-proliferation, the man-portable air defense systems—or MANPADS—threat, and Civil-Military Emergency Preparedness.

First, non-proliferation. During our Chairmanship, and working with subsequent FSC Chairman, the U.S. arranged for a number of sessions that allowed OSCE states to be made aware of the risks, challenges and on-going efforts to combat the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. Representatives from the International Atomic Energy Agency, the International Institute for Strategic Studies, and the OSCE Actions against Terrorism Unit were among those providing insights into the non-proliferation activities of other international organizations. The FSC does not want to impede these ongoing efforts in any way, but remains seized of the issue in order to determine whether and how it can contribute to non-proliferation activities already undertaken by others.

Second, MANPADS. The FSC has led OSCE efforts to address the threat from MANPADS. In 2003, the OSCE took action in response to the G-8 decision at its meeting at Evian, France, regarding effective and comprehensive controls for MANPADS. The FSC called upon participating states to use existing mechanisms under the OSCE Document on Small Arms and Light Weapons—or SALW—to destroy excess MANPADS and to ensure their security and avoid illicit transfers. In 2004, the FSC continued its search for a meaningful contribution to address the MANPADS threat. The result of these efforts was adoption by the OSCE of the Wassenaar Arrangement's Elements for Export Controls of MANPADS. This action by the OSCE almost doubled the number of countries that had agreed to apply these stringent controls on MANPADS. The membership of the OSCE permits it to make a unique contribution to global security initiatives. Sometimes, as was the case with export controls for MANPADS, the OSCE can build on work done by smaller or specialized organizations, resulting in a wider application of valuable agreements. At other times, the OSCE can build on global initiatives, adding European/Eurasian specificity and setting an example for other regions. As with non-proliferation, the FSC will keep MANPADS on its agenda and continue to search for further contributions.

Third is the issue of Civil-Military Emergency Preparedness. Under U.S. Chairmanship, the FSC hosted a day-long discussion on this topic which is increasingly important in today's world. Under Secretary Brown of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security provided the keynote presentation. A rich array of speakers from the UN, NATO, the EU and a number of countries elaborated on their programs and suggested ways in which the OSCE might play a non-duplicative role. The goal of this particular dialog session was to share information and expose OSCE delegations to the range of issues associated with emergency preparedness—in other words, to provide transparency. Delegations welcomed the straightforward approach of the participants and did not worry about trying to devise new OSCE standards. It is possible that related discussions may occur at a later time in the FSC, but nothing is currently on the agenda. Bringing this topic to the security dialog demonstrated a key aspect of the FSC's security dialog: knowledgeable experts may engage in substantive discussion in a setting that may or may not lead to follow-on activity.

Before concluding, let me turn to yet another aspect of the work of the FSC with the potential for tangible results.

You may recall that in November 2000, the FSC adopted the OSCE Document on Small Arms and Light Weapons. As with several other FSC documents, this one establishes norms and standards for the OSCE states, as well as transparency measures related to exchanges of information. In 2003, the FSC endorsed voluntary contributions by a number of participating States to produce eight "best practice guides" to elaborate on specific aspects of the Small Arms Document. For ease of use, these guides were published as a single reference document, the OSCE Hand-

book of Best Practices on Small Arms and Light Weapons, which is available in all six OSCE languages.

At present, the FSC continues work to enhance the standards set by the Small Arms Document, with the immediate focus on establishing common standards for end-user certificates when exporting small arms and light weapons. This will greatly improve the ability of OSCE states to verify the end-use and end-user of any exported small arms. Initiated by the U.S., the actual proposal before the FSC was co-sponsored by Russia, Turkey, Hungary and Finland (representing the European Union), demonstrating the widespread interest among OSCE states in building on the standards set by the Small Arms Document. A related task on the FSC agenda is to establish principles to govern the brokering of small arms and light weapons. Illicit brokering is recognised as among the main factors facilitating the illegal trade in small arms and light weapons around the world. Only some 20 countries worldwide have national legislation in place in this field. Development of this set of principles by the FSC will enhance existing initiatives and efforts at the national, regional and global levels and allow for increased international cooperation in preventing, combating and eradicating illicit brokering in small arms and light weapons.

