

**Proposal for a
Different
European Security Strategy**

Francesco Marelli, M.A.

European Peace University, Austria

Supervised by Jan Øberg, PhD.

The Transnational Foundation for Peace and Future Research

TFF

September 2007 – February 2008

Current opportunities

When examining the political situation of the world we have seen, since the 20th century, the unfolding of novel methods of the strategic exercise of violence such as terrorism with suicide bombers, non-state actors using war-like tactics and attacks on civilians. At its beginning, the 21st century confirms a persistence of this phenomenon and an enormous and ever growing gap between rich and poor, as in the year 2000 only 1% of the world's adults owned 40% of the global assets.¹ Also, despite all pledges by states such as those enshrined in the Millennium Development Goals, undernourishment still affects some 852 million people a year² and the H.I.V./AIDS pandemic kills at a rate of about 8,000 a day.³ The UN with its Human Rights Commission (UNHRC), the Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO), the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), the World Health Organization (WHO), just to mention some, mostly have the knowledge to resolve the problems they have been designed to combat, but solutions are impeded by a lack of genuine cooperation from individual states as well as the global community at large.⁴

To have peace within the EU means, to a great extent, to have peace outside of it, for if a degree of peacefulness does not surround the EU, then those living in those conditions will seek them in the EU or elsewhere where they deem it more peaceful than at home. Also, within the EU people will somehow feel unfulfilled knowing a section of humanity struggles from day to day. In order then to enhance the peacefulness within the EU as well as outside of it, it is quintessential to have, especially in the still very diverse but still also divided EU, a solid common basis.

Fortunately, the global situation for embarking upon a therapy is optimal. In January 2001, no EU Member State felt threatened by the others, nor did it see a military threat from anybody else.⁵ After 9/11, this still holds truth, as confirmed by the current *European Security Strategy (ESS)* which states that "Large-scale aggression against any Member State is now improbable."⁶ Combining this with the growing unpopularity of war worldwide, exacerbated by the wave of US-led interventionism since 9/11, the EU can offer a hard alternative by being a true soft player in international politics. This situation has severely undermined the likelihood that states worldwide will ever accept a unipolar global system again and, already, more and more countries are experimenting with alternative ways of governance and economy to try and escape from the negative externalities of current political and economic realities, such as strong pollution and depletion, as well as severe poverty at the bottom. There seems to be an ever-growing grass roots pressure, which has not yet truly permeated into international politics, to, for the first time in history, genuinely try to heal the aforementioned, as well other, global pathologies.

Unfortunately, the EU does not seem to grasp the importance of the moment, as illustrated by the current (2003) *ESS*. This document, as the analysis will point out, is one of traditional security-based thinking.

¹ *The World Distribution of Household Wealth*, 2006, p. 1

² *The State of Food Security around the World 2004*, 2004, p. 8

³ *United Nations reform*, 1996, p.16-18

⁴ Friesen, 2006, p.30

⁵ Hårleman & Øberg, 2001

⁶ *A Secure Europe in a Better World: European Security Strategy*, 2003, p. 4

The missing pillar for the promotion of the ability to deal creatively and non-violently with conflict in the EU is a holistic guidance, an inspiring document, as the UN Charter must have been at the time of the inception of the UN. This document could make the EU a true force for peace, as it often claims itself to be. Currently, it is unclear what it means by peace and, moreover, it does not act according to any rich definition of peace. The current *European Security Strategy* is a quintessential EU document showing the course the Union will be pursuing in the future and, unfortunately, it is riddled with contradictions, lack of insight, and absence of a visionary and exciting projection of the future of the EU or the world as a whole. It transpires a worldview that is dominated by millennia-old defense and military-dominated security thinking. Nothing points in the direction that the EU will pledge to reduce direct violence, nor does it show any understanding of the nature of, contribution to, and possibility of reducing structural, cultural and environmental violence in the EU and outside its borders. Even though the *ESS* is not meant as operational document, it does provide an important and increasingly used framework of reference for EU strategic planning and forms a sort of mission statement for EU security matters.⁷

For these reasons, it is important that the next *European Security Strategy* be one proposing alternatives and thereby legitimizing a position that stands for nonviolence, empathy and cooperation, and it will spurn constructive, creative and concrete solutions to engage in the exciting challenges the EU and the world face. It is with this notion in mind that it has been rewritten for the purpose of this paper (more on this on page 8).

Before moving on to the analysis of the current text, the reader might be interested in the following passage which sets, in its simple and most pure form, the definition of what it means to be “secure” in Europe. The idea came from Glenn Paige, who has coined the concept *non-killing* to describe the norms and policies which are characteristic of a new development for peace. According to Hårleman & Øberg, when applying these concepts to the EU, moving towards more non-violence looks as follows:⁸

1. “No European will be killed by a European, and no one will be threatened with being killed;
2. Secondly, no European will be killed by foreigners, and no one will be threatened with being killed;
3. Thirdly, no foreigners will be killed by Europeans, and no one will be threatened with being killed ;
4. Fourthly, no Europeans have any weapon to kill one another, no foreigners have any weapon to kill Europeans, and no Europeans have any weapon to kill foreigners;
5. Fifthly, there are no ideological doctrines - political, religious, military, economic, legal, customary or academic - which allow Europeans to kill Europeans, allow foreigners to kill Europeans, or allow Europeans to kill foreigners;
6. Sixthly, there is no relationship in European communities - political, economic, social and cultural - and no relationship between Europeans and foreigners which can only be maintained or changed by threats or the use of killing.”

