




# The EU on the international scene:

## Promoting sustainable peace

With the financial support of the European Parliament

Copyright 2008 PES  
ISSN 2030-5044

All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced  
in any form without written permission of the publisher.

First published in June 2008 by PES  
Party of European Socialists

Rue du Trône, 98 - 1050 Brussels - Belgium

PES Report presented to the PES Council in Sofia, 22-23 November 2007

by Jean Asselborn - André Flahaut

Heidemarie Wieczorek-Zeul - Carin Jämtin

Espen Barth Eide - Alain Richard - Luciano Vecchi





# Table of contents

<b>Foreword by Poul Nyrup Rasmussen</b>	6
---	---

<b>Resolution adopted by the PES Council, 22-23 November 2007 “The EU on the international scene: Promoting sustainable peace”</b>	<b>11</b>
--	-----------

<b>Introduction</b>	29
---------------------	----

<b>Chapter I. Our principles and objectives for EU foreign policy in the 21st Century</b>	35
---	----

1. Peace and freedom	36
2. Economic development and social justice	37
3. Democracy, human rights, the promotion of women’s rights and the respect of diversity	38
4. The objectives of the EU on the international scene	40

<b>Chapter II. Acting to promote human security and world peace</b>	43
---	----

1. Contributing to an effective multilateralism: The United Nations, cornerstone of collective security	43
2. The Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and the EU institutions	49

<b>Chapter III. A new pact for development policy</b>	51
---	----

1. EU development policy: Coherence, untying and effectiveness	52
2. Promoting democratic governance: Effective states responding to their citizens’ needs	54
3. Guaranteeing Decent Work for a decent life!	56
Decent Work for a decent life!	56
Respecting the Millennium Development Goals 2015 deadline	58
4. Financing development	60

Official development aid and the 0.7% objective	60
Putting an end to the debt crisis	61
New sources of financing	61
5. Fair trade for the benefit of people	63
Achieving the Doha Development Round objectives	66
The Economic Partnership Agreements and the challenge of new EU-ACP relations	68
6. Sustainable energy policy, climate change and the protection of the environment	70
Climate change and the protection of the environment	70
Sustainable energy policy	73
7. Humanitarian emergency, food and sanitary aid	76
<b>Chapter IV.</b>	
<b>European security and defence issues:</b>	
<b>Coherence, efficiency and visibility</b>	79
1. Enhancing world peace and global security: A global and coherent approach against new threats	80
The European Security Strategy (ESS)	80
Confronting new threats	82
Weapons proliferation and Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD)	82
Countering terrorism	86
New factors of conflict	88
2. The European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP): A more active and a more capable European Union	89
A more active European Union	90
European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) operations confronting present and future challenges	90
Civil-military cooperation	92
A more capable European Union	93
The effectiveness of European Security and Defence Policy undertakings	93

Encouraging the role of the European Defence Agency	95
Cooperation with NATO: Enhancing the transatlantic relationship on an equal footing	97
3. The future of the European Security and Defence Policy: Getting closer to European citizens	100
<b>Chapter V.</b>	
<b>Regional cooperation:</b>	
<b>Projecting peace and prosperity through partnership</b>	103
1. The Balkans on the path to EU integration	105
2. The European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP)	107
EUROMED relations: Relaunching dialogue	111
Engaging a new partnership with Russia	116
Cooperation with Black Sea countries	119
3. EU and Africa: Bridging the gaps!	120
4. Opening a new era: Cooperating with emerging powers in Asia	122
5. EU and Latin America: Beyond a trade partnership	126
6. A new strategic partnership for transatlantic relations	129
<b>Our role as Party of European Socialists</b>	133
<b>List of acronyms</b>	135
<b>Authors</b>	136

# Foreword

The European Union has become a major global actor and will be even more important in the future, a result of its economic weight, its leading role in international trade and development, and the successes of its European Security and Defence Policy operations worldwide. As a successful model of regional integration, the EU is also well-placed to play an active role in improving the global governance system. We must give collective answers at a time of globally interconnected issues. With all these strengths in our hands, it is our task now to propose progressive policies for EU action in the world.

A preventive policy to tackle today's difficulties and to prevent them from becoming tomorrow's problems is the cornerstone of our action. While we fight the symptoms of global challenges, the EU must also commit to fight the root causes of conflict; conflict prevention tools, including preventive diplomacy, must have an absolute priority alongside peacemaking, peacekeeping and peace building. Yet, in many cases, a sense of urgency and immediate action is required. We have a "time challenge".

Preventive policies are particularly needed in fighting climate change to prevent conflicts, migration or natural disasters. There is a global responsibility to reach a global climate agreement to follow the Kyoto treaty. It is fair to say that industrialized countries must take the lead and accept a substantial share of the international effort, as well as provide technology transfers, in order not to hinder the development of the BRICs (Brazil, Russia, India and China) and other emerging economies.

As social democrats, we believe that globalization must become inclusive and benefit those who are currently least able to meet global challenges. We will never accept global inequalities as those we are experiencing now. A fair trade system is crucial to integrate the poorest countries in the world. The completion of the WTO Doha Development Round



by Poul Nyrup  
Rasmussen,  
PES president,  
prime minister  
of Denmark  
1993-2001

Confronted with the permanent changes in our world, making it closer, richer, more interconnected but also more unequal, more unstable and more unpredictable, European social democrats propose innovative solutions for sustainable peace in the world. To this aim, we launched a process of internal discussion in the Party of European Socialists two years ago to analyse the current trends in international politics. The result is a far-reaching and long-term vision embodied in this report that emphasizes the need for a coherent EU foreign policy that takes into account development, trade, environment and security policy. The resolution "The EU on the international scene: Promoting sustainable peace", based on this report, was adopted by the PES Council, on 22-23 November 2007 in Sofia. I want to thank Jean Asselborn, André Flahaut, Heidemarie Wieczorek-Zeul, Carin Jämtin, Espen Barth Eide, Alain Richard and Luciano Vecchi for their outstanding work.

requires the EU to accept its responsibility towards poor farmers and small industries in the Third World. In the meantime, trade and economic globalization must be accompanied by a globalization of workers rights: securing decent work for women and men everywhere must be a goal of the Union's policies. Only in this way, we can overcome people's fears and conciliate their aspirations regarding globalization. Despite an economic growth of 5% over the last years, Africa will not reach the UN Millennium Development Goals by 2015. The EU has an obligation to comply with the target of 0.7% of GDP aid to prevent Africa to be the lost continent. While Official Development Assistance (ODA) of the wealthy nations reaches EUR 100 billion a year, world arms trade reached EUR 1,000 billion in 2007. This is certainly a trend that we want to reverse. We should also develop a common rights-based approach to migration, through policies to effectively manage migration but also to fight illegal immigration and its root causes.

The international community must do the utmost to prevent wars. Controlling weapons proliferation, arms transfers and adopting high international objectives, such as a nuclear weapons free world, are necessary even if we know that these are not the only answers. With our commitment for the UN paramount, effective multilateralism must be strengthened to tackle both continuing and new threats to world and human security – including failed states, organized crime and terrorism. Rejecting any justification of terrorism, we must fight the root causes of the phenomenon while ensuring full respect of international law. I agree that the EU should invest in the necessary civil and military means for effective humanitarian interventions and be ready to answer the call of the weakest, as in Darfur. In the meantime, the EU should spare no effort to contribute to the Middle East Peace Process, a major source of international instability.

We will never accept the calls for hatred, violence, humiliation or nationalism. On the contrary, the acceleration of exchanges between people and cultures creates a new richness. Dialogue, as in the UN Alliance of Civilizations initiative, will bring people closer and create a new political and civil society at world level.

Preventive policy means the respect of human rights for women and men all over the world. Not through regime change by force, but through active democratic policies to strengthen political parties, trade unions, and civil society organizations. The universality of human rights is a principle that we believe in. The EU, with its history, has a special responsibility to promote a globalization grounded in our shared values – in social justice, equality, human dignity, democracy, freedom and solidarity.

The Lisbon Reform Treaty will come into force in 2009 and bring greater coherence to the Union's approach to foreign policy. With the US presidential elections at the end of the year, and hopefully victory for the US democrats, combined with a victory of the European social democrats in the 2009 European elections, there will be new opportunities to change the course of events. Together, in a renewed transatlantic partnership, with other progressive forces in Latin America, with new leaders in Africa and in Asia, we have solutions to make our world a better place for all.

While the 21st Century started with international tensions, it is time to put into practice this vision to achieve the ideal of a Sustainable peace. It is a matter of urgency, to answer the "time challenge".



*Poul Nyrup Rasmussen*  
PES president

Resolution adopted by  
the PES Council,  
22-23 November 2007

# The EU on the international scene: Promoting sustainable peace

## Introduction

**T**he turn of the 21st Century offers great challenges to bring the advantages of an ever more interdependent world to the benefits of all citizens. It is clear that no one country can shape its own destiny alone, whereas working as part of a strong and progressive European Union offers the possibility of greater security and equality within the Union and beyond. Working together through the EU is the only means for European countries to regain capacity and political influence.

Confronted with continuing challenges to **peace, democracy and human rights** across the world, and the lack of enforcement of even basic political, civil, social, economic and human rights as established under successive UN conventions, the European Union and its Member States have a responsibility to act. The PES proposes, therefore, new thinking on the EU's role in the international scene.

The EU is uniquely positioned to take a key role in shaping the development of a **sustainable peace** in the world by tackling the roots of conflict through **pre-emptive policies**. The EU has developed a special experience of close cooperation between states: guaranteeing peace and prosperity in a continent torn by centuries of war. The EU's approach is based on preventing conflict by increasing cooperation and trade between states and regional entities. The cooperation is so profound that violent conflict is inconceivable. Furthermore, the European social model, a unique combination of economic dynamism and social security, is a source of inspiration for workers throughout the world.

As the success of intra-EU cooperation has demonstrated, such international cooperation on regulation can be for the benefit of all. The EU model provides a better way of managing globalization than a free market without rules. Beyond Europe, regional alliances and international organizations need to be strengthened to enhance a regulatory framework for globalization.

We have the opportunity for real and significant improvement of life chances among the poorest people in the world. However, to avoid growing gaps of wealth and income, **globalization requires more effective multilateralism, fair and efficient rules** for corporate taxation, finance, raw materials and commodity markets

as well as internationally binding social and ecological standards for functioning competition. Competition between national and regional economies should be consistent with fair working conditions, strong social benefits and high environmental standards.

Foreign policy has increasingly moved from bilateral relations to a new model and new level, with regional groupings collaborating on the world stage. Similar integration efforts are taking place from Africa to Latin America. It is a model of international cooperation in its own right, inspiring integration efforts from Africa to Latin America. We want the European Union to interact more closely with neighbouring regions to promote peace and better prospects for people's future. However, if Europe wants to become a force for global peace, the European Union must act more effectively and decisively in the field of foreign policy. We support efforts to bring about greater coordination between the foreign policies of EU Member States, and to use our Common European and Foreign Security Policy as a powerful influence on the world. In order to maximize Europe's contribution, it is essential to pursue an integrated and genuinely coherent approach - an approach that brings together EU policies on development, trade, investment, debt, agriculture, migration, conflict prevention, human rights and the environment. In other words, the European Union must combine its economic and political weight. The EU can be a real player on the international scene, a position that could be strengthened by the creation of the European External Action Service as proposed by the reformed Treaty. The EU can play a real leadership on several issues: promoting peace, combating poverty, enhancing decent global rules, and protecting the environment.

For European social democrats, the EU should be ambitious and carry this **vision of a sustainable peace for the world**.

### 1. Peace: The EU addressing the root causes of conflict

For more than forty years the Cold War divided much of the world into two camps. Its ending led to a more complex and fragile world order, with new threats which are both more diverse and less predictable. In this regard,



Europe has a major role to play on the international scene in order to **preserve peace and strengthen international security**. A real security policy must be elaborated at a world level and on a multilateral basis. The UN, through necessary reforms, is the only possible framework to work towards global security.

We must engage in a continuous fight against underdevelopment, poverty and the lack of schooling. Economic, social, political and cultural problems result in frustration and can lead to violence. The **best prevention policy** consists in reducing these imbalances. Solidarity between the richest and the poorest countries and regions is a fundamental prerequisite to deal with security issues. Development and cooperation policy, along with fair economic relations, are the obvious pillars of conflict prevention. While we fight the symptoms of global threats, the EU must also commit to **fight the root causes of conflict** and conflict prevention tools must have an absolute priority alongside preventive diplomacy, peacemaking, peacekeeping and peacebuilding. EU security and defence policies must take into account **human security** in all its senses.

Today, there are not only classical threats or “hard” threats to stability but also new factors that must be reflected in new policies. **Climate change** will play a major role in the future, threatening the international security on account of its destabilizing impact. Human-induced climate change, that is already occurring, will result in direct impacts to ecosystems, human infrastructure, and our economies, safety, and well-being. Many impacts will be of a negative nature and will require a response. Particularly, the poorest regions of the world will be victim if such process continues and that should be taken into account in the EU Climate Change **Adaptation Policy**.