Another key element of the OSCE Small Arms Document is that it provides a basis for the OSCE, through the Permanent Council and the FSC, to respond to requests for assistance on a range of small arms issues, such as security and management of stockpiles, disposal of small arms, and border controls to reduce illicit trafficking in small arms. The FSC developed a plan of action for responding to such requests that was subsequently endorsed by the Permanent Council. With this procedure in place, OSCE states have begun to request OSCE assistance in destroying and controlling excess small arms. A request from Belarus in 2003 resulted in the visit of an OSCE assessment team to Minsk to determine the viability of an OSCE small arms project there. Despite Belarus' lamentable human rights record, the U.S. decided to participate in this assessment visit and use it as an opportunity to advance efforts to control (and destroy excess) MANPADS. A project team is being organized to begin work on a specific project plan for Belarus, and we are making every effort to ensure that its mandate includes destruction of MANPADS. In the meantime, the OSCE will begin to examine the latest request for small arms assistance—received from Tajikistan in July of this year.

A major accomplishment of the U.S. Chairmanship of the FSC in 2003 was completion of its work on the OSCE Document on Stockpiles of Conventional Ammunition. As you know, there are huge quantities of excess munitions remaining from the end of the Cold War, mainly in the countries of the former Soviet Union. Following on its work with small arms, the FSC was the obvious body to address the security risk arising from stockpiles of conventional ammunition, explosive material and detonating devices in surplus and/or awaiting destruction in the OSCE area. The OSCE Stockpiles Document, as it is more commonly known, establishes a mechanism that allows participating States to request international assistance to either destroy or better manage and secure these stockpiles. The Stockpiles Document is the newest tool in our box and emphasizes the FSC's interest in finding concrete and practical solutions to ongoing security issues in the OSCE region. The OSCE has already received requests for assistance under the Stockpiles Document from four states: Ukraine, Russia, Belarus and Tajikistan. A special experts meeting will be held in Vienna later this month to gain more insights into the precise assistance being requested and to examine options of coordinating with other international organizations to provide assistance.

I'd like to come back once again to the CSBMs contained in the Vienna Document 1999. Time and time again we hear from other parts of the global community about the importance of establishing and maintaining a secure environment based on trust, especially with regard to military forces and activities. Often, the Vienna Document 1999 is specifically cited for its comprehensive system of transparency measures. Two of the OSCE's Partners for Cooperation, Korea and Japan, have demonstrated their belief that Asia has something to learn from the OSCE. They have both held seminars on security issues that provided a focused review of Vienna Document 1999 CSBMs and their possible applicability to Asia, the most recent of which took place last March in Tokyo.

We in the State Department recognize the value our OSCE experience brings to questions related to regional security. Until earlier this year, the Political-Military Affairs Bureau was charged with promoting CSBMs and regional security issues for other parts of the world. We have now brought that function to the Arms Control Bureau. Close coordination within the Bureau allows us to capitalize on the experience of our OSCE experts as we pursue CSBMs elsewhere in the world.

Mister Chairman, the Forum for Security Cooperation, like all other bodies in the OSCE, is a consensus body. This naturally limits what any one country can accomplish, especially when we consider the range of views held in an organization of 55 members. The OSCE—and, by extension, the FSC—is fundamentally about politically binding norms and standards. It has no enforcement capability.

But, the FSC remains a useful forum for the United States. In addition to the norms, standards and measures the FSC has established, it offers a venue for its 55 members to discuss—in open forum or in smaller groups—issues of national interest. That, in and of itself, is a valuable confidence- and security-building measure. I hope I have been able to show you that as a result of the U.S. Chairmanship in the autumn of 2003, the work of the FSC has been broadened to encompass some key U.S. security interests. I have every expectation that we can continue to address U.S. security interests in the FSC, as it is clear that these topics are also vitally important to the other members of the OSCE.

