

# Where We Stand: From Building Peace in Europe to Being a Peace-Builder in the World – Taking Stock of the Union’s Foreign and Security Policy



**Javier Solana**

High Representative for the Common Foreign and Security Policy and Secretary General of the Council of the European Union

**E**ARLY THIS YEAR, the European Union celebrated its 50th birthday. In these 50 years, Europe has been transformed. A continent plagued by wars and confrontations has developed into a community of peace, democracy and prosperity. We have stopped killing each other and starting to work together.

This did not happen by itself. We built strong institutions and a community of law to make the integration process withstand the ebb and flow of political moods and clashes of personalities. We have learned, the hard way, that peace and stability require common rules and institutions, non-stop negotiations and a sense of compromise. We have also not abolished nations, states or sovereignty, but changed their nature. Sovereignty is now expressed not by an army at the frontier but by a seat at the table.

These successes are worth cherishing. But there is a great deal more to be done. In many ways the peaceful unification of our continent has been our great achievement. To act as a credible force for good is now our main challenge. From a continental agenda, we should move to a global agenda. From building peace in Europe to peace-builder in the world.

With respect to Europe’s global role, there is much that we have already achieved. We have expanded our capacity to respond to crises in real time – and not just send out a communiqué two weeks after the event. We have developed sophisticated crisis

management concepts – bringing together civilian and military instruments. We have forged a common strategic culture – enabling us to respond early, rapidly and where necessary, robustly when a new crisis erupts. In short, there is a European way of looking at international problems and a shared sense doctrine on how to solve them.

In the years ahead, we will have to sharpen our crisis management performance in a more demanding security environment. But, first, let me sketch our present ESDP operations.

## **ESDP in practice: Operations**

Last year, the European Union conducted 10 operations with around 10 000 men and women serving in them. The global reach and the scope of these different operations is striking. Across three continents, they cover the spectrum from ‘pure’ military operations – through security-sector reform and institution building – to police and rule-of-law missions. And their impact is significant. From Aceh to Rafah, and from Kinshasa to Sarajevo, the EU is providing the ‘key enablers’ for peace and stability.

- In the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), a country which has seen three million of its citizens killed in a five-year conflict, we acted decisively to ensure that the electoral process enabled the peaceful transition to a democratically elected government.

‘Where we have acted we have succeeded. We have helped governments take forward their peace processes and we have helped to make those processes more sustainable by strengthening their institutions’

- In Aceh, the EU moved quickly with its Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) partners to capitalise on their post-Tsunami desire for peace and opportunity.
- In Rafah, we acted two weeks after an Israeli and Palestinian request to enable the opening of the border crossing point. By working alongside Israelis and Palestinians, we provide the only safety valve for the pressure cooker that is Gaza.
- In the West Bank, in Kinshasa, in Darfur and in Bosnia and Herzegovina we mentor, monitor and support the local police.
- Also in Bosnia and Herzegovina our military force, run under the Berlin Plus arrangements, continues to ensure a safe and secure environment.
- We also have security-sector reform and rule-of-law training missions in the DRC and Iraq respectively.
- Most recently, we have launched our police mission in Afghanistan. Working together closely with the local police, we try to ensure that Afghan communities enjoy the benefits of increased security and to support local authorities in taking responsibility for law and order.

And the demand on the EU is increasing. This year, we will add to these responsibilities the conduct of a police and rule-of-law mission in Kosovo. In Kosovo, we will launch our largest ever

civilian mission. It is already clear that this mission will form a critical part of the agenda for ESDP this year and beyond. It is also right that we take on a greater operational role in our ‘back-yard’ and our planning for this mission is well under way.

Combined, these operations represent a significant engagement by the EU on the key stability challenges. The EU has responded to the demands of its Member States, to the demands of countries in crisis and to the calls for help from the UN. And we had to respond to the changing world, even before our doctrines and structures had caught up completely.

Each crisis threw up its own set of different and unpredicted requirements: some required a rapid, robust military response to the centre of Africa, some a rapid deployment of police and border monitors to a Middle East hotspot. Some, such as Aceh, support to AMIS and EUSEC (EU mission to provide advice and assistance for security sector reform in the Democratic Republic of Congo) required a different mix of civilian and military instruments.

And where we have acted we have succeeded. We have helped governments take forward their peace processes and we have helped to make those processes more sustainable by strengthening their institutions. Most of all, although much remains to be done, of course, in all of these places, we have improved the lives of people and given them hope.

Beyond this, let us look at how ESDP has changed our Union, and our wider impact on the world. CFSP has changed our Union and how we interact with the world. It is a vital, visible and effective part of our daily lives. Imagine a world where there were no unified positions of the EU: on Iran, on the Middle East, on Africa, on climate change and on the Doha Round?

It is true that the business of reach-

ing unified positions is sometimes painful. But this is just a fraction of the pain felt when a common position is not reached. And, when we do not agree, the pain is not just felt by ourselves, but often far beyond. Fortunately, this is not often the case.

#### **ESDP and CFSP: Beyond crisis-management**

CFSP strengthens the effectiveness of ESDP. The political framework gives our operations clear objectives and deep support. And ESDP has made CFSP more credible, and it has given our dialogue with third countries strength.

