

■研究ノート

## Theoretical Analysis of the Cultural Budapest Seminar 1985 in Neoliberalism

Yu Zhong\*

Abstract: Conference for Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) during the Cold War entails an emphasis on personal responsibility and illustrates how a human rights framework reflects ideas with implications for promoting security. The Budapest Cultural Forum, stability was an overarching goal as the preservation of cultural interests seemed necessary to enhance security within Europe. In acknowledging the problem of cultural creation, active representatives who participated in the Budapest Cultural Forum discussed how cultural creation may build security and increase strength in unity across Europe. However, some participants in the Budapest Cultural Forum placed greater emphasis on the Warsaw Pact while others made arguments for promoting greater freedom under globalization. More specifically, leaders of nation-states who placed greater emphasis on the Warsaw Pact argued that the preservation of cultural interests should entail the formation of public-private partnerships under a neoliberal capitalist framework. In this paper, I would like to explain the issue of seminar diplomacy reflects how leaders of conflicting nation-states espouse neoliberalism to promote security as part and parcel of economic and cultural development in a globalized order. Moreover, the majority of member states actively participating in the CSCE have leaders who emphasize economic development from a distinctively Western perspective. The Budapest Cultural Forum was significant for ensuring that leaders of conflicting nation-states could indeed advance a human rights agenda and promote security by practicing seminar diplomacy.

Key words: Seminar Diplomacy, Neoliberalism, CSCE

### I. Background

Established during the Cold War between the United States and the former Soviet Union, Organization on Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) has historical roots in the 1973 Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE). As the world's largest inter-governmental organization with an overarching objective of promoting security, the CSCE requires all participating member states to discuss issues involving arms control, economy and technology, human rights and democracy. Member states actively participating in the CSCE also discuss issues of preventing international conflict, crisis management, and post-crisis recovery.

This research highlighted in the case study of the cultural Budapest 1985 refers to how seminar diplomacy as a major concept in the field of international relations promotes security between nations with leaders who espouse conflicting ideological beliefs.

Considering the nature of the Budapest Cultural Forum, the CSCE event involved a series of meetings that took place from October 15 to November 25, 1985. Most of the individual political actors who participated in the Budapest Cultural Forum included major personalities in art and culture who readily discussed problems associated with preserving cultural interests during the Cold War. The actors who participated in this specific CSCE meeting also discussed issues linked with freedom of the press, economic cooperation, and the exchange of ideas in a global market place. For the actors who participated in the Budapest Cultural Forum, stability was an overarching goal as the preservation of cultural interests seemed necessary to enhance security within Europe. Most of the individual political actors who participated in the Budapest Cultural Forum included major personalities in art and culture who readily discussed problems

---

\* Doctoral Student of Graduate School of Policy Science, Ritsumeikan University

associated with preserving cultural interests during the Cold War. Many of the discussions held during the Budapest Cultural Forum drew from the Warsaw Pact, a formal treaty adopted in May 1955 and understood as representative of regional economic interests for communist states Eastern Europe. Concurrently, many of the discussions held during the Budapest Cultural Form drew from cultural provisions contained in the Helsinki Final Act of 1975, a formal declaration that indicated an attempt to improve relations between Communist nations and Western nations during the Cold War. By drawing from the Warsaw Pact and the Helsinki Final Act, active representatives of conflicting nation-states identified cultural creation as a problem that held significant implications for promoting security in an increasingly globalized order.

In acknowledging the problem of cultural creation, active representatives who participated in the Budapest Cultural Forum discussed how cultural creation may build security and increase strength in unity across Europe. However, some participants in the Budapest Cultural Forum placed greater emphasis on the Warsaw Pact while others made arguments for promoting greater freedom under globalization. More specifically, leaders of nation-states who placed greater emphasis on the Warsaw Pact argued that the preservation of cultural interests should entail the formation of public-private partnerships under a neoliberal capitalist framework. Leaders of nation-states who argued for promoting greater freedom under globalization stressed that art and culture are profitable businesses that have the potential to simultaneously promote security as an overarching goal and stimulate economic development.