## PREPARED STATEMENT OF SECRETARY MICHAEL G. KOZAK

Chairman Smith and Members of the Commission, thank you for holding this timely hearing — in the period before the Warsaw Human Dimension Implementation Meeting and the Sofia Ministerial — to focus on the important work of the OSCE. The Congressional calendar is extremely full this late in the session, so your time and focus is very much appreciated. I commend Commission Members for your long-standing commitment to human rights and democracy work. I am also pleased to be joining Assistant Secretaries Jones and Rademacher at this important hearing.

This is my first appearance before the Helsinki Commission, but I have had the pleasure of working with you and your excellent staff over the years. Before coming to the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor (DRL), I spent three years as Ambassador to Belarus where I saw the impact that the OSCE had on promoting human rights and democratic change. The OSCE Mission put a spotlight on the abuses of the Lukashenko regime, and was a beacon of hope for courageous human rights activists.

Next year will mark the 30th Anniversary of the Helsinki Final Act. Many challenges remain, but the fact that the Government of Bulgaria is now serving as the OSCE Chair-in-Office—something unimaginable in 1975—demonstrates how far we have come. OSCE has been a vital partner in the pursuit of democracy and human rights in Europe and Eurasia, a goal that is more important than ever given the ongoing fight against terrorism. As Secretary Powell has stated, “A world in which human rights and fundamental freedoms are respected and defended is a world of peace in which tyrants and terrorists cannot thrive.”

In my testimony, I will discuss the democracy deficit that continues to plague some parts of the region. Next I will cover the continuing need to establish and improve key democratic institutions such as elections, media freedom, the rule of law, and tolerance. Finally, I will address some of the recent challenges facing the OSCE, and conclude by proposing strategies for refining and strengthening the Organization and promoting enhanced respect for OSCE commitments.

Elections that meet international standards remain a hallmark of democratic society. Yet for elections to be truly democratic, citizens need to enjoy all of their human rights and fundamental freedoms. Unfortunately, a democracy deficit continues to plague many countries of the OSCE, as is evident in the flawed elections some countries continue to hold. We therefore support the crucial work of ODIHR, not only in monitoring and reporting on elections, but also in assisting participating States in developing and implementing laws and legislation that ensures the rule of law and essential rights such as freedom of speech and assembly.

Collectively these efforts have helped foster important reforms. Recent OSCE involvement in the Balkans and Georgia has resulted in marked improvement, with progress made towards elections that meet OSCE standards. With U.S. and OSCE assistance, Albania in 2003 held what was deemed to be the fairest and most transparent elections in the country's history despite some administrative issues and isolated incidents of violence.

In other cases, we have seen less success. Examples of flawed elections since the Commission's last hearing on the OSCE include Azerbaijan's October 2003 presidential election, Russia's December 2003 parliamentary elections and March presidential election, and the August presidential election in Chechnya. There has been little or no accountability for the poor conduct of these elections, and in the case of Azerbaijan, there also has not been an investigation into or accountability for reports of torture by security forces following post-election violence. Georgia's parliamentary elections involved serious irregularities which led to peaceful protests and the resignation of President Shevardnadze—showing that governments that engage in efforts to manipulate the electoral process do so at their own peril.

ODIHR involvement in assisting Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, and Tajikistan to revise their electoral laws this past year has been remarkably successful. While none of their respective laws are fully compliant with OSCE commitments, they have all been brought closer to international standards. We urge these governments to continue their close work with ODIHR to bring their laws into full compliance with OSCE commitments and we remain hopeful that on the basis of this improved electoral legislation, the conduct of upcoming elections in their countries will be a step forward. All depends on the political will and good faith efforts of these governments to impartially implement their legislation.