It makes multilateralism effective, and it helps shape the thinking of others. It means we can act together to address a range of different issues that concern us. Our unity, our influence and our action benefits us, of course. But it also serves many others. And, actually, it is often easier for us to act together than alone. Solidarity and shared political objectives are good force generators, and our collective weight counts. It is also true that in many cases Member States can no longer act alone to any great effect.

Now, can you imagine a Europe that is just a Europe of dialogue and common positions and no action? Not for many people in Africa, the Middle East and the Balkans – who have benefited from our action. And not for many citizens of our own countries or for our many partners around the world who have been calling for more European action and not less.

However, all this risks to make us a victim of our success. We are called upon to undertake more missions and in more difficult circumstances. In Africa or in Asia, on nuclear issues, man-made or natural disasters – we are being solicited. And we have no choice but to be ready and to say 'Yes'. Therefore, we need to make sure we are structured and staffed to meet all these different challenges.

#### **A global agenda**

However, regarding the global agenda, there is much more. Beyond crisis-management, we will have to devote time, energy and resources to also address longer-term challenges. And perhaps the most important of these is to safeguard the capacity of the global system. If truth be told, the global system is in a poor shape.

What we are seeing is that there is a growing mismatch between our security and economics, which are increasingly global in nature, and our politics which often remain national.

Few today would dispute that in a global, interdependent world, solutions to problems will have to be forged at a global level. But the gap between this demand for 'global governance' and its supply is growing. Instead the multilateral system is under severe stress.

Some of the 'old regimes' on issues such as non-proliferation are suffering from political polarisation, growing distrust and hence a sense of malaise. On issues that have shot to the top of the agenda more recently, such as migration or organised crime, attempts to build regimes, rules and institutions are still incomplete.

Therefore, one key task for Europe for the next 50 years is to protect and develop a system of strong institutions able to tackle the problems of a new age; and to build a rules-based international order with the rules that will help us navigate the choppy waters ahead.

We will have to do so at when the world is moving to a system of continents. Europeans will only be able to project and protect their interests if are united.

#### **New heavyweights and new bargains**

But we will also need to make space at the top table. Take the G-8. At present it does not really work effectively. To become more effective, it needs to become more representative and that means changing its membership.

Why not make it a G-10 in which the ten major countries are represented based on a composite index of international weight (GDP, aid, soldiers and civilians deployed on peace support missions)? This would not only bring China and India in but also keep some current members on their toes.

Equally we should make space for the new heavyweights at the UN Security Council. In turn, the new powers should keep in mind that with greater global influence come greater responsibilities too. To strengthen regional co-operation, could we have (semi)-permanent seats at the UNSC for the Great Powers but also for regional organisations?

I am convinced that we need stronger regional organisations: the African Union, ASEAN, Latin American structures. I also wonder whether – in the long run – the Middle East region will remain the big exception: over-armed, under-institutionalised and rife with tensions.

Then we will need to develop new bargains. On the environment and climate change. Or on forms of dialogues between cultures.

Sometimes we also need to be more serious about upholding our side of the old bargain. Non-proliferation is a good example. If we want to be credible on preventing the spread of weapons of mass destruction (WMD), we have to take the disarmament side and technology transfer sides of the bargain more seriously.

‘If we want to be credible on preventing the spread of weapons of mass destruction (WMD), we have to take the disarmament side and technology transfer sides of the bargain more seriously’

In addition, the multilateral system cannot only address our immediate concerns. When we talk about non-proliferation we mostly mean WMD. But for many African or Asian leaders the most urgent proliferation problem is that of small arms and light weapons.

Above all, we need to re-learn that the biggest shift in history came when we extended the rule of law. First within states and now, gradually, also among them. This gradual extension of the international rule of law has provided enormous benefits: taming the passion of states but also providing a legal framework to guide many aspects of human inter-actions at a global level.

We should step up what we are already doing. Regionally – most strikingly in Europe. But also globally on some aspects of international life. See the WTO dispute settlement system, or the International Criminal Court. We have to work hard to extend the geographic and functional reach of the international legal system.

In short, to organise our globalised world, we need to share power (with new players); re-think power (beyond the state paradigm) and tame power (extend the rule of law internationally).

#### **International legitimacy revisited**

The system of global governance needs to be made more effective. It also needs to be more legitimate. One big problem is that we all know that we live in a globalized world. But our politics remain local or national.

This is a problem for those, like me, who are convinced that the world needs more global-level, multilateral co-operation. For I am also a democrat in believing that power has to be accountable.

So the question becomes: how do you make global governance more effective while making it also democratically accountable?

A key benefit of acting multilaterally is legitimacy which in turns enhances

effectiveness. As indicated earlier, this means bringing in new centres of power. But legitimacy also means bringing our publics along. If decisions are increasingly taken at the international level, people have to see these as legitimate.

Therefore, we have two imperatives: to create greater effectiveness in global governance but also to uphold democratic legitimacy. To do so is difficult. It requires new ideas and a sense of compromise. But I really see no real alternative.

Let me end with a quote from Jean Jacques Rousseau, from *The Social Contract*, now that we are talking about a global social contract.

‘The strongest is never strong enough to be always the master, unless he transforms strength into right and obedience into duty.’

As new powers emerge and new issues call for our engagement, Europe will have to apply itself to the task of

promoting the emergence of a new international order. An international order which is based on clear rules and strong institutions.

A failure to do take up this task would mean having to live in a world shaped by and for others; a world which would be more unstable and more unjust.