However, classical threats unfortunately remain. There is an immediate need for concrete efforts to revitalize **non-proliferation** to curb the spread of nuclear weapons and fissile material. We reiterate our aim of a world without nuclear weapons, campaigning for the international monitoring of uranium enrichment. The EU must aim to **prevent a new arms race** or further weapon proliferation: effective disarmament targeting Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) as well as conventional weapons is a must for international stability. The EU must support the worldwide ratification of the **Mine-Ban Treaty**, also referred to as the Ottawa Convention, and contribute to the work of the Oslo process aiming at **banning cluster bombs**. The EU and its Member States should promote a global **Arms Trade Treaty (ATT)** to help curb uncontrolled transfer of arms between countries, ensuring that all governments control arms with the same basic standards. This would include opposing unnecessary levels of military spending to divert resources in favour of more pressing development priorities.

A holistic approach that takes into account the structural foundations of the phenomenon of **terrorism** is needed. The PES condemns terrorism in all its forms, its targeting of civilians and its impact on people’s security, fear and political responses. The origins of terrorism are multi-faceted but terrorism itself is a crime. Poverty and unemployment are not direct sources of terrorism, but the frustrations they generate may create a deeper alienation which can provide fertile space for recruitment to terrorist organizations. **We reject any justification of terrorism**. In the fight against terrorism tough measures may be necessary, but they must always respect fundamental rights, be limited in time and scope, and be determined to be necessary, proportionate and appropriate within a democratic society. Not respecting international law, illegal imprisonment and treatment, are among the measures that are never acceptable. In the international fight against terrorism the fundamental principles of national and international law should continue to be the foundation. We must also ensure that the protection of the sensitive personal data of citizens and that the purposes for their use are strictly defined and limited. We shall work for the solution of outstanding problems in accordance with international law and European values.

The Union possesses a wide range of foreign policy instruments which are particularly suited to respond to today’s challenges and should use the full

potential of **European Security and Defence Policy** (ESDP). With the ESDP, the European Union is now capable of carrying out a wide variety of peace missions both of a civil and of a military nature. The EU has launched **13 ESDP operations**. Apart from the FYR of Macedonia, the Democratic Republic of Congo and the Western Balkans, the EU has or conducts operations in Georgia, Aceh/Indonesia, Palestinian Territories and Darfur. These missions range from humanitarian and rescue operations to peacekeeping tasks and military interventions to restore peace. By making more progress at the operational level and extending its actions in new regions of the world, the EU has revealed its potential to become a **worldwide actor on the international scene**. A necessary further development will require interoperability, a more sustainable and reliable supply chain based on mutual support and assistance, avoiding duplication and suboptimal use of scarce resources at European level or between Member States. The amount of resources allocated for defence purposes depends on national political objectives and priorities. In the long run, the ESDP should be further developed, including by increasing the synergies and integration between European forces.

There must be a better coordination and use of synergies between EU and NATO to promote common interests and address common challenges in the global arena. The ESDP should develop in parallel to NATO and competition should be avoided. A strong ESDP contributes also to NATO's interests. Above all, neither the United States nor the European Union can preserve their own interests by working alone. Working together is not simply an option, it is a necessity and cooperation must be founded on three principles: transparency, coherence and equality. A strengthening of progressive, transatlantic cooperation is paramount.

In the same vein, when the EU acts, it must do so in close cooperation with the UN in order to underpin and enhance, not compete, with the UN's own efforts. The use of force should be decided within the framework of the UN Charter. It is not the law of the strongest but the strength of the law to generate international security. Furthermore, as neither the EU nor NATO is likely to be solely responsible for any particular crisis area, strong and practical measures for enhancing integration not only within the EU, but also with the UN and its agencies, the international financial institutions and regional organizations, are needed. We support an active role for the EU and its Member States for the termination of ongoing conflicts, to end the illegal occupation of Cyprus with a comprehensive settlement, according to UN Resolutions.

The European Defence Policy constitutes an important dimension of European integration and contributes to the construction of a citizen's Europe. The ESDP should convey a strong image of Europe to the European citizens. They will identify more easily with a Europe capable of dealing efficiently with the responsibilities it has in building a world of peace, stability and security.

## 2. Solidarity: A globalization for the benefit of all

Globalization is here to stay. There is a plethora of potentially **positive aspects of globalization**. Globalization calls for more effective multilateralism, if it is to be pursued for the common good. Today globalization has led to the opening up of the national boundaries to international trade and global competition. Developments linked with globalization have opened up boundless possibilities for human development, enormous new opportunities and enhanced the quality of life for many people in the third world countries. However, a fairer world trade is needed. Developing countries do not simply want charity; they want a fair chance in the market. **The interests of people must come before those of capital if a conflict occurs**. Trade liberalization can benefit developing countries, provided they have the economic capacity and infrastructure they need to trade competitively. Developing countries must be further integrated into the world trading system and must be able to better enjoy the benefits of international trade, bearing in mind the different levels of development of WTO's Member States. Without the ability or the right

conditions to enjoy the benefits deriving from free trade, liberalization may entail heavy transitional burdens on developing countries. Trade in goods and services across borders, as other markets, must eventually be regulated by unambiguous rules that ensure sustainability and protection of weak parties and countries. Growth without concern for human rights and development, more social equality and a better environment does not enrich us. On the contrary, it is only a social and environmentally sustainable development that can ensure sustainable growth. In this way alone, can we create security and quality of life regardless of the place of birth. The EU has a responsibility to significantly strengthen Europe's overall contribution to poverty eradication, fair trade and economic relations and provide human security to citizens of the world. There is a need for comprehensive development strategies that both generate "pro-poor growth" and contribute directly to improving the living and working conditions of poor people.

International trade is boosted by **rapidly growing economies** such as China and India. The emergence of these great nations has global consequences that require deeper cooperation and closer relations from the EU with these countries. Described as the manufacturing of the world, they have far reaching effects in terms of social impact, economic competition, environmental costs and energy needs affecting our policies.

A positive completion of the Doha Development Round (DDR), launched in 2001, is a must for the poorest countries. A better regulation on world trade and democratic reform, including more transparency in the World Trade Organization, is necessary. Support must be given to developing countries to enhance their trade capacity as well as strengthen their ability to exercise

their rights, on equal terms, within the WTO. The **Economic Partnership Agreements (EPAs)** are at the heart of the economic and trade cooperation pillar of the Cotonou Agreement. If negotiations cannot be completed before the end of 2007, arrangements need to be made to avoid uncertainty to our ACP partners and to ensure that no ACP country sees its position deteriorate in relation to the Cotonou preferential system. More time should be granted for negotiations if necessary. The EU should offer extensive market access (including services and investments – but with room for exceptions) and the agreements should be reciprocal but asymmetric. Each ACP regional group should make its own decisions on the timing, pace, sequencing, and product coverage of market opening, in line with individual national development plans and poverty reduction strategies. Investment, competition and government procurement should be removed from the negotiations, unless specifically requested by an ACP regional negotiating group. We support the involvement of trade unions, NGOs and consumer representatives in the negotiations process. A follow-up mechanism, the **Trade Sustainable Impact Assessments (TSIAs)**, involving the European Commission, the European Parliament, the Council, Civil Society Organizations (CSO) and the relevant international organizations, is a positive tool to monitor the success of trade agreements.

Trade and economic globalization must be accompanied by a **globalization of workers' rights**. Securing Decent Work for women and men everywhere must be a goal of the Union's internal and external policies. **Decent Work** means access to employment, fair and equal treatment in employment, decent work remuneration, fair conditions of work, safe work environment, unemployment protection, social protection and jobs and training opportunities and collective participation. The development of trade unions, independent of state or employer control or subsidy, in developing countries is an essential element of social progress for local workers. The EU must emphasize the respect of the ILO Core Labour Standards and Decent Work in all its bilateral and regional trade agreements. The cooperation between the **ILO and the WTO** should be strengthened. In addition, WTO Member States should follow the EU example and include labour and social questions in their trade policy reviews (TPRs). Such an approach will strengthen workers' rights internationally. **Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR)** and the OECD guidelines on multinational enterprises provide an opportunity to get common agreement on a clear set of

ethical standards governing the behaviour of TNCs, as many do already within the Global Compact. The EU could develop a principle of “smiley” to reward companies respecting the principles of CSR and create a register of European companies specific to their implementation of CSR – a name and blame website for instance.

Achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) will halve the proportion of people in poverty within a decade. However, hundreds of millions of the poorest and most vulnerable people will remain in chronic poverty. For this reason, the PES urges the EU to set up a ‘**Poverty Elimination Strategy post 2015**’. Recalling the present deficit in MDGs assistance, the PES demands real progress in new mechanisms to finance development and to achieve the MDGs. We call upon all governments to meet their commitments and explore the role of innovative sources of financing in achieving the 0.7% GNI commitment. As a shortage remains, new ways of financing development must be found. These alternative sources should be in addition to the existing means, in order to favour a real spill over effect for development. **Fighting money laundering and tax evasion** is also a way to increase the financial capability of poorest states and to give new means to combat underdevelopment. Tax evasion confiscates important amounts of money that could serve pro-development policy and build up effective states. We support action at a global level such as that exemplified by the Global Fund to fight AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria.

The debt question of poorest countries is also a great concern; African country debt alone stands at over EUR 250 billion. Europe should use its influence to extend the initiative for the **Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC)** and the Multilateral Debt Relief Initiative to provide full cancellation of the great bulk of multilateral public

external debt of the poorest countries. The EU must strengthen the case for **faster debt relief** for those countries committed to poverty reduction targets. Regarding harnessing financial markets, the PES Resolution on Financial Markets, adopted by the PES Council in Sofia, 22-23 November 2007, presents the PES positions.

Forty million people worldwide are living with **HIV/AIDS**. AIDS is not just a problem facing Africa; by 2010 most people with HIV and AIDS will live in Asia and the fastest growth in infections will be in Eastern Europe and Central Asia. Europe must help, namely by supporting efforts on **AIDS vaccine research**. The EU must support the access of developing countries to generic medicines in order to treat HIV/AIDS, TB and malaria patients. Health must prevail over economic interests! Despite repeated statements of commitment to address the feminization of the pandemic, too little has been delivered. Major opportunities to stem the global epidemic and to defeat the devastating impact of HIV/AIDS on the lives of millions of women and girls around the world are being missed. It is time to deliver!

### 3. Democracy: More rights and duties for individuals and states

Basic individual and democratic rights are essential for peace and prosperity. The indivisibility and universal validity of all human rights are non-negotiable. In this field no cultural relativism is acceptable. We believe that human rights are universal and should be respected by all. The Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union and international law are among the guidelines for the EU international policy. We are particularly committed to strengthening the **rights of women**. Equality for women - in all areas of economic, political and social life - is both a fundamental human right and the key to transforming the development prospects of their societies. Rights of women must be reflected in legislation in order to protect them against violence, to uphold their right to own and inherit property, ensure equal pay and to safeguard their right to access sexual and reproductive health services. Such legislation must be enforced effectively. A massive educational offensive and an empowerment of women is necessary. Movements of population have always existed, both for humanitarian and economic reasons. The EU should

preserve a **humane approach to migration** that respects international obligations towards refugees and asylum seekers, and which favours integration mechanisms. The objective of the EU is to ensure that migration is a factor of development for both the countries of origins, the countries of transit and the countries of destination. Consequently, development will allow the reduction of illegal immigration.

Democratic governance, sound and effective coordination between national and local tiers of government, strong civil societies, fundamental democratic freedoms and a productive social dialogue are fundamental for people, societies and nations who want to take advantage of globalization. Economic globalization threatens to undermine the **primacy of democratic politics** in essential areas. We want to defend the primacy of democratic politics since this is the only means to **enforce global democracy**. The EU should pay attention to both political and economic aspects in supporting the emergence or the reinforcement of regional organizations and in associating them to its policies. Cooperation must especially be developed with **regional organizations** that include a political dimension, such as the African Union or the MERCOSUR. This phenomenon reflects the need to reach a new scale in terms of political cooperation, economic and trade relations to address adequately the challenges of today's world.

In promoting peace and international cooperation, **the European Union is seeking multilateral solutions to global problems**. It is therefore highly dedicated to an effective multilateralism with a strong United Nations at its core. Closer cooperation with other international organizations (including the UN and its agencies, funds and programmes, the World Bank, IMF, WTO, OSCE, the Council of Europe, the African Union, MERCOSUR, ASEAN

and other global and regional organizations) is vital for the European Union to manage human security challenges and honour its global responsibility. We reaffirm the UN's primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security and the EU's commitment to strengthening the UN. The international community needs to find new instruments to address adequately the challenge of globalization at the social, economic and financial level, as well as in the area of conflict prevention and resolution. The UN Security Council should be enlarged and strengthened in order to better reflect today's world reality by an appropriate reform. The next reform should increase the number of members and employ more effective and transparent working methods. We emphasize the desirability for the EU to speak with a single voice in all international institutions. The UN General Assembly, while guaranteeing the highest representation for States, should be reinforced, working closely with national parliamentarians and civil society.