Domestic and international observers can enhance the electoral process and public confidence. We welcomed provisions in the recently revised electoral codes in Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan that provide explicit guarantees for domestic election monitoring. Unfortunately, Tajikistan's and Azerbaijan's legislation falls short in

that important area. We encourage them to work with ODIHR to revise their laws to fully guarantee that right.

We regret that Uzbekistan, despite assurances to ODIHR, did not enact any changes to its election legislation, as recommended by an ODIHR assessment. Due to that refusal, and the denial of registration to four independent opposition parties, we regretfully note that the electoral process for the December parliamentary elections is already flawed and will likely not be democratic unless serious steps are taken to reverse course. We are urging the government to allow citizen initiative groups to field independent candidates—something permitted under current law.

Rule of law based on democratic principles and commitments is a lynchpin of democratic society, and an independent judiciary is integral to the rule of law. Without rule of law, no fundamental freedoms and rights guaranteed to citizens of the OSCE region are safe. Instituting the rule of law requires two basic steps: that countries enact laws that meet international standards, and then enforce them impartially and consistently. The OSCE can and has played an invaluable role with both these steps.

Regarding the first step, the OSCE can analyze participating States' legislation and recommend amendments to meet OSCE standards. In Kyrgyzstan, ODIHR advisers provided a praiseworthy service when they analyzed the 2003 constitutional amendments and proposed changes to bring them into compliance with international standards. We urge Kyrgyzstan to enact those recommendations.

Concerning the second step, the OSCE can bolster participating States' capacity to enforce the law consistently and impartially. ODIHR has several notable success stories in Central Asia, especially Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan, where the governments have transferred authority for prison administration to the Ministries of Justice. Comprehensive penal reform programs are bringing prison administration close to international standards.

These commendable efforts need to be reinforced in all participating States where corruption and abuse of authority continues to weaken the rule of law, and thus democracy. We see that in the case of Albania. As I noted earlier, last year Albania had the fairest election in its history. However, organized crime and corruption continues to threaten the stability of Albania. Corruption remains one of the greatest obstacles to improving human rights in many countries in the region. Continued efforts to promote good governance are essential to help countries fulfill their OSCE commitments.

There can be no democracy without media freedom. Free press ensures that people have information needed to make informed choices. Unfortunately, the situation for journalists in some OSCE participating States has worsened since the last OSCE hearing.

Actions in Russia over the past few years raise serious questions about its commitment to media freedom, which had been a hallmark of post-Soviet Russia. NTV's recent cancellation of two programs effectively has left Russian national television without independent political programming. Ukraine and Belarus intensified their assault on independent media in the run-up to October elections by harassing, intimidating, fining, and at times imprisoning independent journalists, and by closing down independent media outlets. Moldova is still grappling with transforming TeleRadio Moldova into a truly independent broadcaster, while Turkmenistan recently took steps to clamp down further, creating a National Press Service to supervise print media.

We are pleased with the selection of Miklos Haraszti, the new Representative for Freedom of Media. We wish him success and are pleased that one of his first major initiatives is to urge governments to decriminalize libel laws. The U.S. made an extra budgetary contribution to the project to develop a database matrix on libel legislation in the OSCE region. Only when libel is decriminalized, can there be a vibrant market place of ideas.

An active civil society is one of the most important components for a thriving democracy. Last year we reported a growing number of vibrant civil society groups advocating for peaceful change and greater accountability in a majority of OSCE states. This past year, NGOs continued their courageous work; however, we remain concerned by harassment and/or restrictions placed on NGOs in several countries.

In FY04 the U.S. provided over \$400 million to support democratic development in the OSCE region. My Bureau uses the Human Rights and Democracy Fund (HRDF) to support freedom of the press, political party development, and human rights advocacy, primarily in Central Asia. In FY04, DRL funded over \$7 million in HRDF projects in Europe and Eurasia. These projects, as implemented by our partners in the NGO community, show U.S. commitment to developing civil society in the OSCE target region and are described in detail in the State Department publication, "Supporting Human Rights and Democracy: the U.S. Record 2003–2004."