⁷ Biscop, 2006, p. 1

⁸ Hårleman & Øberg, 2001

Notwithstanding the fact that these six points are very straightforward and constitute a formidable set of guidelines for how people in the EU should *not* treat one another, there still is a minor issue with them. Their negative formulation too much evokes the thought of commandments, of prohibitions, and thereby can trigger the negative emotions and feelings of being restricted as an individual. Could these six points be formulated in a more “libratory” manner, which is arguably what they are designed for? What happens when one turns around the text to a positive note and adds elements of encouragement? In other words, how *would* we like to treat and be treated?

1. Europeans do their best to treat each other with respect, compassion, understanding and love;
2. Secondly, Europeans do their best to treat foreigners with respect, compassion, understanding and love;
3. Thirdly, foreigners do their best to treat Europeans with respect, compassion, understanding and love;
4. Fourthly, Europeans will do their best to engage with one another, as well as with foreigners, in non-violent and mutually enriching ways;
5. Fifthly, ideological doctrines – political, religious, military, economic, legal, customary or academic – will become acquainted with, and are encouraged to incorporate as much as possible, nonviolent behavior and creative conflict transformation teachings;
6. Sixthly, as many as possible relationships in European communities - political, religious, economic, social and cultural - and again as many relationships between Europeans and foreigners will be encouraged to be maintained or changed by respectful, mutually beneficial agreements and the use of constructive, creative and concrete solutions to conflicts.

Critique of current *European Security Strategy*

“Europe has never been so prosperous, so secure nor so free.”⁹ This inspiring and heartwarming phrase which launches the *ESS*¹⁰ is the first as well as last such phrase. After that, despite a sometimes clear and honest assertion of some of the big problems facing the planet, the document is largely ridden with a choice of topics, reasoning and wording seeming to be copied word for word from a 21st Century U.S. administration paper.

For one, this is visible when turning to the list of major threats to the EU which features, among others, failed states, terrorism and organized crime. The *ESS*, written under the auspices of the ex-NATO Secretary-General and current EU High Representative for the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) Javier Solana, asserts these threats as being the most important ones and states, without advancing any proof or intentions, that those same threats are growing and will continue to grow over time and that it is therefore vital that the EU should be “ready to act before a crisis occurs.”¹¹ Johan Galtung has the following to say about Solana’s ways of dealing with politics, stating that he

“... was against Spanish membership in NATO to win Spanish elections, then worked for that membership, and finally became NATO's Secretary General (Aznar was at least consistently pro-USA). So from Solana little is to be expected. His analysis is autistic. He locates all the problems on the outside in his “Europe faces three key threats”: international terrorism, particularly with weapons of mass destruction, failed states, and organized crime.”¹²

In the *ESS*, besides Solana’s assessment of threats, the Balkans is cited as an area in which, in collaboration with its international partners, the EU has created stability and that the region “is no longer threatened by the outbreak of major conflict” and that “The credibility of our foreign policy depends on the consolidation of our achievements there.”¹³ It also says that the EU has progressed in the direction of Common Foreign and Security Policy and effective crisis management and, remarkably, that “We have instruments in place that can be used effectively, as we have demonstrated in the Balkans and beyond.”¹⁴

Wilfried Graf, by contrast, states that not a single one of the conflicts in the former Yugoslavia, with the exception of Slovenia, have been resolved, and adds that new scenarios of violent conflict are possible in the area within the coming few years.¹⁵ *Le Monde Diplomatique*, in a March 2007 article titled “Kosovo, still ready to explode”, strongly reinforces the critique on the EU management of the situation, arguing that corruption, non-integration, frustration and unemployment are among the factors that could trigger a re-explosion of violence.¹⁶ Finally, Øberg writes that it could certainly be objected that to anyone “who has followed EU policies in the former Yugoslavia may wonder why Solana’s paper [the *ESS*] is so lacking in either self-criticism or humility or both.”¹⁷ Also, in a more recent article, he writes that Solana, in 1999, was

⁹ *A Secure Europe in a Better World: European Security Strategy*, 2003, p. 1

¹⁰ Full text can be found on http://ue.eu.int/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/en/reports/76255.pdf

¹¹ *A Secure Europe in a Better World: European Security Strategy*, 2003, p. 7

¹² Galtung, *Solana's (and EU's?) Foreign Policy: A Non-Starter*, 2004

¹³ *A Secure Europe in a Better World: European Security Strategy*, 2003, p. 8

¹⁴ *Idem*, p. 11

¹⁵ Graf, 2006, p. 1

¹⁶ Dérens, 2007, p. 1

¹⁷ Øberg, *Does the European Union Promote Peace?*, 2006, p. 18

the highest civil decision-maker responsible for destroying Serbia and Kosovo, “a gross violation of international law, done without UN backing and leading to unspeakable suffering...”¹⁸

