

"GREEN SECURITY STRATEGY FOR EUROPE"

prepared by Angelika Beer

adopted by The Greens / European Free Alliance

15.1.2008

Towards a European army? Countering militarisation with conflict prevention, disarmament, and harmonisation.

The 50th anniversary of the EU has kindled controversy about the future development of European security policy. Leading German social democrats and conservatives and even the Belgian Prime Minister are openly calling for the creation of a European army. The long-term objective of a common European army is currently being thrown into the debate so that two key questions cannot be disregarded: what role should conflict prevention, and what role should the military play in the European security strategy? This key bone of contention is being disregarded in order to rally a majority behind militarisation of the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) by stealth. This goes hand in hand with a dispute over the authority to define the 'broader concept of security' or 'human security', to which all political camps are now laying claim.

As the Greens see it, three things have gone wrong. Firstly, the concept of 'human security' has been stretched so far as to even legitimise the deployment of armed forces to secure supplies of fossil fuels, for example. Secondly, as a result of this militarisation of 'human security' - justly criticised -, large sections of the peace movement have now rejected their own concept and concern themselves exclusively with civilian instruments. Thirdly, we are being diverted from the need to examine how to obtain more security with less military involvement via the controlled harmonisation of European armed forces. The Greens are countering the militarisation effort with reinforcement of the civilian instruments of the ESDP, disarmament, and harmonisation of the armed forces in Europe.

The Greens are taking up these challenges by enforcing the original concept of 'human security'. From this concept we derive clear conditions offering a choice between civilian, combined civilian and military, and military capabilities depending on the problem concerned.

A. Threats, risks and challenges

The European Security Strategy (ESS) drafted by Javier Solana in 2003 was the EU's first overall strategic approach to dealing with contemporary threats and risks.

The ESS provides an accurate analysis of some of the key contemporary threats: alongside terrorism, regional conflicts, state failure and organised crime, it emphasises the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the risk of countries acquiring nuclear weapons as fundamental threats to European and global security.

Yet the approach taken by the ESS does not go far enough. A narrow, military, state-oriented concept of security will result in important problem areas being neglected, such as the violation of human rights (including fair social policy), the unfair distribution of resources, and also pollution and climate change.

'Human security': content, not concept

Conflict prevention will succeed only if these 'unconventional' threats, too, are perceived as security risks and taken seriously as such. Non-military threats have been recognised as crucial for national security. A security strategy for the 21st century must make 'human security' - the protection of human beings, not the state,

against threats – its key yardstick for security policy, pursuant to United Nations General Assembly Resolution 60/1 (2005). There have rightly been repeated calls for this in publications ranging from the UN Human Development Report 1994 to the 2004 study 'A Human Security Doctrine for Europe' commissioned by Javier Solana himself. Besides, the only way a security strategy can also effectively combat 'traditional' threats, such as wars between nations, is if the underlying causes in fields such as the environment or human rights are also taken into account in the security-policy doctrine. To take away the underlying causes, the following objectives should be pursued:

- Respect for human rights: Serious human-rights violations – affecting women, in particular, worldwide – threaten the physical security of individuals, hinder social development and destroy civil-society structures. This can trigger civil war or wars between nations.
- Social justice: Globalisation must be shaped by striking a balance between financial markets and social justice.
- Fair distribution of natural resources and fair access: Problems caused by the unfair distribution of resources can be seen in many policy areas: Conflicts over the distribution of water, energy sources and other resources threaten political stability in many regions and worldwide.
- Fair trade and fair agricultural policy: Trade and agricultural policy of the EU should be reformed to ensure fair market conditions for producers and farmers from developing countries, increase standards of living and remove causes for conflict.
- Conservation and the fight against climate change: Environmental degradation further aggravates these problems. Global climate change carries the threat of catastrophic consequences for agriculture and the environment, and thus of refugee movements with a destabilising effect.
- Tackling the causes of flight: The present European foreign trade, agricultural and fisheries policies deprive millions of people in developing countries of their basis of living and drive them to migration. Refugee flows destabilise the poorest regions of the world in particular. Poverty reduction, health programmes and fair world trade are crucial to tackling the causes.

We as Greens are therefore campaigning for a European peace policy that responds to the issues of fair distribution of resources and fair access on a global scale, plea for urgent global disarmament efforts - first and foremost with regard to nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction - and puts the fight against expanding organised crime as one of the EU top priorities.