U.S. democracy funding also includes approximately \$6.5 million in voluntary contributions to the OSCE for human and economic dimension projects, including the participation of NGO representatives at the annual OSCE Human Dimension Implementation Meetings (HDIM) in Warsaw, giving human rights activists from Europe and Eurasia the invaluable opportunity to openly report on the human rights abuses in their countries.

Unfortunately many countries have failed to understand the benefit of U.S. democracy assistance. Recent developments in Russia have called into question for the first time in their post-Soviet history whether the Government respects freedom of association. In his May State of the Union speech, President Putin questioned the loyalty of NGOs that receive foreign assistance. Recent pressure on NDI and its Russian partner The VOICE Association for Voters' Rights are troubling. In Belarus, over 20 human rights organizations have been closed along with several independent trade unions, and the Belarusian Party of Labor was shut down. Ukraine's vibrant civil society is at times weakened by governmental harassment that has intensified, and at times turned violent, with the upcoming elections. There has been violence against members of civil society NGOs or their relatives in several OSCE countries, including Ukraine, Uzbekistan, Armenia and Azerbaijan, with little or no accountability.

In Central Asia, Uzbekistani legislation enacted over the past nine months has severely restricted the rights and ability of domestic and international NGOs to engage in democracy-building work. In both Uzbekistan and Kyrgyzstan, U.S. implementing partners have been publicly accused of engaging in illegal activities. Turkmenistan's civil society is seriously hindered by its November 2003 draconian law on public associations.

Overcoming the persistent democratic deficit in the OSCE region will improve the lives of citizens by giving them a stake in the system, enabling them to enjoy fundamental freedoms and shape their own destiny. It will also help eliminate an overarching threat to democracy and human rights: extremism and terrorism. All OSCE States must continue to root out extremism and terrorism. We all have the responsibility to ensure that human rights are protected even as we combat terrorism. Sadly, no country is immune from such abuses, but in a democracy, those who abuse power are brought to justice.

The deplorable treatment of some Iraqi detainees at the hands of some U.S. military personnel was a shock to our nation. When President Bush expressed his deep disgust and regret about events at Abu Ghraib, it wasn't just his personal reaction as a man of principle. It was also his reaction as the head of state of a country that holds itself to a higher standard, both at home and in our conduct in the world. As President Bush said, one of the key differences between democracies and dictatorships "is that free countries confront such abuses openly and directly." We expose the truth, hold all who bear responsibility fully accountable and bring them to justice, and then take action to ensure that abuses do not reoccur.

The U.S. is committed to promoting and protecting human rights within its territory and around the world. We take our OSCE commitments seriously and we will continue to keep the OSCE apprised as investigations proceed. We are also organizing a side event for the upcoming HDIM in Warsaw where we will proactively address the issue of prisoner abuse and U.S. efforts at accountability. We will continue to press other governments whose forces commit abuses to follow the same approach.

The U.S. supports OSCE's effort to eliminate all forms of torture, and to press individual OSCE participating States to end torture and hold human rights abusers accountable. The U.S. continues to have serious concerns about torture in Uzbekistan. While the Government there took the highly commendable step to invite the U.N. Special Rapporteur on Torture in late 2002, Uzbek authorities remain slow in implementing the Rapporteur's recommendations. We remain very disappointed that, despite promises to do so during the Spring session of parliament this year, the Government has not introduced habeas corpus legislation into its criminal code. We are encouraged by recent efforts to work with domestic human rights NGOs on monitoring prison conditions and we urge swift implementation of the Rapporteur's recommendations.

A crucial component in the fight against terrorism is the support and promotion of tolerance of all ethnic, racial and religious minorities. By protecting the rights of all minorities, we can work to ensure that the roots of terrorism are not fertilized by feelings of societal marginalization and fear. We applaud the OSCE's commitments to fighting racism, anti-Semitism, religious intolerance and other forms of xenophobia or discrimination. The U.S. and the OSCE share a common goal of fostering racial, ethnic and religious tolerance.