## **II. Literature Review**

This chapter discusses seminar diplomacy as a concept of international relations that applies to meetings conducted by member states of the CSCE. Seminar diplomacy refers to how member states, some of which are in conflict, advance a human rights agenda in promoting cultural and environmental interests concurrent with economic interests. As a substantial portion of the literature suggests, seminar diplomacy entails that the CSCE member states formally develop communities of practice that paradoxically reach multilateral agreements and adopt unilateral decision-making processes. In economic terms, member states who may be engaged in conflict participate in the CSCE seminars to promote development under a neoclassical theoretical framework of laissez-faire capitalist production. Globalization figures into this review of the literature as a phenomenon with myriad unintended consequences pertaining to human rights. Extended to issues of national security, seminar diplomacy implies that the CSCE member states must adopt a human right agenda that conforms with economic arguments for maintaining a military defense budget as critical for development in a globalized order.

Neoliberalism is directly influenced by neoclassical economic theory such that free markets rather than governments shape the conditions for development for the CSCE member states. Neoliberalism also advances the notion of personal responsibility for sustaining economic well-being. However, neoliberalism implies that no alternative to capitalist modes of development is acceptable in a globalized order. Within the context of seminar diplomacy, neoliberalism provides a historical indicator of how ideas like deregulation, structural adjustment, and austerity reinforce a specific ideological agenda that promotes human rights on the surface but ultimately deprives vulnerable nations of critical resources necessary for sustaining peaceful conditions of economic development. Extended to the preservation of cultural and environmental interests, neoliberalism shapes the economic and political agenda that the CSCE member states adopt in promoting human rights. Yet, neoliberalism remains considerably influential on how the CSCE participating states advance national security interests as economic development in a globalized order effectively mandates an eschewing of social justice.

Concerning seminar diplomacy, the research literature points to how neoliberalism plays a critical role for leaders of conflicting nation-states attempt to advance a human right agenda and promote economic development under a national security framework. In most cases, acting in the interest of preserving

international relations involves a process by which leaders of conflicting nation-states attempt to negotiate and agree on which national security issues should have center stage. Neoliberalism frequently entails that leaders of conflicting nation-states espouse a view of national security in opposition to what directly aligns with a human rights agenda. In fact, many leaders of conflicting nations who attempt to engage in seminar diplomacy experience what researchers define as a “security dilemma” as the national security interests of one nation rarely align with that of another. Under a neoliberal framework, the leaders of conflicting nation-states may advance national security as a short-term goal worth achieving. However, neoliberalism rarely puts into practice the idea of securing peace in regions, such as the Middle East, characterized by decades of political instability.

Neoliberalism, put differently, urges nation-states to sustain cooperation by distributing power and managing institutional arrangements to conform with unilateral ideas of solving collective problems.<sup>1)</sup> Neoliberalism, thus, entails that integration national security ideas into a human rights agenda will not only preserve cultural and environmental interests but will also guarantee economic development. Moreover, proponents of neoliberalism recognize that nation-states with conflicting interests may participate in meetings with objectives of preserving seminar diplomacy and advancing national security but only to obtain economic benefits that result from opening markets to a globalized system. However, the tenets of neoliberalism as an economic theory imply that each nation-state must act on its own accord and not necessarily advance human rights as having universal applicability.<sup>2)</sup> The types of information that proponents of neoliberalism use to promote economic development under a human rights framework suggest that political reality is a matter of whether leaders of nation states can rely on others to ensure cooperation in a globalized economic order.<sup>3)</sup> Yet, proponents of neoliberalism believe that ensuring cooperation between conflicting states must involve a process of developing and implementing mechanisms that effectively constrain any meanings attributable to individual agency. In most cases, neoliberalism occupies a paradoxical status in the realm of seminar diplomacy as leaders of conflicting nation-states espouse unique ideas for constructing a political and economic reality.