It seems sad and hypocritical that such individuals and their organizations, in this case NATO, directly responsible for bombing countries and thereafter claiming to have stabilized them and brought peace, are not scrutinized and held accountable for their actions. Nonetheless, the document states that what the EU needs to do in future is more of the same, which cannot but mean that military action is still the preferred tool. This is confirmed by Graf, who mentions the Helsinki 1999 and Brussels 2000 meetings which concretely defined the defense and intervention capabilities, and which led to both a projected EU force of around 60.000 soldiers and the build-up of a civilian deployment force, but with the civilian dimension still clearly subordinate.¹⁹ It seems that nothing is about to change and that the EU could again embark into a military adventure in the near future, causing more damage and suffering than it will ever understand, if one is to believe the self-complacent tone of EU documents such as the one under scrutiny. It seems Solana, and the EU, would evidently need to reconsider their ideas and political action, if they want to genuinely come across as respectively persons and institutions of their word and true peacemakers.

The *European Security Strategy* states that the EU needs 160 billion Euro per year in order to “sustain several operations simultaneously” to assist the UN when asked to do so.²⁰ However, the document subsequently states that the EU should react before situations deteriorate, which is something the UN Charter does not authorize.²¹ Graf is of the same opinion when he mentions that, with the erection of defense and intervention forces, the EU is working itself into a chaotic state of national armies, NATO and EU forces without clear task divisions and without a mandate from the UN.²² Again, we see a relapse into a view of “settling” violent conflicts that is light-years behind the UN Charter, which advocates peace by peaceful means, i.e. abolishing war as a social institution. The EU even contradicts itself on this point, by stating in the *ESS* that

“We are committed to upholding and developing International Law. The fundamental framework for international relations is the United Nations Charter ... Strengthening the United Nations, equipping it to fulfill its responsibilities and to act effectively, is a European priority.”

Although peace seems to be the prime aim of the EU, judging from the first two paragraphs of the *ESS*, the document does not present any definition, nor does it show understanding, of what peace really means. This is worrisome, as it indicates the EU will continue behaving the way it does, which is not as peaceful as it believes. As Gandhi said, “An eye for an eye makes the world blind”, so the countries comprising the EU, especially the former colonial powers, really need to change their patterns of behavior if they do not want to continue make others blind and, somewhere along the line, become blind themselves.

According to Solana, the establishment of an EU defense agency is the right way ahead in the first place. However, again, there is a contradiction. On page 12, the *ESS* states that

¹⁸ Øberg, *EU at 50 - What has it got to do with peace?*, 2007

¹⁹ Graf, 2006, p. 1-2

²⁰ *A Secure Europe in a Better World: European Security Strategy*, 2003, p. 12

²¹ Øberg, *Does the European Union Promote Peace?*, 2006, p. 19

²² Graf, 2006, p. 2

“To transform our militaries into more flexible, mobile forces, and to enable them to address the new threats, more resources for defence and more effective use of resources are necessary.”

And, after the subsequent phrase, it reads

“In almost every major intervention, military efficiency has been followed by civilian chaos. We need greater capacity to bring all necessary civilian resources to bear in crisis and post crisis situations.”²³

First of all, why allocate more money to the military, as it is increasingly becoming clear that military and the way it operates does not appreciate nor allow for genuine conflict transformation? Secondly, and in relation to the former, how can one add to it that military *should* be used, for what else can “enable them to address new threats” and giving them “more resources” mean? Both remarks are in stark contrast to the second passage stating that “military efficiency has been followed by civilian chaos” and that civilian resources need more attention. Why then, again, according to the first passage, should increasing emphasis be placed on the military? Also, one might ask if military was really efficient if it has created “civilian chaos.” Is the goal of military generally not to quell violent conflict by addressing military personnel and facilities of the adversary country or countries by doing minimum harm to civilians? And what about the Geneva Conventions? Finally, it is important to note the two passages seem to indicate that the EU unconditionally follows the US lead in the belief that military intervention is necessary and should always take place before civilian efforts which, as the Afghanistan and Iraq invasions clearly show, is a nonsensical approach.

Among the many things that could be added to the document, a striking one is the total absence of questioning the presence of nuclear arms in the EU, not only those belonging to the USA, but those owned by France and the UK as well. The threat that emanates from having them, coupled with the risk of mismanagement, failures or the devices being stolen or accidentally triggered is grave enough to at least re-ignite a comprehensive debate on the presence of nuclear arms in the EU. Hopefully, with pressure from citizens, they can be dismantled once and for all, as the NPT requires.

EU cooperation

Emphasis is repeatedly placed on the EU’s close relationship with NATO, but not with other organizations. It is axiomatic that the EU should cooperate with as many countries as possible but again the transatlantic partnership takes precedence, as it is the only one being mentioned. “Our aim should be an effective and balanced partnership with the USA”, because “Acting together, we can be a formidable force for good in the world”. Both Galtung and Øberg deem the *European Security Strategy* as failing in its analysis.²⁴ It begins by making some good points, but goes on to reach increasingly for the military tool kit.