The Anti-Semitism Conference in Berlin in April resulted in a comprehensive OSCE plan to fight anti-Semitism, while the June Paris Meeting on the Relationship between Hate Speech on the Internet and Hate Crime addressed new forms of propagating hate speech and bigotry while still strongly supporting freedom of expression and ideas. At The Brussels Conference on Racism, Xenophobia and Discrimination, which just concluded, all 55 OSCE participating states joined together to reaffirm and strengthen the OSCE's commitment to combat intolerance in all forms.

But despite these commitments, serious problems remain for racial, ethnic and religious minorities throughout the OSCE region, and much remains to be done by both OSCE institutions and participating States to combat intolerance. As Kosovo struggles to move from the devastation of war to becoming a more stable, democratic society, non-Albanian minorities, particularly Serbs, suffer from widespread social discrimination in employment, education and health services among others. The recent outbreak of inter-ethnic violence resulting in the destruction of homes and churches is a reminder of the crucial relationship between tolerance and the sustainability of democracy and the rule of law.

A good way to address many of the issues is to strengthen the OSCE, but the OSCE can only be as strong as its participating States. This requires the leaders of each OSCE country to honor commitments in word and deed. We must expect more from each other. OSCE provides important tools for promoting democracy and human rights, but ultimately each participating State is responsible for using these mechanisms effectively to hold all OSCE countries to their commitments.

This year, the ability of the OSCE to act as a unified and effective body has been challenged by several developments. The July Declaration signed by nine member States of the Commonwealth of Independent States is puzzling. The Declaration refers to "such fundamental Helsinki principles as non-interference in internal affairs and respect for the sovereignty of States." Yet in 1991, OSCE participating states agreed in the Document of the Moscow Meeting of the Conference on the Human Dimension of the CSCE that:

"The participating States emphasize that issues relating to human rights, fundamental freedoms, democracy and the rule of law are of international concern, as respect for these rights and freedoms constitutes one of the foundations of the international order. They categorically and irrevocably declare that the commitments undertaken in the field of the human dimension of the CSCE are matters of direct and legitimate concern to all participating States and do not belong exclusively to the internal affairs of the State concerned."

In response to the charge of double standards by ODIHR, we underscore that there is only one standard for democratic elections. We see ODIHR's election monitoring efforts as objective and based upon standards set out in the OSCE commitments stipulated in the 1990 Copenhagen Document and the 1991 Moscow Document and reaffirmed in the Charter for European Security adopted at the Istanbul Summit. That is why the U.S. has invited ODIHR to observe our own Presidential and Congressional elections in November as we have consistently since those commitments were undertaken.

Moreover, in the case of those participating States that have not yet had democratic elections, we view ODIHR monitoring teams not as "interference" but rather as an international resource that is available to those countries that seek to improve public confidence in elections and to uphold their OSCE commitments.

We urge participating States to further refine and strengthen the organization by making key strategic decisions and then backing them with political will. One important strategic decision is striking the appropriate balance among diverse OSCE activities. While each effort helps to further OSCE objectives, a finite budget demands that participating states regularly assess the value added of each component. Administrative expenses are obviously essential. Support for ODIHR is crucial. Visits by high-level OSCE officials and special representatives and international conferences are important to focus attention on problem areas and promote reform. However, sufficient resources should be allocated so that those on the ground who are rolling up their sleeves to effect change—whether in field missions or ODIHR teams—have adequate means to do so.

Another key strategic decision involves the development and use of a series of positive and negative incentives that will entice participating States to uphold their OSCE commitments. Public statements and private meetings draw important attention to states that fail to meet their OSCE commitments. However, it is clear that some participating States need more encouragement and support. When the Government of Belarus closed down the OSCE mission in 2002, a joint U.S.-EU visa ban on high-level Belarusian authorities prompted the Government of Belarus to allow the OSCE Mission to be re-established. The Mission in Minsk is still there today.