The EU can play a particularly important role in furthering the peace building work of the UN, i.e. as an active partner in the Peace building Commission. The proposal to create a **"Human Development Council"** aims at achieving the MDGs by establishing structural links between the WTO and the UN, the International Labour Organization (ILO), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), UNESCO, the World Health Organization (WHO), the United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP) and the secretariat of Multilateral Environmental Agreements. The **Washington consensus** often paid too little attention to the social, environmental and political costs of economic reform and their problematic impacts. Corrupt governments, which abuse World Bank, and as well as state and private lending, need to be exposed. The use of non-democratic market economies which deny their citizens core universal rights must be discussed and policies adopted to promote democracy. Europe must make full use of its weight, within the World Bank and the IMF, to support a more balanced approach for a new consensus on international economic and trade relations.

The Mediterranean Sea has progressively transformed into a political and economic space of fundamental importance. The Barcelona process has to be strengthened politically and institutionally with the objective of shaping a Euro-Mediterranean association. The **Barcelona declaration** of 1995 and

the **Euro-Mediterranean Partnership** have defined the framework for the EU, and in particular Mediterranean EU Members, providing an important instrument to foster regional cooperation, confidence building measures, dialogue, mutual understanding, reconciliation and Middle East Peace Process progress, that would culminate with a Peace conference with all actors involved participating. The development of political, social, economic and cultural integration in the Euro-Mediterranean area is fundamental in order to build peace, security and prosperity. The conflicts and contradictions in the region can be easier faced and solved if the EU develops its role as real partner.

The EU has forged a range of tools to promote human rights and democracy. The EU must not accept double standards. Respect of human rights must be pursued by the EU in its bilateral and multilateral relations. The EU already enforces the respect of the **Human Rights Clause in its Association Agreements**, in particular article 2. The EU has a leading role to play in promoting the abolition of death penalty and opposing torture. Furthermore, there is a need for more efficient international institutions and rules that safeguard people against violations of their rights. It is an EU objective to increase the number of states parties to the **International Criminal Court (ICC)** further, so that the court can operate within the widest possible jurisdiction. We also need a better geographical spread of states parties; in particular we need more representation from Arab and Asian states and we will continue to lobby for ratification of the ICC Statute. When the judicial systems of particular states do not work or when states refuse to punish war crimes, crimes against humanity or genocide, the courts must take over.

The modern world is characterized by an acceleration of exchanges between people and cultures. This creates

both a new richness of intercultural exchanges and fears from those same cultures to be absorbed in a sort of “new world culture”. We must underline that **cultural diversity** is part of the world patrimony. In the recent past we have seen concerning trends towards favouring mono-ethnic states or ethnic cleansing. For some, the call for “purity” may be a response to the complexities of cultural change in a globalized world. However, beyond the conflict potential such ideologies entails, they endanger the richness of cultural diversity and cultural exchanges. These must be strongly condemned. The respect of minorities, the fight against racism, xenophobia, homophobia, anti-Semitism and intolerance must be all priorities for the international community. We have to strengthen dialogue and multilateral cooperation within the framework provided by the UN initiative “Alliance of Civilizations”. The UN initiative “Alliance of Civilizations” is of utmost importance to overcome misunderstanding and to prevent conflict.

#### 4. Respecting the Environment: Saving the planet

We refer to the PES Resolution on Climate Change, adopted by the PES Council in Sofia, 22-23 November 2007, for further development of the EU leadership in tackling climate change. Climate change constitutes a serious threat to development and to achieving the MDGs, bearing in mind that developing countries suffer the most and that populations are highly vulnerable to weather-related disasters. EU cooperation with developing countries must enable countries to take into account climate considerations in national decision-making processes, have properly functioning energy markets and can develop renewable energy sources. The potential of **Clean Development Mechanism (CDM)**, under the Kyoto Protocol, between industrialized countries and developing countries, must be further reflected in EU development policy in ways that are seen as environmentally and socially legitimate. Furthermore, the EU trade agreement and EU Aid with third countries must include a provision, which demands the implementation of environmentally-friendly practices.

Security of energy supply must become an integral part of the EU's Common Foreign and Security Policy, on the same level as development and trade policies.

The EU must use its collective weight in dialogues with key energy suppliers, aiming at solid long-term partnerships and energy cooperation agreements between producers and consumers of energy. This requires a common strategy for relations with these countries and regions, in place of the disparate national approaches of Member States. The forthcoming agreement between the EU and Russia should include a provision for mutual access to infrastructure, competition rules limiting the power of quasi-monopolistic companies, which have not been unbundled having access to their respective energy markets and the issue of technical failures in the third countries affecting cross-border supplies to the EU Member States. **Agreements with Europe's energy suppliers** must help to create stable but open regulatory frameworks in supply countries, fostering the massive investments needed in exploitation and transport infrastructures to secure long-term supplies. The EU must help foster a new global energy dialogue, aiming at making global energy markets stable, secure and transparent.

To answer the weakness and fragmentation of international law concerning the environment, the PES advocates for the creation of a **World Environmental Organization (WEO)**, within the framework of the United Nations.

#### Our role as Party of European Socialists

European socialists, social democrats and progressive democrats are willing to take on their share in the joint effort directed at reforming the international institutions and strengthening international cooperation in pursuit of the common objectives of global peace, development and justice. Therefore, we are willing to work with progressive

forces across the world. As EU Member States are not capable of winning the challenges of globalization alone and are looking to join forces through the European Union, so European socialists and social democrats must do at the international level. Primarily with **Socialist International** member parties, European socialists, social democrats and progressive democrats will engage in dialogue and cooperation, aiming at influencing EU policy and international institutions policy. In synergy with the SI, the **PES parliamentary group in the European Parliament** and in the **Committee of the Regions**, ECOSY and IUSY, we are engaged with the **Global Progressive Forum (GPF)** to initiate a dialogue, promote new ideas and take actions to make a difference. Our duty is to build a strong alliance with progressives, trade unions, social movements and NGOs which will promote an agenda for social justice and social progress.

We aim to build up and develop dialogue, cooperation and understanding, on the European and international scenario, with democratic and progressive forces, in order to achieve a greater progressive camp able to influence the decision making on European and global policies.

The EU foreign policy should be participatory and receive contribution from a broad range of **Europe's civil society partners** - working with development NGOs, but also local government, women's and youth groups, trade unions, business associations and academia. This means strengthening the voices of local people and the opportunity for them to bring about changes in their social and economic conditions with the PES' support.

This strategy is our path to achieve our ideal of a **sustainable peace** for the world guided by the principle of solidarity through democratic international institutions and promoting human development.

**PES Report presented to  
the PES Council in Sofia,  
22-23 November 2007**

by  
Jean Asselborn  
André Flahaut  
Heidemarie Wiecek-Zeul  
Carin Jämtin  
Espen Barth Eide  
Alain Richard  
Luciano Vecchi

**T**he turn of the 21st Century carries with it challenges of enormous magnitude for the socialist and the social democratic family. It is both our duty and our intention to propose a set of reforms turning globalization into a tool for the benefit of people in every single corner of the world. Globalization must be at the service of people, representing an opportunity for all within a system of “world governance” based on the rule of law. The very nature of **globalization** and the rise of new global powers mean that, more than ever before, no individual European country is capable alone of bearing the weight of the challenges posed by today’s international system. The EU is a perfect tool to regain capacity and political influence to harness globalization.



The EU's high population density, high dependence on cross-border infrastructure, economic and trade relations, energy supplies, as well as its geographical proximity with politically unstable regions and countries, increasingly expose European Member States to **human security threats**.

Neo-liberal policies and the neo-conservative political agenda cannot rule the world. Socialists and social democrats will never accept dark fatalist announcements claiming that injustices are here to stay. Today's world inequality and injustice require a massive mobilization of all progressive forces around the globe. The figures are frightening: nearly 3 billion people living on less than EUR 2 a day<sup>1</sup>; 30,000 children under 5 years of age dying every day; 186 million people out of work worldwide<sup>2</sup>; and at least 12.3 million people in forced labour<sup>3</sup>. Official development assistance (ODA) was equivalent to EUR 80 billion in 2004, an evidently insufficient figure far from the 0.7% promised. Furthermore, in the 20th Century global inequalities in income increased with an exponential growth never experienced before: The income ratio between the richest and poorest country was about 3 to 1 in 1820, 35 to 1 in 1950, 44 to 1 in 1973 and 74 to 1 in 1999<sup>4</sup>. The number of people attempting to escape their deprived lives by coming to Europe will continue to rise as a result. Yet, efforts to counter the gravity of this compelling situation are inadequate, the **UN Millennium Development Goals** (MDGs) are far from being achieved and existing instruments for development – such as development assistance and trade – are not being fully harnessed.

**Poverty eradication** is an international obligation. Without justice, peace will be neither stable nor lasting. The economy has changed, profiting from globalization and new technologies. International trade is confronted with booming economies such as China and India. The emergence of these great nations has global consequences in many aspects and requires closer relations on the part of the EU. Described as the manufactories of the world, they have far reaching effects in terms of social impact, economic competition, environmental costs and energy needs, affecting directly our policies.

1. ILO 2003

2. ILO 2004

3. ILO 2004

4. UNDP 2000 Annual report

The market economy is also evolving with the emergence of pension funds, hedge funds and private equity funds, all posing new challenges to our societies. Uncontrolled capital movements on the international financial markets have the might of jeopardizing entire national economies. The conclusions of recent analysis are clear: there is a contradiction between the short term financial thinking of hedge funds and big private equities and our long-term investment. This could prevent us from realizing the objective of the European Lisbon Strategy, intended to make the EU become *“the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world, capable of sustainable economic growth with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion”* by 2010.

In the last fifteen years international relations have changed to such an extent and with such a pace to make any prediction unfeasible. The end of the Cold War was expected to provide the preconditions for a peaceful period and a promising **“new world order”** solving outstanding conflicts, proceeding quickly with disarmament processes and reducing arms spending in favour of more investments in sustainable development policies. The progress envisaged did not really take place and when it did, it did not for long. The optimistic mood quickly faded as the international system was confronted with challenges, both new and old. During the 1990s civil wars scattered around the globe emerged with millions of victims and displaced people. While the international community succeeded in preventing a large-scale dissemination of the nuclear arsenal of the Soviet Union, new countries have since then joined the nuclear weapon's club and others seem willing to do so. Following a decrease in military spending, in recent years the trend has been reversed, reaching the frightening figure of EUR 1 billion in 2005. Increasingly, entire regions are susceptible to

conflict due to natural resources access and distribution. Different layers of policy at a local, national, and international level are needed to prevent such clashes from escalating to outright violent conflict.

**Confronted with continuing challenges to peace, democracy and human rights** across the world due to the lack of enforcement of even basic political, civil, social, economic and human rights, as established under successive UN conventions, the European Union has a fundamental responsibility to act. The PES thus proposes a new thinking about EU's role on the international scene.

The world order has been deeply affected by the 9/11 attacks on New York and Washington. Following the reaction by the international community, unanimously condemning these acts, the US, the world's largest power, has engaged in a large-scale fight against terrorism. Today, an even more destabilized Middle East remains the most unstable region in the world, with effects well beyond its own borders.

**32**

In the light of these major geopolitical changes, the EU has had to face several obstacles, including internal divisions, lack of capabilities and diverging interests, which have undermined its influence in a number of occasions. It is important, however, to underline the positive steps accomplished. The EU has been able to successfully integrate Central European countries in the circle of democratic nations by means of a clear, firm and permanent political will. The EU is now committed to achieve the stabilization and integration of the Balkan countries.

Acknowledging and paying attention to these difficult international circumstances, the PES would like to propose a new way of thinking about the EU's role on the international scene. The challenge lies in defining a social democratic vision for the role of the EU, taking into account the status of each EU Member State, that is, neutral, NATO and non-NATO members. A further expansion of the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) would make the EU more visible and more credible on the world stage. It would also be a clear answer to the majority of European citizens who wish to see more from Europe as a global actor, promoting peace in the world while addressing the terrorist threat.

The **EU foreign policy should be ambitious and carry the vision of a sustainable peace for the world**. Only then will the MDGs be achieved and poverty eradicated. Such a vision should be based on a new coherent system of global governance, under the umbrella of a UN Human Development Council, a scheme of preferences for poorest countries and the protection of labour rights and Decent Work.

The PES believes that Europe has the responsibility and the opportunity to give a major contribution to the eradication of poverty and the ending of inequalities. We support the added value of a European integrated development policy that will improve coordination and efficiency and will produce more focused policies. For many years, EU development policy suffered from a lack of coherence; notwithstanding its world status as the largest donor, in some other aspects, including the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) and market access, it prevented or even contradicted some of its development objectives.

The PES sustainable peace should thus be comprehensive, far-reaching and coherent. In order to assume its global responsibilities, the EU must develop a common and coherent security policy as part of its foreign policy.

This is the PES answer to these challenging tasks.

**33**

## Our principles and objectives for EU foreign policy in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century

35

**A**

concern for global equity and a commitment to development need to be fully integrated into other areas of external relations, such as foreign and trade policy. For us, development strategies are not an add-on; cooperation is an essential means to exploit new opportunities and to address the challenges posed by globalization.