For example, some of the research suggests that the meanings attributed to seminar diplomacy under a neoliberal framework include an emphasis on concepts like “security governance” after the post-Cold War era representing a theoretical and practical break away from realist international politics.<sup>4)</sup> As a concept that first emerged in Europe during the early 2000s, security governance evolved from extensive debates about preserving cultural and environmental interests in highlighting two key features of what seminar diplomacy would eventually represent. The first feature illustrates how leaders of conflicting nations pursued national security interests to benefit individuals and smaller communities whereas the second feature involved an expansion of national security strategies to combat “political, economic, social and environmental threats.”<sup>5)</sup> In other words, seminar diplomacy under neoliberalism predicates a need for leaders of conflicting nations to address real and perceive threats not only to national security but also to all aspects human rights. Particularly during the CSCE seminars, the shift away from state-centric approaches towards more flexible and individualized responses to national security threats suggests that seminar diplomacy must have cross-governmental functions within the field of international relations. Accordingly, emerging threats to national security required stronger and more collaborative efforts by leaders of conflicting nations with a troubled human rights record.

During the CSCE meeting, neoliberal negotiation has a significant influence on how leaders of conflicting nations attempted to advance a human rights agenda that reflected ideas such as economic cooperation and national security.<sup>6)</sup> After the Cold War, the CSCE represented an institution that “became an object of some euphoria” that “should [have developed] into some kind of collective security organization for the whole of Europe[.]”<sup>7)</sup> However, the CSCE was an institution whose representatives aimed to control

the political behaviors of participating states by controlling how leaders promoted economic development to deter security threats.

From the above, seminar diplomacy means that leaders of conflicting nations with active involvement in the CSCE must advance a human rights agenda by assuming that all individuals are rational actors capable of making short-term decisions but ignoring the long-term consequences. Seminar diplomacy under a neoliberal framework, therefore, means that the leaders who directly participated in the CSCE meetings would respond to international and domestic pressures by attempting coordinate activities across borders and close a gap between free market behaviors and government intervention in economic affairs. The assumption implied here is that promoting human rights must involve a process of forming transparent partnerships between governments and transnational corporations to stimulate economic development.

Moreover, seminar diplomacy entails that all political actors should practice self-reliance to reduce dependence on governments to provide economic assistance. To achieve self-reliance and not depend on government intervention, all states who participated in the CSCE meetings consulted non-governmental organizations (NGOs) as guaranteed by the UN Charter. However, a neoliberal framework often granted such powers to leaders of Western states who raised cases of documented human rights abuses and sought political protection by claiming threats to national security.<sup>8)</sup> Certainly, as some researchers suggest, neoliberalism presents a multitude of emerging problems as political actors who represent conflicting nations expand national security to have implications for economic development in a global capitalist order.<sup>9)</sup> Of course, many of these emerging problems fall under globalization as an umbrella term for describing how national security threats are a matter of preserving cultural and environmental interests by elevating freedom from government intervention as a benchmark of economic development. However, the deterrence of national security threats does not provide leaders of conflicting nations who directly participated in the CSCE meetings with a sufficient level of analysis for applying multilateral decision-making processes to achieve universal human rights.<sup>10)</sup> National security is, rather, a matter of how well leaders address ad hoc issues without addressing the long-term consequences of failing to reach unilateral consensus on what will preserve cultural and environmental interests under a human rights agenda. The capacity for individual actors who participated in the CSCE meetings to practice seminar diplomacy was indicative of how efficiently one could propose working solutions to ameliorate problematic behaviors occurring in the external environment.

While neoliberalism entails that seminar diplomacy should involve leaders of conflicting nations emphasizing the benefits of having international diplomacy organizations theoretically serving the public good, its consequences often reflect how the prioritization of national security interests over cultural and environmental interests is a narrowly conceived political construction.<sup>11)</sup> Concerning seminar diplomacy, nations who participated in the CSCE meetings may draw from human rights documents adopted by the UN. However, the emphasis on individual interests under neoliberalism has negative (and perhaps intended) consequences regarding the legitimacy of meanings attributed to ideas like human rights and social justice. Surely, the establishment of public-private partnerships under neoliberalism may establish a diplomatic environment of cooperation. Yet, cooperation under neoliberalism may only represent a single-minded construction of reality that eschews any complexities associated with preserving cultural and environmental interests. Neoliberalism, thus, refers to how leaders of conflicting nation-states advance national security through economic development in terms of a dichotomy between East and West.