All areas of foreign, security and defense policy come within the scope of the EU top leadership’s decision-making, not just some or most of them. Graf states that the Member States are already obliged to act loyally and in solidarity to the CFSP, which basically means that the interests of the big countries in the Union take priority, so that the Member States must “refrain

²³ *A Secure Europe in a Better World: European Security Strategy*, 2003, p. 12

²⁴ Øberg, *Does the European Union Promote Peace?*, 2006, p. 19 / Galtung, *Solana's (and EU's ?) Foreign Policy: A Non-Starter*, 2004

themselves from any act which could harm the interests of the Union or its functionality as coherent force in international relations.”²⁵

To conclude, it can be said that the EU, with respect to the dimensions referred to above, falls virtually completely into the traditional, national approach to security with the emphasis on military resources. At present then, as was briefly mentioned earlier on in this essay, it is highly improbable that the EU understands, will understand, or be willing and able to contribute to a reduction of the four types of violence, direct, structural, cultural and environmental, in the world. In the current situation, it mostly depends on whether individual Member States assume greater shared responsibility for the world than the EU does²⁶ or on external forces, such as an increasingly vocal and supported international environmental shift or (perceived) political and economical pressure from China and India.

The next chapter will briefly outline where the inspiration for the new *European Security Strategy* was taken from, as well as with which criteria and structure it was created and written

²⁵ Graf, 2006, p. 1

²⁶ Øberg, *Does the European Union Promote Peace?*, 2006, p. 37

Basis of new *European Security Strategy*

The new *ESS* which will be presented in the coming chapter is largely based on two documents. An essential aspect these texts have in common is that they have mostly come about by thoroughly democratic means, dialogue and making good use of citizens' creativity instead of purely relying on experts and diplomats. Also, both texts are quite visionary and positive, contain elements of discussion missing from the main stream political discourse in Europe and are concise and clear. In short, two excellent works to build upon.

The first document is the *Earth Charter*, from the year 2000, which views itself as a “declaration of fundamental principles for building a just, sustainable, and peaceful global society in the 21st century.”²⁷ It was formed by a large global consultation process and is by now endorsed by numerous thousands of organizations representing millions of individuals and the document “seeks to inspire in all peoples a sense of global interdependence and shared responsibility for the well-being of the human family and the larger living world.”²⁸

The second document, the *European Citizens' Perspectives on the Future of Europe*, from the year 2007, which is in essence a synthesis of 27 *National Perspectives on the Future of Europe* created by randomly selected citizens in all EU Member States who participated in similarly structured deliberations on a shared agenda selected by these citizens themselves.²⁹ The main idea behind this is expressed at the very beginning of the document where it states: “We ask you, European and national policy makers, to take our views into account as you prepare decisions on the future of Europe. And we invite fellow citizens and the media to continue this debate we have started.”³⁰

In rewriting the document a number of things were kept in mind. Firstly, it had not to exceed the length of the current version, so as to keep it readable for any citizen as well as being to-the-point. Secondly, to present security by way of positive peace, of guidelines that inspire and connect with all, not as an enumeration of threats and dangers to the EU which is how the current document is more or less written. So, for example, when mentioning the importance of recycling, durable environmental solutions, the idea is to sketch a more holistic picture of what security really entails, because the mentioned factors contribute to less pollution, climate change and depletion and thereby lead to security within and outside of the EU. It is vital to not see security as only being about freedom from terrorism, invasion of privacy, and war. As important as those factors, if not more, is, for example, the answer to how well an individual is able to take care of his or her family (job security, pension system, disability allowance, child care etc.) and how much the EU supports this person in these efforts. A breakdown of this structure has consequences serious enough to fall under the label “security” as it is used for war and violence-related concepts.

The reader of this paper will find many selected elements from both aforementioned documents that have been interwoven, roughly following the format provided by the *European Citizens' Perspectives on the Future of Europe*. Finally, additions have been made coming forth from the writer's reflections. The idea behind this new *European Security Strategy* was to create a holistic, unity-driven, modest, passionate and humble text that can appeal to all within the EU.

²⁷ Earth Charter, p.1

²⁸ Idem

²⁹ European Citizen's Consultations, p.1

³⁰ Idem, p.2



A PEACEFUL EUROPE IN A UNITED WORLD

EUROPEAN SECURITY STRATEGY

The Hague, 16 September 2007

Introduction

This document establishes a set of fundamental principles aimed at building just, sustainable and peaceful European societies in the 21st century, and hopes to be a catalyst for encouraging the same elements in non-European ones.

It aims at inspiring a sense of global interdependence and mutual responsibility for the welfare and happiness of the human family, as well as the larger living world. Importantly, it presents itself as an expression of hope and a call to help create a global partnership at a critical juncture in history.

It is precisely in recognizing the rising global challenges that the vision needs to be inclusive and recognizing that our environmental, economic, political, social, developmental, spiritual challenges and quest for peace are interconnected, and that it is only by regular consultation and genuine, nonviolent and profound global dialogue that we can forge inclusive solutions in which every individual has a vital role to play. All organizations and sectors in our societies are called to offer creative leadership. A pivotal role here is the partnership of government, civil society and business for effective governance. In order to build a sustainable global community, the nations of the world must renew their commitment to the UN and at the same time fulfill their obligations under existing international agreements. These are all essential factors if we want ours to be remembered as a time of the awakening of a new reverence for life.