## 1. Peace and freedom

The EU must be committed to addressing the root causes of war. This is the best policy for conflict prevention, post-conflict reconstruction and peace building. Socialists and social democrats have always opted for dialogue, conflict prevention and the respect of the law. Taking into account the human and financial costs of war, prevention must be the core objective in the avoidance of violent conflict escalation and the promotion of their peaceful resolution. Conflict prevention tools must have absolute priority. The use of force, decided within the framework of the UN, should represent the very last resort. It is not the law of the strongest but the strength of the law to forge international security. A coherent approach to conflict by preventive diplomacy, prevention policy, peacemaking, peacekeeping and peace building must be part of the EU agenda to prevent violent conflicts, to put an end to them and to contribute to the achievement of a lasting and sustainable peace.

A real security must be elaborated at a world level and on a multilateral basis through the UN, ESDP, NATO, African Union (AU) and other regional institutions. **The UN, through necessary reforms, is the only viable institution to design global security.** The EU's aim must be to prevent any new arms race or weapon proliferation. Effective disarmament targeting WMD as well as conventional weapons is a must for international stability. Often, however, economic, social, political and cultural problems result in frustration and violence. It is for this very reason that we must engage in a permanent fight against underdevelopment, poverty and ineffective education systems. The **best prevention policy** consists in reducing these imbalances. Solidarity between the richest and the poorest countries and regions is a fundamental prerequisite in dealing with security issues. Development and cooperation policy, along with fair economic

relations, are evident pillars of conflict prevention. Strategies in emerging countries also require increased support for regional organizations, such as the African Union, and should help build their capacity in the areas of early-warning, conflict prevention, peacekeeping and peace building. A coherent post-conflict approach is necessary as too many conflicts resume only a few years after a peace settlement due to a lack of effective long-term peace building strategies. Prevention remains the security instrument par excellence. The threat of terrorism illustrates the need to address security issues at their root causes; there is no peace and security until all appropriate measures are taken to remove dictatorships, political exclusion, poverty, oppression and injustice.

Peace must also be contingent to people's freedoms. All societies must ensure the freedom of expression and of association. Minorities - whether religious, ethnic, gender, or language - should be able to enjoy their rights freely.

## 2. Economic development and social justice

Our responsibility as European socialists and social democrats is to significantly strengthen Europe's overall contribution to poverty eradication and sustainable development. There is a need for comprehensive development strategies that both generate economic dynamics and contribute directly to the improvement of the living conditions of poor people through "pro-poor growth" policies. This includes implementing and enforcing the **international poverty eradication strategy**, decided at the major United Nations conferences of the past decade in Rio, Cairo, Copenhagen, Beijing and Istanbul. The international development strategy must commit the world's richest countries to working in partnership with emerging countries to achieve a number of specific targets. For us, people's dignity must be the underlying driving force of policy.

EU strategies must contribute to the achievement of the UN Millennium Development Goals and foster sustainable development. EU policy, in its commitment to poverty eradication, must also guarantee the ability of developing countries to use trade opportunities to strengthen their own development. It is in Europe's interest to take the trading interests of poor countries into account. Developing countries must be further integrated into

the world trading system and must be able to better enjoy the inherent benefits of international trade, bearing in mind the weaknesses and different levels of development of WTO's Member States.

Solidarity among people is essential to reduce the poverty gap in the world and to bridge the gap between rich countries and regions and the poorest. Socialists and social democrats have always insisted on this value as a priority for an internationalist agenda.

### 3. Democracy, human rights, the promotion of women's rights and the respect of diversity

We will be one step closer to peace when people will be able to enjoy their basic individual and democratic rights. The concept of good governance implies the respect of democratic principles. Democratic political governance, sound and effective coordination between national and local tiers of government, strong civil societies, fundamental democratic freedoms and a productive social dialogue are fundamental for people, societies and nations who want to take advantage of globalization. Economic globalization threatens to undermine the primacy of democratic politics in essential areas. We want to defend the **primacy of politics** since this is the only means to **enforce global democracy** as a structural principle.

The indivisibility and universal validity of all human rights are non-negotiable. We believe that human rights are universal and should be respected by all. The Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, and international law more broadly, provide guidelines for our international policy. Socialists and social democrats consider the promotion and protection of human rights an utmost priority. We believe that economic, social, cultural, political and civil rights,

including a strong commitment to **labour rights** - the right of workers to organize in free trade unions to improve their working conditions - and the ILO Core Labour Standards, are important human rights.

We are particularly committed to strengthening the **rights of women**. Equality for women - in all areas of economic, political and social life - is both a fundamental human right and the key to transforming the development prospects of their societies. Too often, women lack access to resources and services and are grossly under-represented in positions of political power. In the meantime, women's rights must be extended to economic independence and self-determination. Women are important drivers of economic development and can play a major role in their society's economic progress. The rights of women must be reflected in legislation in order to protect them against violence, to uphold their right to own and inherit property and to safeguard their right to access sexual and reproductive health services. Such legislation must be enforced effectively. A solid educational offensive and an empowerment of women are necessary preconditions for an adequate and just gender balance in the societies of our time.

Movements of population have always existed, both for humanitarian and economic reasons. The EU should preserve a human approach on migration that respects international obligations for refugees and asylum seekers.

The modern world is characterized by an acceleration of exchanges between people and cultures. This creates both a new richness of intercultural exchanges and fears from those very same cultures to be absorbed in a sort of "new world culture". We must underline that cultural diversity is part of the world patrimony and should be respected. It is vital to promote the value of dialogue and the principle of respect of "differences". In the recent past we have seen concerning trends favouring mono-ethnic states or ethnic cleansing. For some, the call for "purity" may be a response to the complexities of cultural change in a globalized world. However, beyond the conflict potential such ideologies entail, they endanger the richness of cultural diversity and cultural exchanges. We strongly condemn ethnic-cleansing. The respect of minorities, the fight against racism, xenophobia, anti-Semitism and intolerance must all be priorities for the international community.

The UN initiative “Alliance of Civilizations” is of the utmost importance in order to overcome misunderstandings between people and to prevent conflict. The adoption of the **Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions** by the **UNESCO General Conference**, seeking to protect and promote cultural diversity, is a victory in the long-lasting fight for the preservation of the world’s cultural richness.

#### 4. The objectives of the EU on the international scene

The EU has a unique responsibility to take a key role in shaping the further development of a **sustainable peace** in the world. With its history, the EU has developed a unique experience of close inter-state cooperation, guaranteeing peace and prosperity in a continent torn by wars for centuries. Our core approach in this regard is based on preventing conflict by increasing cooperation among states and regional entities. This cooperation aims at tackling the roots of conflict through **pre-emptive policies**. The EU’s socio-economic development has transformed it into the region with the highest living standard in the world. This is reflected in its public services, infrastructures, technology expertise and research centres. Furthermore, the European social model, a unique combination of economic dynamism and social safety net, is a source of inspiration for many all around the world.

In Europe, as in the rest of the world, competition between economic areas must not lead to worldwide pressure on wages and to a worsening of working conditions, social benefits and environmental standards. On the contrary, **globalization requires fair and efficient rules** for corporate taxation, finance, raw materials and commodity markets as well as internationally binding social and ecological standards for well-functioning competition. The EU is the tool to regain and expand capabilities for the control of the

economies by international cooperation and regulatory frameworks without releasing national politicians from their responsibilities.

The EU should take advantage of these strengths to be a real player on the international scene. The EU can be a major soft power, supporting swift reforms. Its diplomatic advantage should be used more frequently for a real leadership on several issues including promoting peace, combating poverty, enhancing decent global rules and protecting the environment.

However, if Europe wants to become a power for global peace, the European Union must improve its capacity to act, as one, in the field of foreign policy. We support the strengthening of our common European foreign and security policy. For a comprehensive security policy the European Union must combine its economic and political weight.

In Europe, we have safeguarded peace by means of a fair balance of interests. By means of understanding and combining common interests, we have achieved an unprecedented form of transnational cooperation and partnership. Europe is now called upon to contribute with its experience towards a new policy of détente.

Policy at the EU level has already transcended classical foreign policy. Beyond Europe’s interests, regional alliances and international organizations need to be strengthened. The EU will not turn into a new state. It is becoming a phenomenon in its own right. As such, it should find ways to multiply its influence, and provide inspiration for others. We want the European Union to interact more closely with neighbouring regions to promote peace and better prospects for people’s future.

# Acting to promote human security and world peace

### 1. Contributing to an effective multilateralism: The United Nations, cornerstone of collective security

In promoting peace and international cooperation, the **European Union is seeking multilateral solutions to global problems.** It is therefore highly dedicated to an effective multilateralism with a strong United Nations at its core. Closer cooperation with other international organizations (including the UN and its agencies, funds and programmes, the World Bank, IMF, WTO, NATO, OSCE, the Council of Europe, the African Union, MERCOSUR, ASEAN and other global and regional organizations) is crucial for the European Union in order to manage security challenges and honour its global responsibility.

The **European Security Strategy gives a pivotal role to the collective security system of the UN**. It defines “effective multilateralism” as “*the development of a stronger international society, well functioning international institutions and a rule-based international order*”. Moreover, it powerfully reaffirms the UN’s primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security and the EU’s commitments to strengthening the UN and “*to equipping it to fulfil its responsibilities to act effectively*”. The EU-UN cooperation for peacekeeping purposes has been increasing steadily since the year 2000, at a time when the UN was examining the reform of its peace operations through the “Brahimi Report” and the EU was laying the foundations of the ESDP.

The “Joint Declaration on EU-UN cooperation in crisis management”, adopted by the June 2001 European Council, provides the framework for a regular consultation between the two organizations. It identifies four main areas where further cooperation should be explored: planning, training, communication and best practices. “Artemis”, the first autonomous ESDP military operation without the use of NATO assets, launched in the summer of 2003 in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), constituted a real “test of effectiveness” for the EU-UN relationship and was positively assessed by both organizations. This operation was executed at the request of the UN, under a UN mandate, to reinforce the military presence of MONUC and the UN mission in the region. EU and UN activities were intimately linked throughout the planning and the deployment of operations. The police and military missions in DRC in support of the MONUC, EUPOL Kinshasa and EUFOR RD Congo, reveal the significant goals achieved through EU-UN collaboration.

There is no doubt that **effective multilateralism** is built on legitimacy. UN Security Council authorization must be sought for any operation carried out by regional organizations. The

example of the Iraqi crisis in 2003 and the pre-emptive use of force without a UN Security Council resolution, generating marked divisions between EU Member States, is still a vivid memory.

Although the EU does not have the legal competence to act on behalf of the EU Member States within the Security Council, the EU can still speak with a single voice at the United Nations. The recent military engagement of many European nations in the UN operation (UNIFIL) in Lebanon demonstrates the strong will of Europeans to act on the international scene. We welcome this renewed determination to engage directly through the United Nations. After a decline in blue helmet peacekeeping around the turn of the Century, recent developments have again placed the United Nations as the predominant multilateral actor in international peacekeeping, with more fielded troops in more operations than all regional organizations in the world combined. In this period of rapid surge in UN peacekeeping, we must assist the UN in enhancing the tools for strategic oversight over its peacekeeping and peace building activities. European ‘exceptionalism’, intended as separate command mechanisms for UN operations with a strong European presence, should be avoided in favour of a forceful and dedicated European voice promoting reform of UN peacekeeping in general.

The EU certainly enjoys being recognized as an indispensable partner of both UN Member States and UN bodies in the field of peace and security. Effective multilateralism is about uniting diverse countries, people and the organizations that represent them, in common and concrete projects. It is with this purpose that the UN-EU cooperation finds its legitimacy and its effectiveness. As biggest donor of the UN system, the EU should be a compelling force in the development of the UN’s role and influence. As a profoundly multinational actor in its own right, the EU should seek to inspire the development of the global multilateral system in meeting the challenges of the 21st Century.



In today's fast paced globalized world, change is constant and has a direct impact on the organization of the United Nations. The international community needs to find new instruments to address adequately the challenge of globalization at the social, economic and financial level, as well as in the area of conflict prevention and resolution. **Reform needs to allow the UN to make the world a safer, more just and democratic place.** In September 2006, the 60th United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) delivered only part of the achievements that were proposed. There are certain "musts" in the view of the PES. The central elements guiding the reform of the Security Council must be: the strengthening of its authority, the truly representative nature of all geographic areas, legitimacy, effectiveness and its primary role in the maintenance of international peace and security. The United Nations Security Council (UNSC) should be enlarged and strengthened by an appropriate reform in order to better reflect today's world reality and to have more representation than the current five permanent members. The next reform should increase the number of members, introduce the participation of regional organizations (including the EU) and have a better regional composition; India, Brazil, Republic of South Africa, Mexico and Pakistan could be the potential candidates. The UNSC should employ more effective and transparent working methods and should include new developing countries. UN reform must strive to strengthen and democratize its main organs. Further reform is also needed to strengthen the capacity of all UN Departments, Agencies, Funds and Programmes to work in unison in the pursuit of commonly agreed objectives. The compartmentalization of the UN system must be overcome. This requires both institutional reforms of the Secretariat and increased policy coherence among key donor countries and institutions.

The rotating memberships of the Security Council should be based on regional organizational structures or according to an institutionalized regional geographical system. The

veto power should be limited, requiring its use to be justified by reference to the UN Charter or by providing for an automatic referral back to the General Assembly.