### **III. Analysis in Budapest Cultural Forum**

To summarize the text produced from the Budapest Cultural Forum, meetings scheduled to take place from October 15 until November 25, 1985, were held in “accordance with the relevant provisions contained in the Concluding Document of the Madrid Meeting on Representatives of the participating States of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe.”<sup>12)</sup> As part of its formal agenda, the Budapest Cultural

Forum commenced with an address given by a representative of the host country. Moreover, the Budapest Cultural Forum also was the first CSCE meeting held in a Warsaw Pact state. During the opening sessions, each representative of a participating nation-state launched proposals for creating subsidiary working bodies. The working bodies formed during the opening sessions of the Budapest Cultural Forum focused on “Plastic and Applied Arts”, “Performing Arts”, “Literature” and “Mutual Cultural Knowledge”.

In many ways, the Budapest Cultural Forum was representative of what some scholars in international relations define as “preventive diplomacy” to prevent the emergency of security threats during the Cold War.<sup>13)</sup> Preventive diplomacy sharply contrasts the realist assumptions implying that international organizations like the CSCE do not space to comment on national security issues. Yet, acts of diplomacy were necessary to prevent nuclear weapons proliferation from become a priority that trumped human rights and the preservation of cultural interests. Preventive diplomacy is also necessary for leaders of conflicting nation-states to consider in the event that nuclear war occurs as a result of an inability to achieve consensus on proposals to implement working policy solutions on the international stage.

Neoliberalism was even more influential in shaping the multilateral decision-making processes that prompted each participant to develop policy recommendations that emphasized liberalization and deregulation as tools for promoting security through personal responsibility. Returning to the problem of cultural creation, the outcomes of the Budapest Cultural Forum only reflected what each representative defined as viable for promotion regional security. In the original text produced by the Budapest Cultural Forum, the discussions that attempted to resolve the problem of cultural creation attempted to highlight an interrelationship between plastic and applied arts, performing arts, literature, and mutual cultural knowledge.<sup>14)</sup> Regarding the category of “plastic and applied arts,” representatives of conflicting nation-states focused on the significance of “painting, graphic and photographic arts, sculpture, design, architecture, [and the] preservation of cultural and historical monuments.”<sup>15)</sup> The reality of emerging security threats was indicative of how participants drew inspiration from a neoliberal perspective to emphasize economic development and statist interventions as necessary not only for promoting human rights but also for preserving cultural interests considered unique to a specific geographical region. Quite arguably, no representative of a nation-state who participated in the Budapest Cultural Forum held a neutral position on what policy mechanisms would most effectively advance security as a goal. However, the original text of the Budapest Cultural Forum indicates that artists bore the brunt of neoliberalism and its active attempt to displace creativity and supplant it with military defense to promote democracy under explicitly capitalist terms.

Specific to the second category of “performing arts,” representatives of conflicting nation-states who participated in the Budapest Cultural Forum identified “theatre, dance, folklore, music, film, [and] cultural programmed [sic] on radio and television.”<sup>16)</sup> Interestingly, the cultural conditions of nation-states in Eastern Europe were characterized by censorship that effectively prevented some artists and other creative types to act independently.<sup>17)</sup> Government censorship, by this logic, not only shaped a social and political environment that lacked security but also failed to conform with a human rights agenda. Accordingly, the governments of many communist countries in Eastern Europe could only permit the production of cultural goods based on what were established standards of decency. Because the governments of communist nation-states practiced censorship as a means of promoting security, some representatives who actively participated in the Budapest Cultural Forum adopted realism to establish policies that controlled the behaviors of individuals actors. Thus, while advancing a human rights agenda was important for ensuring that the Budapest Cultural Forum would promote security by promoting economic development through cultural production, representative participants who espoused realism on ameliorating an immediate situation at hand as requiring strategies that would ideally promote freedom to engage in more creative endeavors after the end of a regional political conflict. Moreover, the realist view held by some active representative of conflicting nation-states who

participated in the Budapest Cultural Forum implied that repression was necessary to promote security at an exclusively regional level.