In the EU, as well as in geographical areas in which its governments and corporations are active, the dominant patterns of production and consumption are causing environmental devastation, depletion of resources, and a massive extinction of species, and threat to the existence of many communities. Worldwide, the benefits of economic development are not shared equitably, and, also within the EU and within the Member States, the gap between rich and poor is widening. Injustice, poverty, ignorance, and violent conflict are present and cause great suffering. An unprecedented rise in human population has overburdened ecological and social systems. The choice the EU and its citizens make is therefore to form a global partnership to care for the Earth and to seek fundamental changes in values, institutions and ways of living. This must come from the realization that when basic needs have been met, human development is primarily about being more, not having more. The knowledge and technology to provide for all and to reduce impact on the environment is largely existent and, coupled with the emergence of a strongly committed global civil society, more opportunities arise to build a democratic and humane world.

From above reasoning it follows that the security which is need in Europe is one that stems not from weapons and ammunition, but from how individuals and institutions feel they understand and can contribute to solving economic maldevelopment, poverty, climate change and pollution, energy supply, small and large-scale violence. In this quest the EU should not seek to push, overshadow or corner countries within and outside its bloc, but to act as a bridge and platform for dedicated and perseverant discussion towards solutions.

The EU affirms the ideas outlined in this *European Security Strategy* for a sustainable way of life as a common standard by which the conduct of all individuals, organizations, businesses, governments, and transnational institutions is to be guided and assessed.

European Security Strategy

We are a human being.

We are a mother, a father, a brother, a sister, an uncle, an aunt, a niece, a nephew, a cousin, a daughter, a son, a grandfather, and/ or a grandmother. Together, we are a family composed of different and/ or similar sexes, religions, geographical whereabouts, cultures and ancestry.

How can we better celebrate this than to enjoy Earth and life in all its diversity; care for the community of life with understanding, compassion, and love; build societies that are just, participatory, sustainable, and peaceful; secure Earth's bounty and beauty for present and future generations?

We can do this by recognizing that all beings are interdependent and every form of life has value regardless of its worth to human beings;

We can do this by striving for a shift towards a more biocentric and less anthropocentric view and way of life;

We can do this by accepting that with the right to own, manage, and use natural resources comes the duty to prevent environmental harm and to protect the rights of people is a focal point;

We can do this by acknowledging that, whether for countries, corporations or citizens, having a relatively high amount of freedom, knowledge, means and power signifies increased responsibility to promote the common good;

We can do this by promoting social and economic justice, enabling all to achieve a secure and meaningful livelihood that is ecologically responsible and sustainable;

We can do this by recognizing that the freedom of action of each generation is qualified by the needs of future generations should fill us with a respectful and thoughtful attitude radiating from our actions.

European citizens must make sure to transmit to future generations the values, traditions, and institutions that support the long-term flourishing of Earth's human and ecological communities. This translates into creating lifestyles that emphasize the quality of life and material sufficiency in a finite world. The EU can embark upon these commitments by adhering to the following guidelines:

Social and Economic Justice

A proactive, social EU

The EU can play a substantial role in virtually all social policy issues, and actively create a “social Europe” beyond the “economic Europe”. Gradual harmonization of social and economic policies among EU countries and the creation of equal opportunities are at the centre of the social agenda. Within this framework, it is important that the EU sets minimum standards for achieving a “social Europe”. Moreover, the Union’s institutions should monitor national implementation, exchange best practices, and support communication among Member States in the area of social policy.

Eradication of poverty

The EU must guarantee the right to potable water, clean air, food security, uncontaminated soil, shelter, and safe sanitation by allocating the necessary national and transnational resources. The EU must empower all its citizens with the education and resources to secure a sustainable livelihood, as well as simultaneously provide social security and safety nets for those unable to support themselves to ascertain they can develop their capacities and to pursue their aspirations nevertheless.

Economic activities and institutions promoting human development

The EU must pursue equitable and sustainable distribution of wealth within and among Member States, as well as to increasingly require multinational corporations and international financial organizations to act transparently in the public good, and hold them accountable for the consequences of their activities.

Gender equality and equality of the sexes for sustainable development

Securing the human rights of all, and in particular of women and girls, and ending all violence against them is an important goal for the EU. In combination with this, it is important to promote the active participation of women in all aspects of economic, political, civil, social, and cultural life as full and equal partners, decision makers, leaders, and beneficiaries. For example, women should be appreciated and not penalized for their decisions in trying to balance private and professional life. Equally important is to allow men, since many women are drastically changing their lifestyles, to be allowed to do the same.

Right to dignity, health and spiritual well-being

Eliminating discrimination in all its forms, such as that based on race, color, sex, sexual orientation, religion, language, and national, ethnic or social origin is a key priority. In particular, the right of indigenous peoples to their spirituality, knowledge, lands and resources and to their related practice of sustainable livelihoods must be respected at all times, and repaired for where it has faltered.