We underline the necessity for the EU to speak with a single voice in all international institutions, including the UNSC. We emphasize that an **EU seat in the UN Security Council** remains our aim as soon as the political, constitutional and legal conditions for the seat are met. Such a solution would be coherent with the European Reform Treaty, which creates a legal personality for the Union and the EU High Representative for Foreign Affairs. As this may take some time, a transitory procedure should be adopted. In this context, we call on the EU Council to establish the appropriate mechanism to designate the EU Member States who will carry out their mandate as EU representatives. They will seek common positions in close coordination with the other EU Member States, the High Representative for the CFSP or its equivalent, the Commission and the European Parliament until the conditions for an EU seat are met. The EU should speak with one voice during open as well as closed Security Council meetings.

The UNGA, while guaranteeing the highest representation of states, should be reinforced, working closely with national parliamentarians and civil society. The EU can play a particularly important role in furthering the peace building work of the UN, i.e. as an active partner in the Peace building Commission.

The PES proposes the establishment of a new UN body: the **"Human Development Council"**. Its role would be to avoid an overlap and a contradiction between institutions and to reach the MDGs by establishing structural links between the WTO and the UN, the International Labour Organization (ILO), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), UNESCO, the World Health Organization (WHO), the United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP) and the Secretariat of Multilateral Environmental Agreements. The new UN Council for Development should have frequent political exchanges with the UNSC.

As European socialists and social democrats we must use our influence within the International Financial Institutions (IFIs) to support further reform aimed at: i) increasing the transparency and accountability of the IFIs and the priority they give to poverty eradication; ii) encouraging the IFIs to assist adjustment strategies' local ownership and participation; iii) improving the multilateral surveillance of national policies; iv) countering excessive financial instability; and v) ensuring adequate funding for the social sectors, such as health and education. The **Washington consensus**, which for a long time guided the World Bank and IMF structural adjustment policies, often paid too little attention to the social, environmental and political costs of economic reform, with deleterious effects on recipient countries. Perspectives on such economic adjustment strategies are currently becoming more nuanced, also within these institutions. Europe must make full use of its weight within the World Bank and the IMF in its support for a more balanced approach to economic adjustment. A more coherent approach to EU development policy, in support of reform towards better participation of developing countries and more transparency, would also allow Europe to exercise a greater influence on development issues in key international fora such as the UN, the World Bank, the IMF and the WTO. A new consensus for international economic and trade relations is necessary, replacing the obsolete Washington consensus. As socialists and social democrats, we are committed to ensuring that an open international trading system works fairly, bringing real development benefits to the world's poorest countries and helping contribute to poverty eradication without leading to a deterioration in social, environmental or labour standards. Taking greater account of the trading interests of poor countries is in Europe's immediate own advantage. It would be a mistake to believe that industrialized countries must pursue their own interests; neither trade nor development are a zero-sum game. Development policy must be committed to strengthening poverty eradication in the EU's bilateral and multilateral trade policy.

In this way alone can trade policy contribute to sustainable development and guarantee the ability of people to use trade opportunities to strengthen their own development.

There is a need for more efficient international institutions and rules that safeguard people against violations of their rights. The **International Court of Justice** and the **International Criminal Court** (ICC) must be allocated additional resources to better perform their tasks. It is an EU objective to increase the number of states parties further, so that the court can operate within the widest possible jurisdiction. We also need a better geographical spread of states parties; in particular we need more representation from Arab and Asian States and we will continue to lobby for the ratification of the ICC Statute. When the judicial systems of particular states do not work or when states refuse to punish war crimes, crimes against humanity or genocide, the courts must have the jurisdictional ability and capability of taking over.

## 2. The Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and the EU institutions

The European Reform Treaty contains some interesting provisions regarding the CFSP, such as the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, the creation of a European external action service and the concepts of **“solidarity clause”** and **“structured cooperation”**.

These instruments are of fundamental importance. Whilst respecting the role of EU Member States in the field of security and defence, legitimacy and practical requirements, such as the linkage with other fields of EU activity and their budgetary implications, make it necessary to strengthen the role of the European Parliament in a complementary and integrated division of labour with the national parliaments. This process would also require increased supervisory powers for the European Parliament.

# A new pact for development policy

**G**lobalization is here to stay. There is a plethora of potentially **positive aspects of globalization. Globalization, however, calls for more effective multilateralism**, if it is to be pursued for the common good. Today, globalization has led to the opening up of national boundaries to international trade and global competition. Developments linked to globalization have generated boundless possibilities for human development and enormous new opportunities as well as enhanced quality of life for many people in third world countries. However, we all need a fairer world trade.

## 1. EU development policy: Coherence, untying and effectiveness

Today, the EU does not make use of its full potential. There are 27 uncoordinated national policies with a real coherent European development policy missing. In order to maximize Europe's contribution, it is essential to pursue an integrated and genuinely coherent approach to development - an approach that brings together EU policies on development assistance with its policies on trade, investment, debt, agriculture, conflict prevention, human rights and the environment.

EU policy must take into account the **new drivers of change** shaping the future development landscape. With a rapidly changing environment, development policy must be forward looking as well as responding to current challenges. Some important drivers of change have recently emerged:

- The economic weight of China and India, accompanied by growing economic and political multi-polarity;
- The increasing heterogeneity of the donor landscape, including new players such as China in Africa;
- Countries transitioning from low income status to middle income status, and from recipient status to donor status;
- Increasing migration flows and larger diaspora communities in Europe;
- The impact of climate change and the growing importance of adaptation, mitigation and clean energy.

At the same time, a new approach vis-à-vis drivers of change must be combined with the **drivers of growth**. The conditions necessary for successful development and pro-poor growth in developing countries include:

- Good governance and effective states, assisted by credible and competent local authorities;
- Strong public services, particularly in health and education;

- Fair trade access to regional and global markets;
- Voice in international negotiations and institutions;
- Economic conditions conducive to foreign investment;
- Peace and security.

The EU has a great potential in the implementation of an advanced division of labour (the EU provides more than 50% of worldwide Official Development Aid -ODA). The aim is to avoid extreme cases such as Nicaragua (16 EU donors) or Tanzania (8 EU donors in the education sector). The EU policy programme should avoid a situation of "aid orphans" and "aid darlings". Therefore, the **Code of Conduct on Donor Coordination** should be used to empower recipient countries to better manage their relations with donors, to reduce their administrative costs and improve the effectiveness of aid. Better coordination among European donors can also help to ensure that 'neglected countries', including crisis and fragile states, receive more attention. The effectiveness of EC development assistance must also be improved by action on untying. Aid tying produces economic distortions and inefficiencies and reduces the value of the aid budget. It is not only about "how much" the EU spends but also about "how well" the EU spends it.

The **EU Budget New Financial Perspectives** for 2007-2013 is an important opportunity to reaffirm the need for EC development programmes to focus on equitable development and to shift more resources towards poor and low income countries. The EC programmes should be better designed to reduce social disparities and strengthen efforts by giving a new impetus to primary education, professional training, reduction of gender inequalities, mainstreaming of primary healthcare policies, microfinance projects and investment in technologies. In this regard, the Commission should publicize a comprehensive annual report on all EU development policies and EC programmes as well as aid effectiveness and progress in achieving the MDGs. This should be subject to debate in the Council, the European Parliament and national parliaments.

Greater **accountability** should be provided to parliaments, including national parliaments, the European Parliament, the ACP-EU Joint Parliamentary Assembly, the APEM Joint Parliamentary Assembly and the EP-Latin America Joint Parliamentary Assembly. Parliaments should be fully involved with development policy making and programming.

## 2. Promoting democratic governance: Effective states responding to their citizens' needs

The EU has forged a range of tools to promote human rights and democracy. The EU cannot develop a double language, nor accept double standards. Respect of human rights must be pursued by the EU in its bilateral and multilateral relations. The EU already enforces the respect of the **Human Rights Clause in its Association Agreements**, in particular article 2. The EU has a role to play in promoting the abolition of death penalty and opposing torture. The EU, together with the UN, must work to ensure that all states ratify and implement the UN Convention against Torture.

EU policy must define clearly its conception of good governance, focusing specifically on the importance of responsiveness, accountability and capability in effective states. The decentralisation process in development policies should be given special attention in order to speed up democratization, address recurrent problems of corruption and encourage all tiers of authority in a country to govern according to the principles of transparency, public participation and respect for subsidiarity. The Cotonou Partnership Agreement provides a valuable framework for dialogue between EU and ACP states on governance issues and similar provisions should be strengthened in the Economic and Partnership Agreements. There is growing evidence of the central importance of good governance for development, drawing on recent World Bank work and the DFID White Paper.

The fight against corruption should be part of any strategy to end misuses of public funds, bad governance and poverty. Several examples already exist. The recent ratification of the **UN Convention Against Corruption** gives nations the authority to prosecute officials accused of stealing public funds and provides broader powers to fight money laundering and to override bank secrecy laws to ensure stolen public money can be recovered. Domestic policy is an important part of development policy. For instance, domestic company law affects corruption and bribery payments in other countries, while also regulating the capacity of domestic police forces to investigate corruption at home. Development policy needs to look inwards as well as outwards and EU Member States should advance their legislative responsibility.

A similar initiative to the UK's **Global Transparency Fund (GTF)**, which aims at building the capacity of civil society and trade unions in developing countries, should be launched Europe-wide. The Fund is designed to strengthen civil society and the media in developing countries to help citizens hold their governments accountable.

Local and regional authorities working in the field of development policy are creating an increasing number of initiatives that have a positive impact on the ground. The idea is to broaden the number of actors involved in the development process by reducing the monopoly of the national state level. Apart from encouraging participation, such strategies set the preconditions for the spread of democracy and human rights. In this way, the culture of anti-repression and anti-corruption can expand. Cooperation policies must take account of the need to give the local authorities of developing countries and countries in transition the means to shoulder the responsibilities falling upon them. Conversely, policies should consider providing European local authorities with the means to offer support through their experience and know-how. Decentralized cooperation is beneficial in that it also fosters the participation of civil society.

A key objective must be to strengthen the voice of the poor within developing countries, providing them with the space to articulate and promote their own interests and the opportunity to hold their governments accountable. A central aim should also be offering assistance to build national consensus on a country's development needs and priorities.

### 3. Guaranteeing Decent Work for a decent life!

#### Decent Work for a decent life!

Decent Work is a global concern today. This point is reiterated in the report of the "World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalization" promoted by the ILO. Decent Work with social protection and equality between women and men is the only way out of poverty, and yet it is neglected as an objective in trade, financial and monetary policies. The present situation requires further efforts. It is for this very reason that we welcome the **EC Decent Work Communication** and we express our support for the implementation of the Decent Work Agenda in EC's external policies, development aid and trade policy. Through the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) and GSP+ incentive, the EU has granted important preferences to countries that have implemented sustainable development and good governance policies, including the adoption of international conventions relating to Core Labour Standards. However, it should be acknowledged that, to genuinely serve the interests of all, social objectives should not be used for protectionist purposes. Trade and economic globalization must be accompanied by a **globalization of workers rights**, making Decent Work a global demand. Securing Decent Work for women and men everywhere must be a core objective with increased visibility in the EU development policy. Cross gender Decent Work should represent the unifying, common purpose of the Union's internal and external policies.

Decent Work means access to employment, fair and equal treatment in employment, decent work remuneration, fair conditions of work, safe work environment, unemployment protection, social protection, jobs and training opportunities and collective participation.

Decent Work indicators based on comprehensive research are needed to measure the impact of trade liberalization on the employment rate, i.e. whether tariff reductions result in an increase or decrease in the number of jobs. However, the impact of trade liberalization goes well beyond the employment rate. Trade not only affects the quantity but also the quality of employment, including job security, the informal economy, the labour market gender gap, child labour, youth employment, social protection, freedom of association and worker-employer relations. Although trade is positive for jobs, it is not sufficient alone. We need globalization to be harnessed to the full benefit of Least Developed Countries (LDCs). Without adequate information on both the quantity and quality of employment, even the effective design of compensatory or flanking measures would not be feasible. We believe that all pillars of Decent Work can play an important part in poverty reduction, linking growth and economic competitiveness with social justice.

As it has been the case in Europe in the past, the development of trade unions in developing countries is an essential element of social progress for local workers. Strong trade unions can play a role in promoting collective bargaining, the improvement of labour laws and social dialogue. The EU should emphasize and foster compliance with the **ILO Core Labour Standards** and the right of workers to unite. The respect and implementation of the ILO Core Labour Standards should be a prerequisite for gaining membership to the WTO. Tenderers who have been awarded contracts should respect internationally agreed ILO Core Labour Standards. The cooperation between the **ILO and the WTO** should be strengthened and the ILO should be granted

observer status in the WTO. Member States of the WTO should follow the EU example and include labour and social questions in their trade policy reviews (TPRs), as illustrated in the 2004 EU TPR. The EU, on its part, should support the twinning between European Workers Councils and the Workers Councils of EU companies present on other continents. Such a strategy would lead to joint observation missions in the respective production plants of transnational companies (TNCs), strengthening workers rights internationally.