Pertinent to the third category of “literature,” representatives of conflicting nation-states who participated in the Budapest Cultural Forum primarily emphasized publishing and translation. Even more pertinent to the preservation of cultural interests is how some representatives referred to “less widely spoken languages of the participating States [sic].”<sup>18)</sup> For many participants in the Budapest Cultural Forum, literature remains an important element of characterizing the historical events specific to a time and place. However, literature is also controversial as some authors attempt to embed personal views about what makes a democratic society in written works in spite of government repression. Nevertheless, the emphasis on literature during the Budapest Cultural Forum speaks to how the political situation in Eastern Europe during the Cold War entailed a need for more firm structures of cooperation.<sup>19)</sup> Through literature, oppressive regimes would eventually collapse to inspire many individuals into developing their creativity.

Under a repressive regime, creativity is only possible if the government sanctions it. Yet, more formally democratic regimes sanction the production of literature in alignment with globalized market structures.<sup>20)</sup> Still, the Budapest Cultural Forum involved some active participants citing cultural provisions in the Warsaw Pact as critical not only for promoting economic development but also for establishing a more secure political environment. Cultural differences between nation-states in Eastern and Western Europe were so evident that discussions of literature, many of which involved print distribution, during the Budapest Cultural Forum were critical for maintaining seminar diplomacy. Ideally, discussions of literature that occurred during the Budapest Cultural Forum represented a need for leaders of conflicting nation-states to identify the underlying significant associated with providing citizens with expanded freedom of the press. Considering how neoliberalism had a growing influence on what the leaders of conflicting nation-states would define as a representative democracy, the discussions of literature that took place during the Budapest Cultural Forum emphasized economic development as necessary for establishing a regime of change.<sup>21)</sup> Accordingly, nation-states that granted more freedom of the press through literary means effectively combated realist assumptions in international relations by allowing individuals to exercise agency and take personal responsibility in holding oneself accountable without statist interference. However, under a neoliberal framework, governments would still need to exercise some level of responsibility for ensuring that writers and other creative types would receive enough funding to thrive and, by extension, continue publishing valuable works of literature.

Specific to the fourth category of “mutual cultural knowledge,” leaders of nation-states who participated in the Budapest Cultural Forum held discussions on “research, training and education in the arts, libraries, cultural heritage, preservation of and respect for the diversity and originality of the cultures of the participating States [sic], museums, [and] exhibitions.”<sup>22)</sup> Yet, during the Cold War, mutual cultural knowledge seemed to involve leaders of conflicting nation-states emphasizing the idea of advancing security governance.<sup>23)</sup> Seminar diplomacy also played a critical role in determining what exactly constituted mutual cultural knowledge as bridging a gap between nation-states with a communist and capitalist economic system was a more ideal goal during the Cold War. Undoubtedly, mutual cultural knowledge is a phenomenon developed from an arrangement of complex meanings and organizational structures. Nation-states with governments that exercised considerable levels of material power, thus, experience unintended consequences under a neoliberal framework as the representatives of a particular region have divergent meanings of personal responsibility. In contrast to “civilian power,” by which the leaders of conflicting nation-states who participated in the Budapest Cultural Forum place greater emphasis on advancing a human rights agenda to promote international security, material power reflects the differences in control mechanisms used by governments who implemented economic policies designed to promote freedom in creative pursuits.

#### IV. Conclusion

As explained in the literature review, the concept of seminar diplomacy refers to the behaviors of nation-states with active participation in meetings led by the CSCE during the Cold War. The conflicting ideological beliefs refer to neoliberalism entails an emphasis on personal responsibility for promoting security. However, as this study suggests, the issue of seminar diplomacy reflects how leaders of conflicting states espouse neoliberalism to promote security as part and parcel of economic and cultural development in a globalized order. Moreover, the majority of member states actively participating in the CSCE have leaders who emphasize economic development from a distinctively Western perspective.