Families as pivotal structures

The family has a high value for all, which is why improving the social and economic conditions for families should be a European policy goal, so families are better protected and supported. It is vital for many families to be able to combine family life and careers. The EU should support family-friendly work places. In Europe, intergenerational solidarity needs to be guaranteed. The elderly need to be supported in order to be able to live their life in dignity with fair and guaranteed pensions, as well as supporting the extended family.

Jobs and opportunities

The principles of “the right to work”, “equal pay for equal work”, non-discrimination and equal access to the labor market for all must form part of the agenda, as such measures will also help tackle challenges such as brain drain and discrimination against women from which some Member States currently suffer. Recognizing the importance of respecting the dignity and granting equal opportunities, it is important to guarantee that everyone should be able to contribute to society, especially pensioners and jobless people, even if in an unpaid manner.

Convergence in health care

Concerning health care, the EU should set standards ensuring accessible, dignified, high-quality and affordable treatment in all Member States for everybody. This trying to work towards equal quality of primary health care across the EU is important, as well as eventually moving towards free health services within the Europe.

Raising the bar on education

The EU should carry further its aim of developing uniform and high standards for education at all levels in the Member States. The qualifications, as is now with most higher education degrees, could be determined at EU level, while the specific content for comparable and compatible degrees is specified at national and regional levels. The resulting education system should become free in order for all to be able to enjoy it. Another element to consider is life-long learning or training. Also, the leap in quantity and quality of exchange programs at all levels needs to be maintained for the benefit of all.

Consultation of citizens

It is important to be united wherever necessary, but to leave space and attention to the individual so that unity does not become uniformity. In this framework, the direct involvement of interested citizens in the overall policies of the EU is quintessential. Citizen’s initiatives concerning EU legislation is one example of this.

Democracy, Nonviolence and Peace

Unity in diversity

Europe needs to be open to the world and cultural differences, and yet as coherent and united internally as people allow. This Europe is strong and self-confident and speaks as much with one voice on the world stage as possible. The EU should expand the activities to foster cultural exchange, tolerance and intercultural learning by providing financial support for educational projects, NGOs and adult education institutions which operate in such fields.

Additionally, the EU should strengthen its active role in protecting and promoting peace, democracy and respect for human rights. By doing so, the EU could herald a new era in international relations by embarking upon a multipolar, equitable and fraternal method of conducting its foreign relations, even if this means temporarily distancing itself from certain traditional allies. By the same token, the EU needs to be able to act or react jointly and in solidarity in the fields of foreign, security and defense policies. It must also make sure to enhance the intellectual, financial, technical, and social resources of economically developing nations, and relieve them of onerous international debt.

Finally, it is important to remember that the borders of the EU are drawn more on content than on geographical bases. The fundamental terms for a state to join are an understanding and adoption

of standards of democracy, human rights, free flow of people and goods and the acceptance of the *acquis communautaire*.

Defense

It is vital the EU take a proactive stance within the global political arena by fostering the idea of professional civil peace cores and by moving the current military structures in that same direction, through training in cultural knowledge, non-lethal and nonviolent action, as well as the command of multiple languages. Another matter of utmost importance is the revision of the role of NATO and similar organizations in order to shift the focus from military to civilian conflict resolution matters. This will be more in accordance with the UN Charter's "peace by peaceful means".

Democracy

It is vital to strengthen democratic institutions at all levels, and provide transparency and accountability in governance, inclusive participation in decision making, and access to justice. For this to happen, local, regional and global civil societies are to be supported, as they oftentimes facilitate meaningful participation of interested individuals and organizations in decision making who normally, not being part of the private sector nor of government, have little influence in agenda-setting. Core democratic values such as the freedom of opinion, expression, peaceful assembly, access to administrative and independent judicial procedures and, finally, dissent, though much taken for granted in the EU, must be held high at all times. The same goes for the continuous efforts to eliminate corruption in both public and private institutions.

Culture of tolerance, nonviolence, and peace

Encouraging and supporting mutual understanding, solidarity, and cooperation among all people within and among nations, both inside and outside the EU, is an honor and grand task the EU will focus on. Besides massive and frequent dialogue platforms, one way to do this is to implement comprehensive strategies to prevent violent conflict and use the latest conflict transformation techniques to herald creative solutions to disputes, including environmental conflicts.

Another step to be taken is the demilitarization of national security systems to the level of a non-provocative defense posture, and converting military resources to peaceful purposes. Further implications are the complete elimination of all stockpiles of nuclear, biological, and toxic weapons and other weapons of mass destruction within the EU, plus ensuring that the use of orbital and outer space supports environmental protection and peace. Additionally, EU production of SALWs, military machinery and military nuclear applications must be halted, and alternative employment found for employees in this sector, as the produce of the military-industrial complex causes unspeakable suffering and forms a security threat, rather than a guarantee, for the EU in the long run. In addition to this, the sector drains each and every Member State's budget, which portion could be spent to constructive ends, such as education or environment. By these and other measures, the EU and its citizens will gradually evolve towards the recognition that peace is a process that is constructed every day, and that it comprises the wholeness created by right relationships with oneself, other persons, other cultures, other life and the Earth in its totality.