European companies and TNCs that operate in emerging countries must adhere to the highest standards, upholding core labour rights and protecting the environment. **Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR)** and the OECD guidelines on multinational enterprises provide an opportunity to get common agreement on a clear set of ethical standards governing the behaviour of TNCs. We welcome the EC Communication on CSR and the Commission commitments to support and promote CSR across all fields of activity, undertaking concrete action. We believe, however, that the EU could go one step further by developing a principle of “**smiley**” to reward companies respecting the principles of CSR. The EU could also develop a register of European companies in relation to their implementation of CSR – a name and blame website for instance.

Together with trade unions, NGOs and the **Global Progressive Forum**, the PES is committed to promote the Decent Work Agenda in the EU external policy.

**Respecting the Millennium Development Goals  
2015 deadline**

Achieving the **Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) by 2015** is one of the major challenges facing the United Nations and the international community. If the current pace is not accelerated the MDGs will not be achieved by the set date. The

PES supports the achievement of the MDGs as a vital priority of the EU external policy agenda.

Therefore, we call on all Member States off-track to honour the promises made in Barcelona, Gleneagles and Monterrey to urgently commit themselves to a scaling up of real aid. The EU has a fundamental responsibility to make adequate planning for the financial and organizational aspects of forthcoming aid increases to ensure the EU interim 2010 target of 0.56% GNI and the 2015 0.7% GNI for Official Development Assistance are met. Currently the global ODA for basic education is EUR 1.6 billion, whilst reaching the MDGs on basic education would require EUR 6.9 billion of ODA annually. Regarding the health MDGs, current financing only meets 36% of the estimated EUR 21 billion needed per year.

Recalling the present deficit in MDGs assistance, the PES demands real progress in terms of new mechanisms to finance development and to achieve the MDGs. Innovative sources of finance must play a part in meeting the MDGs. The PES supports the 20/20 initiative, where recipient countries agree to dedicate 20% of their national budgets, and donors give 20% of their development assistance, to social development spending, the Basic Social Services (BSS). The PES demands that 20% of EU funds for aid be dedicated to social programmes in the fields of education, health and relevant social sectors. Poverty reduction must remain the key focus of all development programmes and a broad stakeholders' partnership is essential to attain the MDGs, especially with developing countries' national parliaments and civil society. Achieving the MDGs will reduce the proportion of people in poverty within a decade. Even if the MDGs are met, there will be much work to do to end global poverty. Therefore the PES urges world leaders to support the MDGs Call to Action issued in July 2007. In view of the dynamics of poverty and development, the PES appeals to the EU to set up a '**Poverty Elimination Strategy post 2015**'.

## 4. Financing development

In 2003, total aid from the 22 richest countries to the world's developing countries was just EUR 61 billion - a shortfall of 100 billion EUR from the 0.7% promise. On average, the world's richest countries provided just 0.25% of their GNP in Official Development Assistance (ODA). The EU must work with its partners towards achieving these goals by implementing the specific commitments agreed upon in Monterrey and Johannesburg.

### Official development aid and the 0.7% objective

Although in 2006 the European Commission committed a record EUR 7.6 billion and disbursed EUR 6.5 billion to external assistance and development aid (this is respectively 55% and 58% more than in 2001), it still must work, together with the EU Member States and partners, towards achieving the 0.7% objective. As European socialists and social democrats, we reaffirm our commitment to the UN aid target of 0.7% of GNP. **The Barcelona commitments**<sup>5</sup>, adopted at the European Council in Barcelona on 14 March 2002, must be duly respected. Notwithstanding the progress made in relation to both the ODA increase and the other Barcelona commitments, there is still a need for a more vigorous effort on the part of the EU.

5. The "Barcelona Commitments" consist of 8 political commitments to which the EU agreed as its contribution to the international conference "Financing for Development" in Monterrey in March 2002. The commitments were made in two areas:

- Commitments on ODA, volume and sources: increased ODA volumes, innovative sources of financing, initiatives concerning Global Public Goods (GPG) and debt relief for Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC);

- Commitments on aid effectiveness: closer coordination of policies and harmonization of procedures, untying of aid, trade-related assistance (TRA), the reform of the International Financial System.

## Putting an end to the debt crisis

The debt question of poorest countries is a matter of great concern; African countries alone stand at EUR 250 billion. Europe should use its influence on the issue of international debt relief and the **Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) initiative**. The European States have played an important role in the July 2005 G8 summit decision in Gleneagles, which led to an extension as well as a deepening of the HIPC with the Multilateral Debt Relief Initiative to provide full cancellation of the great bulk of multilateral public external debt of the poorest countries. The EU must strengthen the case for faster debt relief in favour of those countries committed to poverty reduction as well as link much more closely debt relief to the international poverty eradication targets. The PES supports **impact assessments on the social dimension** in relation to the requirements with which the poorest countries must comply under the HIPC Initiative to prevent harmful conditions requiring liberalization and privatization.

### New sources of financing

As a shortage in devolved resources remains, new ways of financing development must be found. Alternative sources should complement existing means, in order to favour a real spill over effect for development. Additional sources of financing devoted to development should include an EU-wide airline ticket tax as well as a European, and later on international, kerosene tax. The **International Finance Facility (IFF)** could also be a source of funding to achieve the MDGs by 2015.

**Fighting money laundering and tax evasion** constitutes an additional tool to increase the financial capability of poorest states and to provide new means to combat underdevelopment. Tax evasion confiscates important amounts of money that could serve pro-development policy objectives and the building up of effective states.



The issues of tax fraud and tax evasion should be given high priority and should be dealt with in a global framework together with other issues related to them including money laundering and the financing of terrorism. Regulatory means and conventional measures against fiscal fraud and fiscal evasion have been employed in the last years and seem to show a political will to tackle these situations with unprecedented intensity. Some progress has been made: a growing number of non-OECD economies are negotiating agreements providing for the exchange of information. There is, however, a real need to go further and beyond. Regulation must operate in the framework of a global conference convened by the UN that will ensure compliance. The **fight against offshore centres** is far too fragmented with the current division of labour between GAFI, Forum of Financial Stability, IMF and OECD.

The international community has to be engaged firmly and coherently against this phenomenon. The solution to the problem lies with a multilateral agreement, preferably negotiated, preserving the fundamental right of sovereign states to determine their tax rates by democratic means. At the same time, this right should be protected from the unregulated pressure of large corporations advocating for the provision of needless and harmful tax incentives. Why not supporting the proposal for an International Convention to facilitate the recovery and repatriation of funds illegally appropriated from national treasuries of poor countries? Or, why not terminating development aid to countries considered as tax and financial havens? A UN Conference on **International Fiscal Regulation** could prevent the negative consequences of money laundering and offshore centres. These proposals should all constitute a central part of the agenda at the negotiating table.

In order to ensure transparent, efficient financial markets and effective long-term financing, also in relation to **hedge funds and private equity funds**, we call on Heads of state and government to take the following preliminary measures:

- To take all appropriate steps to establish full transparency, disclosure and accountability in the international financial markets. There needs to be a level playing field between the alternative funds and other collective investment schemes with regard to transparency and reporting on performance, risk-management and fee structure;
- To take all measures necessary to uphold workers' rights to collective bargaining, the education and training of workers and related social issues. Worker information, consultation and representation are essential to ensuring positive outcomes in these areas. This is also an important mechanism to promote the long-term interests of private equity-backed companies;
- To take all appropriate steps to establish an international task force charged with presenting recommendations on further adequate regulatory action in relation to the international financial markets. The ILO should be represented in such a task force.

## 5. Fair trade for the benefit of people

The PES strongly supports a multilateral trade system which puts trade at the service of sustainable development, full employment and the effective management of globalization, for the benefit of all. Free trade provides us with the opportunity to extend welfare in all corners of the world. LDCs also stand to gain from increased trade between themselves. However, capital must not be allowed free reign, managing development in other countries or creating a zone outside democratic control and social responsibility. With some, there is a tendency to elevate trade across borders as an aim in itself. The ultimate aim should always be development. In addition, free trade cannot be introduced from one day to the next. Countries that have been closed to international trade

or have reduced production capacities need time and assistance to prepare for the introduction of lowered trade barriers, just as Europe and America did. A poor and as yet closed country that suddenly finds itself in a world of free trade and unrestrained capitalism will not be able to create a sustainable production system. Should this opening occur too quickly, it could have detrimental consequences, increasing social injustice, disadvantageous possibilities for development, insecure production of foodstuffs and unemployment. We need more fairness in world trade. The developed world must put an end to unfair trade practices and market openings in LDCs. Developing countries do not want charity – they want fair chances on the markets. Trade liberalization can benefit developing countries, provided they have the economic capacity and infrastructure they need to trade competitively. Without the ability or the right conditions to fully enjoy the benefits deriving from free trade, liberalization may entail heavy transitional burdens on developing countries. Countries that have ‘taken-off’ have typically done so by not implementing strict or hasty liberalizations. Trade in goods and services across borders, as other markets, must eventually be regulated by unambiguous rules that ensure sustainability and protection of weak parties and countries. Growth does not necessarily equal wealth. Growth without concern for human rights and development, more social equality and a better environment does not enrich us. On the contrary, it is only a social and environmentally sustainable development that can ensure sustainable growth. **“People before profit”** should be the mantra of EU trade policy and must be taken into full consideration as the EU pursues trade negotiations with developing countries.

Fair Trade is a growing international movement ensuring producers in poor countries get a fair deal. This means a fair price for their goods. A just price covers the cost of production and guarantees a living income, with long-term contracts

providing real security and, for many, support and resources to gain the knowledge and skills they need to expand their businesses and increase sales. Even though Fair Trade alone cannot address the crisis faced by millions of small-scale farmers and producers whose livelihoods are threatened by low commodity prices and unfair competition from rich countries, it must be encouraged nevertheless. Thanks to consumer awareness, the **Fair Trade movement** has been a success. The PES calls on its members and citizens in Member States to act as responsible consumers to improve development outcomes, inter alia by buying Fair Trade products or campaigning. It is the personal responsibility of every one of us to encourage the respect of social and environmental criteria.

**Trade Sustainable Impact Assessments (TSIAs)** are conducted to explore the impacts – positive and negative – of trade policies on the three dimensions of sustainable development: economic, environmental and social. However, they are based on very general indicators, such as employment, poverty, health and education, not allowing a comprehensive assessment on the impact of trade liberalization and the diverse social groups that make up societies. Any meaningful TSIAs should examine the effects of trade liberalization on women, the poorest, indigenous people, trade unions and so forth. Social indicators are critical and should include gender analysis and Decent Work indicators. Decent Work – a concept which includes employment, equality between women and men, rights in the work place, social protection and social dialogue – is an essential component of sustainable development and is not addressed in the TSIAs. The findings of the TSIAs should influence trade policy before agreements are signed and before mandate is given to the European Commission. A follow-up mechanism monitoring how TSIAs are used could be established, involving the European Commission’s different DGs, the European

Parliament, the Council, Civil Society Organizations (CSO) and relevant international organizations.

### Achieving the Doha Development Round objectives

A positive completion of the Doha Development Round, launched in 2001, is a must for the poorest countries. A successful outcome of the Doha **Development Round** has the potential of bringing millions of people out of poverty. A better regulation on world trade and democratic reform, including more transparency in the World Trade Organization, is necessary. Support must be given to developing countries to enhance their trade capacity as well as strengthen their ability to exercise their rights, on equal terms, within the WTO. The Hong Kong Declaration on the elimination of export subsidies on agricultural produce must be implemented by 2013.

The erosion of **trade preferences**, notably those granted by the Cotonou Agreement and the General System of Preferences (GSP) and including transition periods, financial assistance, transmission of know-how, infrastructure development, capacity building and substantial market-opening towards all LDCs and developing countries with low Human Development Index (HDI) by developed countries, must be dealt with.

A strengthening of the **Special and differential treatment (SDT)** should be designed to assist less developed countries in becoming equal partners in the world trading system. A particular SDT such as the HDI of the UNDP, a socio-economic criterion allowing a better and deeper differentiation than the GDP, has to allow flexibility and differentiation within the Developing Countries category.

The EU's position in the Non-Agricultural Market Access (NAMA) negotiations must reflect its commitment to a development round. The formula adopted for tariff reduction must hence respect the principle agreed in Doha of "**less than**

**full reciprocity**", applying substantially different tariff reduction coefficients. The agreement must allow developing countries and LDCs more room for manoeuvre in their development strategies. It must take into account the needs of both the poorest and the more advanced developing countries to promote industrialization and economic diversification and to safeguard employment.

The **CAP reform**, taking into account the negotiations in 2008, should support:

- The phasing out of export subsidies, including hidden support through export credits, food aid and export trading enterprises;
- A significant improvement in market access for poor countries attempting to export to developed countries with a very limited number of sensitive products not exceeding 1%;
- The elimination of all export-related support for cotton production in developed countries as rapidly as possible, and no later than 2010;
- Existing tools to protect agricultural systems that favour the development of sustainable models of production in social and environmental terms;
- The avoidance of single-crop farming for exports, as dictated by multinationals, to fight hunger and famine.