Neoliberalism was especially present during the Budapest Cultural Forum as representatives of conflicting nation-states attempted to preserve interests considered unique at a regional level. However, the official report of the Budapest Cultural Forum indicated that a two-week time frame was insufficient for achieving consensus on what would promote security and effectively advance human rights on a global scale. Upon closer inspection, one may assume that the location of the Budapest Cultural Forum influenced how actively participating representatives attempt to apply multilateral decision-making processes. However, the growing influence of neoliberalism entailed that a unilateral goal of economic development in a globalized order was more integral for promoting security interests. Accordingly, economic development would involve a process of government leaders forming alliances with owners of private sector businesses to advance cultural interests.

The fact that meetings took place during the Cold War is significant for international relations scholars interested in how seminar diplomacy shifted in meaning to address emerging contexts that included discussions of upholding national security and promoting a human rights agenda by preserving cultural interests. As the Cold War represented an era in which behaviors on the international political stage represented a failure to reach mutual agreements, the Budapest Cultural Forum was significant for ensuring that the conflicting states could indeed advance a human rights agenda and promote security by practicing seminar diplomacy.

#### [Notes]

1) Michael Lipson, "The reincarnation of CoCom: Explaining post-cold war export controls," *The Nonproliferation Review*, 6. 2 (1999): 35. As Lipson wrote: Neoliberalism, the most influential theoretical alternative to realism, focuses on the salutary effects of international independence and on the promotion of cooperation by international institutions. Neoliberals accept the realist assumptions that states are the basic actors in international relations and that they act rationally in pursuit of their national interests. However, neoliberals argue that states, contrary to realist theory, are capable of sustained cooperation that is not merely a byproduct of the distribution of power. This cooperation is accomplished through international institutions and regimes. Thus, neoliberals see export control regimes [...] as institutional arrangements for solving collective action problems among states with common interests.

2) Nielson and Tierney, "Delegation to International Organizations: Agency Theory and World Bank Environmental Reform," *International Organization*, 57.2 (2003): 243-244. Nielson and Tierney go further by arguing that the critical difference between neoliberalism and realism concerns how the latter implies that "information is always scarce and unreliable" and that "risk-averse states assume the worst about their neighbors, and security dilemmas result."

3) Ibid, 244; see also Asbjørn Eide, Allan Rosas, and Theodor Meron, "Combating Lawlessness in Gray Zone Conflicts Through Minimum Humanitarian Standards," *American Journal of International Law* 89, no. 1 (January 1995): 215-223.