Migration and Integration

Preventing and controlling illegal immigration

It is vital to grant asylum to the persecuted around the world that knock at the EU's doors. The EU should set a framework for asylum procedures in order to streamline the multitude of

different currently existing national procedures. This will benefit both receiving countries and the applicants of residence, as it will clarify bureaucracy and allow countries to share the job equally. Controlling and preventing illegal immigration is also important and, to achieve this, more efficient border control is to be used but, most importantly, there is the need to identify and act upon the root causes of big flows of (forced) migration and to find sustainable solutions there.

Root causes of immigration

It is vital to identify the causes of migration and to provide help accordingly. To reduce the levels of forced migration to Europe, the EU should target development aid towards the countries of origin of the majority of immigrants. Both the EU and its Member States should be responsible for the provision of aid and the EU's role is ensuring that each one pays a minimum share. Other means of addressing the root causes for migration include dialogues on multiple levels with members and officials both from the receiving and originating societies, increasing social, cultural and economic exchange with these countries, responsible market economics, reforming the EU's agricultural subsidies system and opening up of European markets.

Migration

The EU should be involved in establishing a common migration policy. People living both within and outside of the EU should not feel under economic pressure to migrate because they should be able to find good living standards at home. On the other hand, it is vital to accept those who come to EU countries well, as immigrants have refreshing insights and play a constructive role in host societies, the more so ageing ones as is the case in most of the Member States.

Integration

Successful integration is of the utmost importance once migrants arrive in an EU country. Mutual rights and responsibilities to both states and migrants must be clear and non-threatening to be able to improve, support, promote and achieve successful integration. Learning the host country's rules and values and commit to learning its language are two elements of vital significance. In turn, migrants should have equal opportunities in order to achieve successful integration, such as equal access to education and work opportunities, as well as instances they can approach with questions and troubles they might have with integrating. Overall, it is important that the host country be initiator of exchange of opinions and worldviews between its citizens and the new arrivals so that all can grow and learn from each other in mutually enriching ways.

Environment and Energy

Common approach, extended mandate

The challenges of climate change and energy security, as most other ones, are not only Europe's, they are global and thus cannot be managed at the national level, or at the EU level alone. Increased common action is required to tackle the impact of Europe's energy use on both the environment and the economy. The EU must be strong in taking on the role of setter of binding targets to be implemented by the Member States as well as pushing for these and other measures, such as fiscal incentives, at the global level. This must be done in a continuing dialogue with other countries and goes hand-in-hand with aiming at a strong, independent and self-sufficient energy supply for the EU in the future. On a citizen level, they should have access to effective and efficient administrative and independent judicial procedures, including remedies and redress for environmental harm and the threat of such harm.

Earth's regenerative capacities

It is imperative to adopt patterns of production, consumption, and reproduction that safeguard Earth's regenerative capacities, human rights, and community well-being. Being composed of consumer societies, means EU must push for reducing, reusing, and recycling as much as possible materials used in production and consumption systems, and ensure that residual waste can be assimilated by ecological systems. It also signifies learning to act with restraint and efficiency when using energy, and rely increasingly on renewable energy sources such as solar, water and wind. Additionally, this can be promoted by the development, adoption, and equitable transfer of such environmentally sound technologies, as well as by internalizing the full environmental and social costs of goods and services in the selling price, hereby enabling consumers to identify products that meet the highest social and environmental standards. In connection to the former, it is crucial to advance the study of ecological sustainability and promote the open exchange and wide application of the knowledge acquired. Recognizing and preserving the traditional knowledge and spiritual wisdom in all cultures that contributes to environmental protection and human well-being is again critical, and possibly the greatest learning source. Finally, ensuring that information of fundamental importance to human health and environmental protection, including genetic information, remains available in the public domain is on the EU's priority list.

Protection of the environment

Protecting and restoring the integrity of Earth's ecological systems must be undertaken, coupled with special concern for biological diversity and the natural processes that sustain life. This will facilitate the establishment and safeguarding of viable nature and biosphere reserves to protect Earth's life support systems, maintain biodiversity, preserve natural heritage and speed up the recovery of endangered species and ecosystems.

Another vital element is controlling and eradicating non-native or genetically modified organisms harmful to native species and the environment, as well as preventing new introductions. Lastly, it is essential to fairly manage the use of renewable resources such as water, soil, forest products, and marine life in ways that do not exceed rates of regeneration, as well as the extraction and use of non-renewable resources such as minerals and fossil fuels in ways that minimize depletion and cause no serious environmental damage.

Respect for all living beings

It is important to prevent cruelty to animals kept in human societies and protect them from unnecessary suffering. Safeguarding animals from methods of hunting, trapping, and fishing that cause extreme, prolonged, or avoidable suffering is a moral imperative, as is the minimization of taking or destroying non-targeted species.

Minimum harm and caution towards environment

All in the EU should be compelled to take action to avoid the possibility of serious or irreversible environmental harm even when scientific knowledge is incomplete or inconclusive. One way of doing this is by placing the burden of proof on those who argue that a proposed activity will not cause significant harm, and make the responsible parties liable for environmental harm. Along the same lines, it is important to ensure that decision making addresses the cumulative, long-term, indirect, long distance, and global consequences of human activities and, finally, prevent as much as possible the pollution of any part of the environment and allow no build-up of radioactive, toxic, or other hazardous substances. The EU should control the implementation of environmental norms and sanction infringements. Also, in order to achieve these goals, both in the area of energy and environmental policy, it is vital to promote personal responsibility, increase investment in research and technology, reform transportation and the use of financial instruments.