Concerning the **General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS)**, public services are not and should not be part of them. They should not be dismantled or undermined through GATS negotiations. The EU must ensure that the full flexibility of the GATS architecture is maintained for developing countries, so that liberalization is not forced upon them, especially on services related to basic needs.

Negotiations must also remain totally multilateral, in the framework of the Marrakech agreement, without new rules or

binding calculated figures. By 2010, all developed countries should follow the EU's lead in granting free market access to the products of LDCs. Socialists and social democrats are convinced that measures to strengthen regional trade among developing countries will yield important benefits.

The full text of offers and requests should be made public at the time of their transmission, with full access to the European Parliament, national parliaments and civil society as a whole.

### The Economic Partnership Agreements and the challenge of the new EU-ACP relations

The **Economic Partnership Agreements (EPAs)** are at the heart of the economic and trade cooperation pillar of the Cotonou Agreement and could be implemented by 2008. EPAs will progressively remove trade barriers between the EU and 77 African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) countries. Since negotiations haven't been completed before the end of 2007, arrangements need to be made to avoid uncertainty to our ACP partners and to ensure that no ACP country sees its position deteriorate in relation to the Cotonou preferential system. More time should be granted for negotiations. The priority is to reach a deal that will help the poorest in the ACP countries prosper. The EPAs must be development instruments.

The EPAs should not provide worse EU market access to ACP countries than what is currently enjoyed under the Cotonou preferences. The EU should offer extensive market access (including services and investments – but with room for exceptions) and the latter should be asymmetric. EPAs must ensure that ACP regional groups have maximum flexibility over their own market opening. The EU should thus offer all ACP regional groups the ability to postpone market opening until concrete **development benchmarks** are met. In the event of a surge of subsidized EU exports, ACP countries should be able to use an effective safeguard mechanism.

Each ACP regional group should make its own decisions on the timing, pace, sequencing, and product coverage of market opening, in line with individual national development plans and poverty reduction strategies. Investment, competition and government procurement should be removed from the negotiations, unless specifically requested by an ACP regional negotiating group. ACP regional groups must judge the development benefits of any agreement on these issues. The EPAs need to be **flexible with review mechanisms**. There should be full ACP regional group ownership and participation should be introduced to ensure the EPAs are delivering the intended developmental benefits. In this sense, it is essential to undertake regular consultation with national parliaments in ACP countries in order to facilitate their scrutiny and follow-up.

On Decent Work, the **ILO Core Labour Standards** should be integrated in the social chapter, as in the case of CARICOM. In order for the ACP countries to benefit from trade reforms and build their export competitiveness, EPAs must be accompanied by additional resources. We support the involvement of trade unions and NGOs in the negotiations process, taking stock of social partners and civil society claims.

The EU, in coordination with international financial institutions and other donors, must provide **additional financial assistance** to support the ACP countries in building the infrastructure and economic capacity they need to benefit from trade with the EU and the rest of the world. The EU must respect the commitments made for the **Aid for Trade** (EUR 2 billion until 2010).

To support poorer countries with the cost of transition, the EU must offer its assistance towards the establishment of institutions, helping managing change and protecting vulnerable people. In particular, we need compensating mechanisms to prevent public spending cuts in key sectors, such as education and health, which could occur as a result of falling customs revenue on ACP budgets due to regional integration.

## 6. Sustainable energy policy, climate change and the protection of the environment

### Climate change and the protection of the environment

High-energy prices and the evident consequences of climate change underline the urgency of a new energy strategy for Europe and our planet at large. While liberals and conservatives believe that deregulated markets are the only answer to our energy and climate problems, we think it is of the highest priority to decide on a long-term strategy and to take immediate political action. Liberals and conservatives avoid a clear commitment to a strategy against climate change or are reluctant to use regulation to reach targets. As Europe's socialists and social democrats, we commit ourselves to ambitious targets because we think energy is the most pressing issue of our time. The conclusions of the Stern report, in 2006, and of the **Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)**, in 2007, underline that global warming is caused by human activity and the international community must mobilize to react promptly. The PES Resolution on Climate Change, adopted by the PES Council in Sofia on 22-23 November 2007, underscores the need for additional EU leadership in tackling climate change. The EU should take the lead on this issue, recalling that developing countries suffer the most from climate change and that populations are highly vulnerable to weather-related disasters. Climate change constitutes a serious threat to development and to achieving the MDGs and mitigation efforts are a necessary measure. The potential of the **Clean Development Mechanism (CDM)**, under the Kyoto Protocol, between industrialized countries and developing countries, must be further reflected in EU development policy in ways that are seen as environmentally and socially legitimate.

The EU should aim for effective and global long-term quantified emission reduction targets for the **post-Kyoto period from 2012 onwards**. The efficient use of energy, the implementation of renewable energy sources which produce much less greenhouse gases and the introduction of cleaner energy production based on fossil fuels are all essential preconditions for achieving the Kyoto targets. Therefore, the PES proposes that the EU agrees to reduce 30% greenhouse gas emissions by 2020 and invites other countries to agree to similar ambitious targets. The EU should reach out to our international partners fostering agreement on ambitious targets for 2020.

To achieve the ultimate objective of the **UN Climate Change Convention**, clear action is essential with Kyoto only a first step. However, Europe's efforts will not be sufficient without the support of the US, China and other countries which do not participate in the **Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS)**. We need binding targets for all the major carbon emitting countries. The ETS is a key instrument to achieve the Kyoto commitments. Emission markets can be an efficient way to reduce carbon dioxide emissions in the commercial sector, but only if emission quotas are set in a very rigorous way. Its further development is a vehicle for the transition to a sustainable European energy system with low climate impact. The setting of a price on carbon can make people more aware of the full costs of emitting CO<sub>2</sub>. Therefore there needs to be a long-term commitment to continue and expand the ETS. This would provide greater certainty for investors and producers. A central objective of international policy is to prepare for the time after the Kyoto commitment period, which ends in 2012. Our objective is to gain the adherence of all countries to an emissions-reducing policy so that climate change can be halted.

The ETS should be extended internationally and should run for a period of 20 years. It should also include all relevant sectors and all modes of freight transport (especially air-freight),

following a thorough impact assessment. At the same time, the ETS should be harmonized and simplified. It needs more transparency and better accuracy of data in order to avoid over-allocation of emissions and ensure greater auctioning of ETS credits, a ceiling for the trade of certificates and a mechanism to allocate some of the auctioning revenues to R&D focusing on renewable energy and energy efficiency. A percentage ceiling should be placed on the ability to use the **Clean Development Mechanism** and Joint Implementation in third countries.

The European Union should encourage the further development of an economical method of **carbon capture and storage** in relation to coal, gas and oil. The decision by the red-green coalition in Norway to finance, jointly with the industry, a full scale carbon capture plant for a new combined heat and power plant is a major step in this direction. By 2015 there should be 12 large-scale demonstration plants in the EU. By 2020 our aim is to have carbon capture and storage as standard for any new fossil fuelled power plant.

**Global warming**, according to the Stern Report, could shrink the global economy by 20% but, if action is taken promptly, it would only cost 1% of the global GDP. In other words, initiatives and investments in new technology, carbon offsets, renewable energy, fuel cells, hybrid cars, and forests — which act as natural carbon dioxide sinks — along with the deployment of financial instruments like carbon taxes and carbon trading, are worth being implemented immediately. It has a political importance for Europe to lead the way on climate change and to demonstrate the advantages of low-carbon technologies in practice. Europe must show how a low-carbon economy can be advantageous for economic growth.

It is necessary to either create a world environmental organization or to strengthen the UNEP. There is a weakness and fragmentation of international law concerning the environment. The PES welcomes the creation of a **World**

**Environmental Organization (WEO)** having the same power and capacities as the WTO and reflecting the principle of climate change as a question of future survival. While there is a whole range of multilateral environmental agreements and mechanisms for limited or voluntary observation (the Kyoto Protocol is only competent for seeing to the respect of emission shares), in the field of trade the WTO has a global scope and sometimes arbitrates conflicts to the detriment of the environment. The PES demands better links between the **Multilateral Environment Agreements (MEAs) and the WTO's** programme to avoid trade aspects with a negative impact on the environment. The WTO should restrict the use of trade measures in MEAs and should ensure that the international environmental conventions are not subordinated to WTO regulations.

### Sustainable energy policy

The PES believes that the instability of most energy supplying regions can only be tackled at its root causes. Economic and social development, good governance and fair agreements are much better safeguards for a secure energy supply than the exclusive reliance on military and political measures that many conservatives propose. For social democrats and socialists, the social dimension of energy policy is as important as the economic, environmental and security ones. High fuel and electricity prices hit the poor households hardest, forcing them to cope with the high, and sometimes unbearable, heating and electricity bills and rising public and private transport costs. Consumer interests and a socially just distribution of energy resources must be at the centre of all future energy policy. EU's cooperation with developing countries must ensure that these countries have the capacity to take into account climate considerations in national decision-making processes, have properly functioning energy markets, can participate in international institutions and can develop renewable energy sources.

Security of **energy supply** must become an integral part of the EU's Common Foreign and Security Policy, on the same level as development and trade policies. The EU must use its collective weight in its dialogue with key energy suppliers, aiming at solid long-term partnerships and energy cooperation agreements between producers and consumers of energy. This requires a common strategy for relations with all relevant countries and regions rather than the disparate national approaches of Member States. In addition, transatlantic cooperation must be increased. The EU and the United States depend on imported energy and, at the same time, they have the best economic and technological resources to find joint solutions to improve their energy security.

The forthcoming agreement between the EU and Russia should include provisions on mutual access to infrastructure, competition rules limiting the power of quasi-monopolistic companies and the issue of technical failures in third countries, affecting cross-border supplies to the EU. The EU Member States, and the Union in its energy-related discussions with Russia, should demand the ratification and implementation of the Transit Protocol and the Energy Charter Treaty. This is instrumental to ensuring much-needed foreign investment in Russia's energy infrastructure and an adequate gas supply to the EU in the future.

Partnership and cooperation agreements must be mutually beneficial, especially with supplier countries like Russia, Algeria and Libya, with which the EU is interdependent. Norway, participating fully in the internal energy market through the EEA agreement, is in a special position as a major strategic supplier of energy to Europe. **Agreements with Europe's energy suppliers** must help creating stable yet open regulatory frameworks in supply countries, fostering the massive investments needed in exploitation and transport infrastructures to secure long-term supplies. This must be

complemented through agreements with transit countries to establish diversity of secure oil and gas pipelines. Partnerships and agreements should also be used as an opportunity to promote the EU's environmental agenda - establishing cooperation on renewable energies and promoting energy saving and energy efficiency at an international level. The EU must help foster a new global energy dialogue, aiming at making global energy markets stable, secure and transparent.

Member States, in cooperation with EU institutions, should have a list of priority areas where they have reached agreement in terms of external energy policy. The EU and its Member States must ensure that their diplomatic, aid and trade relations with energy-supplying countries promote fiscal transparency, good governance and the role of local civil society as a watchdog over energy revenue management. This is essential to counter corruption and mismanagement of energy revenues, which can destabilize such countries by undermining sustainable development, fomenting unrest and thus threatening the security of energy supplies. This theme should be embedded in all the EU's neighbourhood agreements. Additional measures should also be considered including not only capacity-building assistance to help civil society groups in the resource revenue-dependent countries act as independent monitors of their energy industries but also sustaining the energy and industry ministries of these countries in the enhancement of transparency and good governance. Cooperation with developing countries reliant upon energy imports must support investments in a domestic, ecologically sustainable energy production. Their access to energy imports must be safeguarded while a hurtful competition between them and developed countries must be prevented. The EU should make proposals for poor countries in the fields of energy, resources and environmental protection including intensive research for alternatives to fossil fuels.

## 7. Humanitarian emergency, food and sanitary aid

Helping people who are most in need, regardless of their nationality, religion or ethnic origin, is a key principle of the European Union's humanitarian aid policy and the European Commission's Humanitarian Aid Office (ECHO). As the nature of crises confronting communities, states and the humanitarian sector is diverse and complex, the reaction mechanisms must aim at improving the timeliness, appropriateness and equity of crisis response. The EU, and ECHO, could improve the UN's capacity for immediate humanitarian response, particularly concerning the **Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF)**. It should also be discussed how the UN and EU could work with other organizations, such as the African Union, on conflict prevention.

Forty million people worldwide are living with **HIV/AIDS**. AIDS is not just a problem facing Africa. By 2010, most people with HIV and AIDS will live in Asia and the fastest growth in infections will be in Eastern Europe and Central Asia. Europe must help eradicate these diseases, namely by strengthening first and foremost the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria (GFATM). This multi-donor fund has proved to be the most effective instrument in the fight against HIV/AIDS in recent years. It has helped to save more than 1.5 million lives since its foundation in 2000. In a recent replenishment conference in Berlin, donors pledged additional EUR 6.8 billion for the GFATM. The European countries must stick to these commitments and should further increase their support in the upcoming years. Europe should also promote efforts on **AIDS vaccine research**. The EU must support the access of developing countries to generic medicines in order to treat HIV/AIDS, TB and malaria patients. Health must prevail over economic interests! Major opportunities to stem the global epidemic and defeat the devastating impact of HIV/AIDS on the lives of millions of women and girls around

the world are being missed despite repeated statements committing to address the feminization of the pandemic. It is time to deliver in the interest of women and girls, in line with the commitments contained in the Political Declaration on HIV/AIDS by the United Nations General Assembly of June 2006. The **obstacles preventing access to HIV prevention**, diagnosis, treatment, care and support services must be removed by:

- Increasing funding destined to AIDS programmes for women and adapting existing strategies to ensure they take into account the gender dimension and include accountability systems;
- Enhancing access for all women to services such as education, sexual and reproductive health, ante-natal care, prevention of mother-to-child transmission, antiretroviral therapy and other required medications, as well as prevention options women can initiate themselves, notably micro-biocides and female condoms. Gender disaggregated data should be produced to show improvement in these areas;
- Fostering women's active participation where AIDS policies are decided, strategies forged and funds allocated and strengthening women's organizations to play an active role in developing and implementing such policies.