B. Implementing 'human security'

A comprehensive threat analysis based on the concept of 'human security' entails practical consequences for the strategic orientation of European security policy. This means recognising threats and causes of threats to human rights and to the fair distribution of resources as being security threats as well. We consider the reduction of conflict resolution to its military dimension as neither right nor successful and for

this reason we reject the EU ISS White Paper. Complex problems such as state failure are cross-cutting tasks and cannot be eliminated by military intervention.

A peace policy for the 21st century can succeed only if there is systematic, institutionalised coordination of the Common Foreign and Security Policy/European Security and Defence Policy (CFSP/ESDP) with EU policies on the environment, energy (including "sustainable" renewable energy, that is: respecting biodiversity and access of the poorest to food), development, foreign trade, agriculture, fisheries and human rights and with the fight against organised crime. Our goal is a comprehensive European peace and security policy that pushes military action into the background.

Thus 'human security' means integrating the Green's roots in the peace, environmental and North-South/third-world movements' into the EU security-policy doctrine.

B.1. Commitment to human rights

A European security policy must always be a human-rights policy, too. Human rights are universal. Peacekeeping and peace-enforcement operations, and also the fight against international terrorism, can succeed only if forces deployed under the EU flag respect the European Charter of Fundamental Rights, the European Convention on Human Rights and international humanitarian law absolutely.

The responsibility to protect the population against genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity and ethnic cleansing was clearly and unequivocally acknowledged by the UN member states at the 2005 millennium summit. In the first place this obligation rests with the government of each country, and in case of its failure, with the international community. It comprises the duty to exhaust all preventive means before deploying the military as an ultimate step to prevent genocide, as well as a long-term responsibility for peace, stability and reconstruction after the intervention

The Greens support military operations to prevent genocide under clearly defined preconditions. Establishing whether genocide is imminent or even happening already must not be crippled by diplomacy, as in Darfur, and the United Nations Security Council must carry out a fundamental reform to overcome the problem of the right of veto. It is also true, however, that humanitarian intervention must not be abused as a pretext for interference in a country's internal order. Humanitarian intervention mandated by the UN Security Council must always remain only the last resort of European security policy.

- Fundamental rights not negotiable: We Greens are campaigning to ensure that all EU security operations fully respect human rights, fundamental rights, international humanitarian law and law on refugees.
- Humanitarian intervention: We Greens support humanitarian intervention mandated by the United Nations as a last resort, under clearly defined conditions and with clearly defined objectives.

B.2. Increasing security by switching to renewables

The Green energy policy is a policy for peace. As well as responding to concerns about the security of energy supply, our strategy of moving away from oil and gas removes the cause of many conflicts. Our understanding of 'human security' firmly rejects the deployment of armed forces to safeguard raw materials. We reject the renaissance of nuclear power as a replacement for oil and gas – one of the reasons being the lessons learnt from Chernobyl. Nuclear power always has a dual purpose, which is why its promotion must be struck from the duties of the IAEA in the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). After all, civilian and military use are inseparable. The fight against proliferation cannot succeed whilst nuclear power is being used – a fact illustrated by the nuclear dispute with Iran. This means that renewable energy sources are not only necessary for the environment; they also increase security, in that they tackle the causes of conflicts over fossil resources and, of their decentralised networks, present less scope for attack – by terrorists, for example. Investment in renewable energy sources is investment in greater security and stability, and thus in peace. We would work to ensure that the EU promotes and provides renewable technologies at low or zero cost as appropriate to developing countries.

- Adapt energy policy to prevent conflict: We pursue our objective of reducing dependence on fossil fuels and on nuclear power particularly and for increasing the use of sustainable renewable energy, which contributes to conflict prevention.

B.3. Environmental and climate policy as policies for peace

Environmental policy is a policy for peace – and climate policy, too, has an influence on security policy measures. With resources becoming ever scarcer, we have a duty to conserve them. Growing pollution and wastage are further increasing the scarcity of essential resources, thus increasing the number and intensity of political and social conflicts. Growing concern about the imminence of Peak Oil - the point at which half of all known oil reserves have been consumed, and beyond which extraction goes into inevitable decline - will add to the tension and potential conflict over access to fossil fuels.

As UN secretary General Ban Ki-moon has stressed, climate change is one of the underlying causes of the Darfur conflict. Environmental and climate pollution are almost always cross-border phenomena. Siting a nuclear-power plant near a border, in particular, can be perceived as a hostile act by neighbours. Nuclear power is unacceptable as source of energy. Oil, carbon and gas use should be decreased. Oil, gas and nuclear power are unacceptable as sources of energy not least from an environmental point of view.

Climate policy is a policy for peace, as the rapid climate change caused by human activity results in the sudden disappearance of resources. Fields dry up or are flooded, drinking water becomes ever-scarcer, whole areas become uninhabitable, and large migration flows are triggered that can politically destabilise individual countries and regions.