Personal responsibility

To promote personal responsibility, integrate into formal education and life-long learning the knowledge, values, and skills needed for a sustainable way of life. All must be provided, especially children and youth, with educational opportunities that empower them to contribute actively to sustainable development. In this context, not only the contribution of the arts and humanities must be promoted, but, for example, that which can come from the sciences regarding sustainability education. The mass media should be more directed towards raising awareness of ecological and social challenges. Finally, it is vital to uphold the right of everyone to receive clear and timely information on environmental matters and all development plans and activities which are likely to affect them or in which they have an interest.

Reforming transportation

Focusing on the greatest sources of pollution, a proactive and integrated transport policy, encompassing environmentally friendly, optimized public mass transportation as well as increased cargo transport on rail and waterways is indispensable. The EU should moreover encourage the use of clean vehicles, including bikes, environmentally friendly fuels, and set transport policy goals for Member States to achieve.

Conclusion

This is a world of new dangers but also of new opportunities. The European Union has the potential to make a major contribution, both in dealing with the threats and in helping realize the opportunities. An active and capable European Union will make an impact on a global scale. In doing so, it will contribute to an effective multilateral system leading to a fairer, safer and more united world for us, those who surround us and our offspring.

The content of this document will serve as a broad policy guideline and the EU institutions, Member States and their citizens are entrusted to translate them in concrete actions on all levels of governance and daily life.

Bibliography

Biscop, Sven. "De Europese Veiligheidsstrategie twee jaar later: Eerste balans van een integratieproject". Atlantische Commissie. 2006.

<http://www.atlantischecommissie.nl/site/Publicaties/wp-content/2006%20nr%203%20Biscop.pdf>

Davies, B. James et. al. "The World Distribution of Household Wealth". World Institute for Development Economics Research of the United Nations University. Dec. 5, 2006

<<http://www.wider.unu.edu/research/2006-2007/2006-2007-1/wider-wdhw-launch-5-12-2006/wider-wdhw-press-release-5-12-2006.pdf>>

Dérens, Jean-Arnault. "Kosovo, still ready to explode". Le Monde Diplomatique. March 2007.

<<http://mondediplo.com/2007/03/12kosovo>>

Friesen, Eric R. "The Need for a Global Democracy: Obstacles and Reworking Structure". European University Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies. 2006

<<http://www.aspr.ac.at/epu/Friesen.pdf>>

Galtung, Johan. "Solana's (and the EU's?) Foreign Policy: A Non-Starter". The Transnational Foundation for Peace and Future Research. Jul. 23, 2004.

<http://www.transnational.org/SAJT/forum/meet/2004/Galtung_Solana.html>

Graf, Wilfried. "Supermacht oder Friedensordnung? Die EU zwischen Militarisierung und Friedenspolitik" Institute for Integrative Conflict Transformation and Peacebuilding. 2006.

<http://www.iicp.at/communications/publications/articles/Graf_Supermacht%20oder%20Friedensordnung.pdf>

Øberg, Jan. "Does the EU Promote Peace? Analysis, critiques and alternatives." The Transnational Foundation for Peace and Future Research. 2006.

<www.transnational.org/SAJT/forum/meet/2006/Oberg_EU_Promote_Peace.pdf>

Øberg, Jan; Hårleman, Christian. "Peaceful Europe – Something different". The Transnational Foundation for Peace and Future Research. Jan. 17, 2001

<http://www.transnational.org/SAJT/pressinf/2001/pf112_PeacefulEurope.html>

"A Secure Europe in a Better World: European Security Strategy". European Union. Dec. 12, 2003.

<http://ue.eu.int/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/en/reports/76255.pdf>

"European Citizens' Perspectives on the Future of Europe". European Citizens' Consultations. May 2007.

<http://www.european-citizens-consultations.eu/fileadmin/user_upload/ECC_Fin_Con_Media/ECC_Fin_Con_Perspectives_FINAL_1_.pdf>

"Goebbels New Year address to Germany". Calvin College. Dec. 31, 1939.

<<http://www.calvin.edu/academic/cas/gpa/goeb21.htm>>

"President tries to give Americans some answers". The Indianapolis Star. Sep. 21, 2001

<<http://www.indystar.com/library/factfiles/crime/national/2001/sept11/transcripts/0921bush.html>>
>

“Propaganda: Did Goebbels write The Bush Administration speeches?”. Information Clearing House. *No date*.

<<http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article4433.htm>>

“The Earth Charter”. The Earth Charter Initiative. 2000.

<http://www.earthcharterinaction.org/assets/pdf/charter/charter_eng.pdf>

“The State of Food Security around the World 2004”. *Food and Agriculture Organization* 2004

<http://www.fao.org/documents/show_cdr.asp?url_file=/docrep/007/y5650e/y5650e02.htm>