- 4) Mark Bevir and Ian Hall, "The Rise of Security Governance," In *Interpreting Global Security*, edited by Mark Bevir, Oliver Daddow, and Ian Hall (New York, NY: Routledge): 17.
- 5) Ibid. Bevir and Hall suggest that security analysts who drew from the tenets of neoliberalism argued that security analysts "were s[k]eptical about the realist and liberalist claim that the pursuit of national security implied greater security for individuals and communities. [Security analysts] recognized that the state was sometimes the principal threat to the security of citizens."
- 6) Arie Bloed, ed., *The Conference on Security and Co-Operation in Europe: Analysis and Basic Documents, 1972-1993*, 1-2 (Dordrecht, Germany: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1993).
- 7) Ibid.
- 8) Rachel Brett, "Non-Governmental Organizations and the CSCE," *Helsinki Monitor* 3, no. 3 (1992): 19-24. Brett cites the adoption of the Helsinki Final Act in 1975 that led to the formation of human rights watch groups. Brett also cites the Madrid Document of 1983 in which political leaders in Western states may invoke human rights but only as applicable on an individual level and as defined in the Helsinki Final Act.
- 9) Barry Buzan and Ole Weaver, *Regions and Power: The Structure of International Security* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2009): 464. To quote the authors, "Indeed, it might be argued that neoliberal globali[z]ation is the source of a large part of especially (but not only) the non-traditional security problems, i.e., the spread of security to new sectors [...]."
- 10) Ibid., 43.
- 11) Ibid., 41.
- 12) Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, "Opening Statement" of the Budapest Cultural Forum by His Excellency Mr. Bela Kopeczi (Minister of Culture of the Hungarian People's Republic, Head of the Hungarian Delegation at the Cultural Forum)
- 13) Gregory Flynn and Henry Farrell, "Piecing Together the Democratic Peace: The CSCE, Norms, and the "Construction" of Security in Post-Cold War Europe," *International Organization*, 53.3 (1999):507.
- 14) CSCE/CFB/ PM.2 4 December 1984 (Austria, Finland, Liechtenstein, Malta, San Marino, Sweden, Switzerland, Yugoslavia: Draft Report)
- 15) Report of the Meeting of Experts Representing the Participating States of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, Foreseen by the Concluding Document of the Madrid Meeting, to Prepare the "Cultural Forum"
- 16) Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, "Cultural Forum," section I, "Agenda."
- 17) Timothy Carton Ash, "A Few Ideas... Nothing New" *Index on Censorship* 15, no. 1 (1986): 49-50.
- 18) CSCE/CFB.52 Budapest, 7 November 1985
- 19) Klaus Schumann, "The Role of Present Co-Operation Structures in the Process of European Integration," *Helsinki Monitor* 2, no. 3 (1991): 12-21.
- 20) Ibid., 12. Specifically, Schumann notes from the early 1950s to the early 1990s, "Europeans in Central in Eastern Europe had been excluded from the process of European construction and integration, based on individual liberty, pluralist democratic institutions and the rule of law because they had the misfortune to be liberated by the wrong tasks. The ongoing democratic reforms and the expressed wish to join the Western European institutional model of pluralist democracy and market economy" made formal documents like the Warsaw Pact impossible to implement into a human rights agenda that also included proposals for promoting security.
- 21) Luis Simón, *Geopolitical Change, Grand Strategy and European Security: The EU-NATO Conundrum in Perspective* (New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013): 20.



22) Proposal Submitted By The Delegation Of The Federal Republic Of Germany, Supported By The Delegations Of Czechoslovakia, The German Democratic Republic And Hungary And By Members Of The Delegations Of Norway And The United Kingdom, 15 November 1985

23) Alessandra Russo, "Regional Security Governance in the Former Soviet Space? Researching Institutions, Actors, and Practices," *Journal of Contemporary Central and Eastern Europe*, 24.3 (2016) 273-291.

[References]

Acharya, Amitav. "Human Security: East versus West." *International Journal: Canada's Journal of Global Policy Analysis* 56, no. 3 (September 2001): 442-460.

Alessandra Russo, "Regional Security Governance in the Former Soviet Space? Researching Institutions, Actors, and Practices," *Journal of Contemporary Central and Eastern Europe* 24, no. 3 (2016) 273-291.

Asbjørn Eide, Allan Rosas, and Theodor Meron, "Combating Lawlessness in Gray Zone Conflicts Through Minimum Humanitarian Standards," *American Journal of International Law* 89, no. 1 (January 1995): 215-223.

Attinà, Fulvio. *The Building of Regional Security Partnership and the Security Culture Divide and the Mediterranean Region*. Berkeley, CA: Institute of European Studies, 2004.

Barry Buzan and Ole Weaver, *Regions and Power: The Structure of International Security* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2009): 464.

Bátora, Jozef, and Nik Hynek. *Fringe Players and the Diplomatic Order: The "New" Heteronomy*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.

Bloed, Arie, ed. *The Conference on Security and Co-Operation in Europe: Analysis and Basic Documents, 1972-1993, Part I*. Dordrecht, Germany: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1993.

Bourbaki, John. "The Budapest Summit Meeting." *Helsinki Monitor* 6, no. 1 (1995): 5-17.

Emanuel Adler and Beverly Crawford, "Normative Power: The European Practice of Region Building and the Case of the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership," in *The Convergence of Civilizations: Constructing a Mediterranean Region*, edited by Emanuel Adler, Beverly Crawford, Federica Bicchì, and Rafaella Del Sarto, 4.