- Environmental policy: We are working to ensure that environmental policy continues to play an important role in measures under foreign and security policy.

- Climate policy: We are working to ensure that environmental policy forms part of security policy analyses, planning and measures.

B.4. Enlargement as a peace project

The accession perspective, currently benefiting the Western Balkan countries and Turkey is one of the most powerful security-policy instruments at Europe's disposal. The prospect of joining the EU gives our neighbours a unique boost for democratisation and modernisation. This will materialize only, however, if the EU advocates its founding values self-confidently and is credible in its negotiation strategy.

The situation in the Balkans is a particularly vivid illustration of the degree to which prospective accession and the vision of a common European future has given these countries, which were ravaged by civil war and political instability, the courage to carry out reforms. By continuing to hold out this prospect of accession on the one hand, and strengthening its neighbourhood policy on the other, and while recognising cultural differences as an asset, the EU can provide a decisive boost for democracy and human rights in Eastern Europe and Central Asia, in particular. We do not support the casting of doubt over promises of future EU membership that have already been made, as this would mean relinquishing, without good cause, one of the most important instruments for Europe as a peace project.

- Against the 'third way': The Greens support the EU's promises and firmly oppose a 'third way' between neighbourhood policy and membership that would call these promises into question.
- Promotion of democracy: With the awareness that values and cultural traditions others than ours are a common heritage to be safeguarded, we are campaigning for a European Neighbourhood Policy and External Policy whose supreme objective is the promotion of democracy and human rights, in particular in East Europe, Central Asia, North Africa and the Middle East.

B.5. Disarmament – the key to peace

The threat of the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction is more virulent than ever. The failure of disarmament initiatives at the UN Millennium Summit, the NPT Review Conference and the policy of double standards being practised against countries such as Iran and India have increased the appeal of nuclear weapons, particularly to newly industrialised countries. We are countering the US doctrine of preemptive strikes with a policy of reinforcing international organisations and agreements. This includes the provision of security guarantees. Europe can set a good example here by becoming a nuclear weapon free zone and by starting to cut military expenditure. Our objective remains complete elimination of all weapons of mass destruction.

As Kofi Annan himself pointed out with unprecedented passion for a Secretary General, the failure of disarmament initiatives in 2005 at the UN Millennium Summit and the NPT Review Conference was shameful. Double standards and a policy of exceptionalism threatens the future viability of the non-proliferation regime.

Mines, cluster bombs and small arms are the 'weapons of mass destruction of everyday life'. Even after wars have ended they remain a danger to the civilian population, as they not only hinder social and economic development, but also prevent a social existence free from violence.

Worldwide arms exports have increased by 50% from 2003 to 2007. We want to stem arms production and international arms exports, particularly the trade in small arms. Accordingly, we are campaigning for binding European rules to prevent the supply of arms to crisis regions, and for an international agreement forbidding and penalising arms exports – in particular of small arms – to crisis-hit and developing countries.

- Nuclear disarmament: The Greens call for the removal of all US tactical nuclear weapons in Europe as a sign that the EU is coming into line with NPT Article 1 and 2 commitments, with a view to reviving nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. Our objective is to make Europe a nuclear-free zone. To further that end, we recognise that it is a EU wide responsibility to bring pressure to bear to achieve negotiated nuclear disarmament in the UK and France.
- International ban: We support the Norwegian initiative seeking an international ban on cluster bombs and, also accordingly, are campaigning to outlaw white phosphorus, depleted uranium ammunition and anti-vehicle mines.
- Stemming exports: We call for the European Union Code of Conduct on Arms Exports to be made legally binding now.
- Missile Defence: Recognising global challenges for security and disarmament in times of globalisation, Greens will support all initiatives to prevent proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their carriers, to eliminate nuclear weapons (eg. through a Nuclear Weapon Convention) and to reduce and control conventional weapons. Inside Europe we want to strengthen the CFSP. That means we cannot accept the plans of the so called US missile defence shield in two of our EU member states. Bilateral approaches and decisions in this important issue are out of the question and would at least result in zones of asymmetric security inside Europe, with the certainty of provoking a new arms race - particularly in space - as well as being counterproductive to the European Security Strategy and the European Strategy on Weapons of Mass Destruction. We therefore also reject proposals that such a shield be deployed in co-operation with, or by, NATO and/or Russia.

B.6. Civilian instruments take precedence and the need for an integrated foreign policy

The EU should avoid 'Clash of Civilizations', and enter dialogue with other cultures on the basis of Europe's own identity. The EU must therefore recognise its own history, culture and scientific, political and religious inheritance in order to create a room for common understanding, dialogue and relevant confrontations.