This example demonstrates that unified political will coupled with the right incentives is effective.

The upcoming elections in Belarus and Ukraine are cogent examples of times when targeted incentives backed by unified political will could make a difference. Despite varying degrees of repression, democratic candidates are gaining popular support in both countries. A voting process that meets OSCE standards could significantly advance democracy in these two nations. We commend the OSCE's efforts to date to mount effective observer missions in Belarus and Ukraine and we will continue to urge participating States to contribute as much as they can to these efforts. Yet these two participating States clearly need extra incentives to do the right thing.

Strong, effective leadership strengthens the OSCE. Participating States must select Chairs in Office and Heads of Missions who are willing to put OSCE concerns first and foremost. These leaders must actively promote a unified strategy among participating States who care about democracy and human rights, using revamped incentives as well supporting field missions.

We attach great importance to the chairmanship and consider very carefully the readiness of any state wishing to assume that heavy responsibility. Chairmanship must be held by a nation that has demonstrated leadership in implementing all the commitments undertaken by participating States. The U.S. welcomes Kazakhstan's bid to become Chairman-in-Office in 2009 and we would be pleased to see them become a viable candidate. We very much hope that they will be able to demonstrate the leadership required of a chair well before December 2006, when the chairmanship will be approved.

Field missions need adequate resources and staunch political backing from OSCE leaders and participating States. When participating States fail to fully back field missions, the organization and the host country's citizens suffer. Field missions provide vital support to civil societies and governments alike in the promotion of democracy and human rights. They are there to help countries meet their commitments. For this reason, we hope that the OSCE can move quickly to fill vacancies for Heads of Mission in Uzbekistan and Turkmenistan.

When field missions receive strong support from the Chairman in Office host government, and each member of the Permanent Council, the missions can achieve significant changes even in the most troubled environments. However, when the OSCE allows host governments to obstruct the work of field missions, it is embarking on a slippery slope of dangerous precedent that will undermine the organization. Decisions affecting the operations of field presences should not be taken without full consultations and serious consideration of the implications for the OSCE.

This past July, Turkmenistan refused to renew the contract of the OSCE Head of Mission in Ashgabat, Ambassador Badescu, for activities that fell well within her mandate. The U.S. adamantly opposed this action and we will work with our OSCE colleagues to find another excellent head of mission. A unified OSCE voice from leaders and participating states against such action coupled with calibrated incentives, as were eventually used when Belarus closed down its OSCE Mission, could have kept Ambassador Badescu in Ashgabat, helped promote reform in Turkmenistan, and strengthened the OSCE.

In his memoirs, former Secretary of State George Schultz recalls traveling to Vienna in 1989 to sign the CSCE Treaty that resulted in a Human Rights Conference in Moscow. Recounting the strong efforts of the U.S. that resulted in expanding room for independent media in Russia and the release of political prisoners, he said, "We had insisted that we would not settle simply for words on human rights. We insisted on deeds by the Soviets and their Satellite states." Today, we can only echo Secretary Schultz' sentiment that we must insist that promises of human rights for citizens are fulfilled in deed throughout the OSCE region.



This is an official publication of the  
**Commission on Security and  
Cooperation in Europe.**

★ ★ ★

This publication is intended to document  
developments and trends in participating  
States of the Organization for Security  
and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE).

★ ★ ★

All Commission publications may be freely  
reproduced, in any form, with appropriate  
credit. The Commission encourages  
the widest possible dissemination  
of its publications.

★ ★ ★

**<http://www.csce.gov>      @HelsinkiComm**

The Commission's Web site provides  
access to the latest press releases  
and reports, as well as hearings and  
briefings. Using the Commission's electronic  
subscription service, readers are able  
to receive press releases, articles,  
and other materials by topic or countries  
of particular interest.

Please subscribe today.