Erika B. Schlager, "From Budapest to Lisbon," *Helsinki Monitor* 7, no. 3 (1996): 7-10.

Fisher, Ali. *Collaborative Public Diplomacy: How Transnational Networks Influenced American Studies in Europe*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.

Gerald M. Steinberg, "Realism, Politics, and Culture in Middle East Arms Control Negotiations." *International Negotiation* 10, no. 3 (2005): 488.

Gregory Flynn and Henry Farrell, "Piecing Together the Democratic Peace: The CSCE, Norms, and the "Construction" of Security in Post-Cold War Europe," *International Organization*, 53.3 (1999).

King, Gary, and Christopher J. L. Murray. "Rethinking Human Security." *Political Science Quarterly* 116, no. 4 (Winter 2001): 585-610.

Klaus Schumann, "The Role of Present Co-Operation Structures in the Process of European Integration," *Helsinki Monitor* 2, no. 3 (1991) 12-21.

Luis Simón, *Geopolitical Change, Grand Strategy and European Security: The EU-NATO Conundrum in Perspective* (New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013).

Mark Bevir and Ian Hall, "The Rise of Security Governance.," *Interpreting Global Security*, edited by Mark Bevir, Oliver Daddow, and Ian Hall (New York, NY: Routledge): 17.

Michael Lipson, "The reincarnation of CoCom: Explaining post-cold war export controls," *The Nonproliferation Review*, 6. 2 (1999)

- Nielson and Tierney, "Delegation to International Organizations: Agency Theory and World Bank Environmental Reform," *International Organization*, 57.2 (2003): 243-244.
- Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, "Cultural Forum," paragraph 1
- Plomp, Wouter. "The CSCE Human Dimension Seminar on Migrant Workers." *Helsinki Monitor* 5, no. 2 (1994): 85-88.
- Rachel Brett, "Non-Governmental Organizations and the CSCE," *Helsinki Monitor* 3, no. 3 (1992): 19-24.
- Roth, S. J. "From Madrid to Vienna: What Progress in the Helsinki Process?" *Soviet Jewish Affairs* 16, no. 3 (1986): 3-16.
- Wallander, Celeste A., and Robert O. Keohane, "Risk, Threat, and Security Institutions." In *Power and Governance in a Globalized World*, edited by Robert O. Keohane, 88-94. London, UK: Routledge, 2002.

## ブダペスト・文化フォーラムにおける新自由主義の理論分析

鐘 鈺

【要旨】 欧州安全保障協力組織(OSCE)は、冷戦期における東西の両陣営の関係を調整するためのプラットフォームとして発足した。欧州安全保障協力会議(CSCE)が常設機関化したものである。OSCEは、ヨーロッパ、北米、アジアの57ヶ国で構成される多国間機関として注目を集め、安全保障問題に取り組む上で、重要な役割を果たすことが期待された。政治・軍事、経済および環境分野に基づく3つのバスケット構造からなる多国間国際機関である。ブダペスト文化フォーラムに参加した代表者は、文化創造の重要性を共有して、文化創造がどのようにしてヨーロッパ全体の連帯を増強するかという論題を議論した。しかし、ブダペスト文化フォーラムの参加者の中には、ワルシャワ条約についての理念より重視する国家があり、文化的利益の保全と新自由主義的資本主義の枠組みの下での国家パートナーシップの形成を伴うべきであると主張した。

本稿では、セミナー外交の問題について、衝突中の国家が、グローバル化された秩序で、経済成長と文化発展の一部として安全保障を促進する。新自由主義制度論から支持する方法を反映していることを説明したい。さらに、CSCEに積極的に参加している加盟国は、欧米の立場から経済発展を重視する指導者を抱えている。ブダペスト文化フォーラムは、紛争国家のリーダーが実際にセミナー外交を実践することによって、人権問題を進展させ、安全保障を促進できるようにするために重要であった。

キーワード：セミナー外交，新自由主義，欧州安全保障協力会議