Non-military foreign-policy instruments must be the mainstay of Europe as a civilian power. Conflict prevention, reconciliation and civilian crisis intervention have not kept pace with military developments. The test case of Europe as a civilian power will be how much money and how many staff and structures it provides for civilian conflict-management instruments.

Peaceful conflict resolution is still too often undermined by actions of individual EU member states. A real common European foreign and security policy often suffers from unilateral and also bilateral approaches. Also, short term considerations often take precedence over long term approaches which would guarantee sustainability and conflict resolution. All too often, means of influencing conflicts are not fully exhausted before the military is called for.

- Common Foreign and Security Policy in one piece: EU institutions and especially member states have to critically review and eventually change their policies and their impact on conflicts before deciding on military interventions.
- Civilian conflict prevention: The Greens are campaigning to strengthen Europe's civilian capabilities to make Europe a civilian power. We strongly support the establishment of the European Civil Peace Corps, the implementation of a Peace Building Partnership and the establishment of a European civil protection system.

B.7. Harmonisation – the Greens’ response to militarisation

We need a European white paper clearly defining operational scenarios and laying down clear limits for military operations. The Greens reject the ‘Proposal for a White Paper’ drafted by the EU ISS (EU Institute for Security Studies), on account of its one-dimensional perspective. The armed forces cannot act as a substitute for politics. There should be no military operations in order to safeguard raw materials or in the fight against drug cultivation, and we firmly reject such an approach.

We support preventive military operations such as that in Macedonia for containing conflicts. Military peace-enforcement operations as an instrument of European security policy must have a clear basis in international law. We reject pre-emptive military strikes.

In the light of this, we support the decisions concerning ESDP that were taken at the Cologne, Helsinki and Feira European Councils. These comprise participation in the establishment of NATO stabilisation forces and European rapid-reaction forces (‘battle groups’), and strengthening the pool of police officers and experts in the rule of law.

We support the harmonisation of national military capabilities at European level, which makes it possible to concentrate on the necessary capabilities and to divide up the work – unlike present practice, whereby each party believes it must be able to do everything. By harmonisation we mean that national capabilities have to become fully interoperable in European multinational missions, and that we have to overcome the idea that each EU member state has to have national land, sea and air forces. In a political union as the EU there should be enough solidarity to counter any external military threat together. Harmonisation therefore means a significant reduction of overall numbers of armed forces because of division of labour, a concentration on key competences by each member state and also a reduction of military spending. But harmonisation cannot mean that those relatively small military units are not well

trained, educated and equipped to be capable to conduct stabilisation as well as peace enforcement missions. European harmonisation is the key to countering militarisation, and could be the precondition for a future European army.

In addition, we call for the development of European capabilities and bodies to be subject to greater transparency and parliamentary control, as this is the only way of giving this development democratic legitimacy. Future ESDP operations, whether they be for the purpose of stabilisation or of rapid reaction, must be coherent and subject to parliamentary scrutiny at national and European level.

In the light of this, the juxtaposition of 27 national arms markets must also be consigned to the past. By extending the internal-market rules to the arms sector, we can reduce arms production and military budgets, create transparency and save taxpayers' money. These requests correspond to our call for the abolition of the Euratom Treaty.

- Parliamentary control: We Greens are campaigning resolutely for effective parliamentary control of all EU military operations. For as long as this is not guaranteed at European level, the rights of national parliaments must be ensured and strengthened at all events. The codecision procedure, which we managed to secure for the first time with the 'Stability Instrument', is even more important in the case of Euratom and the military.
- Strong civilian ESDP: We are campaigning for a team of police officers and experts in the rule of law within the ESDP that at least matches the military component.
- Harmonisation – setting the course: We are in favour of further building up and reorganising the ESDP with the aim of creating a more effective European security capacity and reducing military expenditure at the same time, and with the prospect of making possible the development of integrated European forces in the long term.
- Transparent arms market: The Greens support extending the internal-market rules to national defence sectors with the aim of full transparency, cost efficiency and orienting procurements exclusively to the requirements of the ESDP.

Conclusion

The Greens are taking on responsibility for conflict prevention and disarmament. Only when European security policy tackles the causes of conflicts and deals with security issues as cross-cutting tasks in all policy areas can a contribution be made towards stability and lasting peace in the world. Modern Green foreign and security policy comprises a comprehensive security strategy incorporating the issues of conflicts over the distribution of resources, shortcomings in terms of human rights and democracy, fair trade, environmental problems and climate change, and also the debate on sustainable energy supply.