# European security and defence issues: Coherence, efficiency and visibility

**F**or more than forty years the Cold War divided much of the world into two camps. Its ending has led to a more complex and fragile world order, characterized by new threats which are both more diverse and less predictable. In this regard, Europe has a major role to play on the international scene in order to **preserve peace and strengthen international security.**

## 1. Enhancing world peace and global security: A global and coherent approach against new threats

### The European Security Strategy (ESS)

The **European Security Strategy**, adopted by the European Council in 2003, identifies the most dangerous security risks confronting the European Union: terrorism, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, regional conflicts, state failure and organized crime. The PES welcomes the ESS specific commitment to the promotion of multilateralism, international law, the UN Charter, the ICC and the resolution of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

Following the ESS, several strategies have been adopted to combat these new threats. In addition to measures undertaken to combat terrorism, including the Declaration on Combating Terrorism, the **EU Counter-Strategy Terrorism** and the EU Action Plan on combating terrorism, the EU is also determined to deal with the proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) and Small Arms and Light Weapons (SA/LW). The European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP), encompassing both civil and military crisis management operations, can also contribute to the fight against terrorism, either directly or as an aid to other instruments. In this respect, "The ESDP dimension of the fight against terrorism", adopted by the Council in November 2004, identifies four main areas of action: prevention, protection, consequence management and support to third countries.

However, in order to effectively prevent threats, which endanger European security, the EU should act toward solving the root causes of these threats including authoritarianism, bad governance, poverty, injustice and inequality. In its fight against terrorism, the EU has to take into account the promotion of human rights, rule of law,

development policy and crisis management and prevention. Along this line, the ESS aims for an active and coherent approach in order to deal with "new threats", bringing together the different instruments and capabilities, such as European assistance programmes and the European Development Fund, military and civil capabilities from Member States and other instruments with diplomatic efforts, development, trade and environmental policies following the same agenda. The PES rejects any form of pre-emptive war or anticipatory self-defence that is not authorized by the UN Security Council.

The **EU response to new threats**, in particular those concerning security and defence matters, requires a global, coherent and durable approach. According to our principles, the EU doctrine and the overall long-term goals must be:

- Promoting political, civil, social, cultural and economic rights for all;
- Developing an international system governed by international law and rules;
- Securing an habitable planet through the implementation of sustainable strategies in relation to the environment, climate change and energy supplies.

The PES proposes that a **regular assessment of security threats and EU strategic responses** shall take place within the competent EU institutions every two years and a half on the basis of proposals from the High Representative for Foreign Affairs. We also call for the creation of fora to include the expertise of as many competent organizations and eminent persons as possible in such a debate.

This integrated approach raises several considerations. Firstly, as the ESS states: "**Security is the first condition for development**". Experiences from past conflicts show that new threats cannot be prevented solely with arms. Military crisis management operations should be part of a wider political strategy. A secure and stable environment is a precondition for humanitarian and development assistance, with the latter playing a decisive role in the exit strategy of the military options. Security and development are complementary and not antonymous concepts.

Secondly, **integrated civil-military cooperation** gains more and more importance in crisis management operations both at a national and European level.

Thirdly, military expertise is increasingly used for advice and training as part of conflict prevention or for the stabilization of a post-conflict situation. **Security Sector Reform (SSR)** and Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration (DDR) represent a good illustration of these forms of security assistance. The same logic must be applied to humanitarian crises: where necessary, military means can be used in a coordinated manner with other actors on the ground.

Finally, EU security and defence policies require a coherent and comprehensive strategy, which takes into account the **human security** dimension in the promotion of peace and security. Natural disasters, human or animal diseases, climate change, environmental pollution, migration flows and energy supplies become additional new threats jeopardizing the security of European citizens.

### Confronting new threats

#### *Weapons proliferation and Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD)*

For more than five decades the world has sought to control the proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction as well as their component materials and technology. It has done so by relying upon international legal norms, international institutions and other global tools with the **Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty (NPT)** at their core. Now the regime is beginning to show its age. There is an immediate need for concrete strategies to revitalize the world's non-proliferation efforts. To curb the spread of nuclear weapons and materials, we need a comprehensive, integrated approach. Ad hoc solutions are inadequate. Just as the fight against terrorism calls for the marshalling of all elements of our military, political and economic arsenals, so does the fight against nuclear proliferation demand cooperation between the United States, Europe and beyond. It also requires nuclear-weapon states to

demonstrate their commitment to strengthening non-proliferation norms – if they want the cooperation of key non-nuclear weapon states. We underscore our ultimate aim of a world without nuclear weapons, campaigning for the international monitoring of uranium enrichment.

To advance global peace and security, we need to devise a global nuclear non-proliferation net that captures nuclear weapons, materials, and technology, and strengthens the grand bargain which underlies the current nuclear non-proliferation regime. The net should be based on **four principles**:

- Nations must recognize that non-proliferation is a two-way street;
- Progress can only be achieved by a truly global coalition;
- Non-proliferation requires actions to curb both the supply of, and demand for, nuclear weapons, materials, and technology;
- Leading nations must maximize the resources available to ensure successful outcomes.

The nuclear-weapon states must take measures to fulfil their obligations to gain wider support in favour of the strengthening of the global nuclear non-proliferation regime. We further recommend that, as a prerequisite for strengthening the global non-proliferation regime, the five NPT nuclear-weapon states take these **critical steps** to fulfil their end of the grand bargain:

- Cease research on, and development of, new nuclear weapons, such as the so-called “bunker buster”, currently under development in the United States;
- Negotiate a Fissile Materials Cut-off Treaty and ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty;
- Enlist support beyond the G8 for nuclear non-proliferation efforts, especially by closing the fuel-cycle loophole in the NPT.

Issues of vital concern in this area include the need for deeper cuts through a firm regulatory framework restricting: (1) nuclear arsenals, (2) the development of ballistic missiles and missile defence systems, (3) the danger of clandestine nuclear weapon programmes, (4) nuclear-weapon proliferation, (5) nuclear tests including South Asia and North-Korea (6) the continuing reliance on nuclear weapons and (7) the illicit trafficking of nuclear material. Key states ratifying and enforcing the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty is a necessary step in this direction.

The PES is convinced that the international community should establish a unified position in order to prevent the threat posed by weapons proliferation, arms race and the destabilization of regional or international balances of power. Political and diplomatic efforts should be supported to ensure the prevention of WMD proliferation. A full commitment by all parties concerned is essential to reach the goal of nuclear disarmament and the respect of international agreements such as the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). The PES is concerned about the risks raised by the US plans to proceed with a missile defence programme in Europe by 2011-2012. We should avoid creating division and weakening the international non-proliferation efforts. We should join all attempts to avoid a new arms race in Europe or tensions with other nuclear powers. Proper exchange of relevant information with Russia is thus a must, including the future of the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) that is set to expire in 2009. The PES calls on the US Administration and all involved parties to maintain dialogue and consultation with the EU and within NATO. We firmly support a multilateral approach with all relevant states and organizations in Europe and worldwide concerning the future of the missile defence to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons. Priority should be given to a joint solution to the rising problems of non-proliferation, within the context of the Common Foreign and Security Policy, in order to strengthen the credibility of the international community, to avoid unilateral actions and to enhance global security. We must refrain from creating a division between the European Union and the United States in a crucial issue such as non-proliferation. It is in our common interest to invest in enduring stability and long-term security. The proper monitoring mechanisms of the **Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC)** and of the **Biological Weapons Convention (BWC)** must ensure the compliance and effectiveness through a more efficient verification system. The UN should have permanent weapons inspectors to follow up on the implementation of weapons agreements.

The growing proliferation and indiscriminate use of anti-personnel landmines around the world has been under intensive scrutiny, leading to an agreement on an absolute **ban on all anti-personnel landmines**. The Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines on Their Destruction (Mine-Ban Convention), which opened for signature in December 1997 in Ottawa, Canada, was signed by 123 countries and has since been ratified by over 40. The EU must support further Convention ratification.

The EU must support the worldwide ratification of the **Mine-Ban Convention** and a **Conference on Disarmament** to negotiate a ban on mines transfers. A significant percentage of bomblets fails to explode immediately but may still detonate if picked up or struck, endangering civilians, often children, even years after the end of the conflict. In line with the February 2007 Oslo Conference, where a global call was made to ban the use, production and stockpiling of cluster munitions, the PES demands a firm engagement on the part of the EU to call for a banning treaty by 2008.

The proliferation of illicit **Small Arms and Light Weapons (SA/LW)** in regions of the world suffering from political instability and violent conflicts has proven to be a major obstacle to peace, economic development and efforts to rebuild war-torn societies. The UN Millennium Report of 2000 focused mostly on small arms, which were described as "Weapons of Mass Destruction" due to the number of casualties they cause. Weapons are not ordinary goods and hence they cannot be treated as such. An estimated 40 to 60% of world's trade in small arms is illicit. Controlling the proliferation of illicit weapons is a necessary first step towards the non-proliferation of small arms.

The UN Firearms Protocol commits UN Member States to regulate the manufacture, export, import and transit of firearms. It also requires firearms to be marked and recorded for 10 years and encourages (but does not require) the regulation of arms brokers. With Poland and Zambia becoming the 40th and 41st countries to ratify it, the UN Firearms Protocol will now take effect as a legally binding instrument. The PES demands that the EU exerts pressure on third partner countries to ratify the Protocol. The EU-wide action on SA/LW received a new impetus with the agreement on an EU Small Arms Strategy. The EU Strategy to Combat Illicit Accumulation and Trafficking of SA/LW and their Ammunition was adopted in January 2006 and provides a basis for further

action against SA/LW proliferation and misuse. The EU should promote a global **Arms Trade Treaty (ATT)** to help curb uncontrolled transfer of arms between countries. A legally binding international treaty on arms controls should ensure that all governments manage arms with the same basic, internationally agreed standards and regulations. This would include opposing excessive levels of military spending to divert resources in favour of more pressing development priorities. The EU should also contribute to the work of the Oslo process aiming at banning cluster munitions that entail unacceptable humanitarian consequences.

The **EU Code of Conduct on Arms Exports** (1998) is one of the world's most established regional mechanisms for arms transfer controls. At the heart of the EU Code are the eight common criteria governing national arms export licensing decisions. The European Union Code of Conduct on Arms Exports has the status of a political commitment in the framework of the CFSP. The PES demands that the new text be upgraded to legally binding status in the form of a common position of the EU Council.

### Countering terrorism

Terrorist attacks and the struggle against terrorism have led to the loss of many innocent lives over recent years and pose a serious threat to human rights. The threat of terrorist attacks is real and, unfortunately, has now become itself a challenge to human rights. However, the history of the 21st Century has not been written yet and we have the opportunity to influence its course. In order to ensure a development for the good of humankind, it is paramount that we fight hard over the coming years to secure universal and undisputed human rights. This includes countering lawless, non-state, fundamentalist organizations and actors who use inhumane methods. It must be underlined that terrorism has different sources and different faces. The need for a common

definition of the term "terrorism" and a common analysis on the development of the international efforts are of the highest importance for addressing the issue adequately and collectively.

Due to globalization, the indoctrination, financing and 'education' of new terrorists can also come from the outside and an internal defence against terrorism is not always effective. Withdrawing from the world is simply not an option and the use of armed force in the fight against terrorism can be necessary. Although military intervention cannot be excluded, it should be carried out in accordance with international law to ensure that we do not work against our own interests by fanning the flames of alienation and further conflict. A holistic approach that takes into account the structural foundations of the phenomenon of terrorism is needed. The narrow security approach that has been used so far in the fight against terrorism is counterproductive and has led to greater instability and insecurity in the world. The causes of terrorism are principally political: lack of political openness and participation, closure of the media. Poverty and unemployment are not direct sources of terrorism, but the frustrations they generate may create a deeper alienation which can provide fertile space for recruitment to terrorist organizations. The growth of terrorism is also due to unresolved regional conflicts, including the instability in the Middle East and the failure of the Arab-Israeli peace process. Unsettled conflicts constitute a destabilizing factor and an important source of radicalization. The resolution of regional conflicts must be a priority concern. Europe's efforts against terrorism must be both consistent and durable in the long term. **We reject any justification of terrorism.**

Since the attacks in Madrid (2004) and London (2005), European citizens are concerned with the risk of new terrorist acts on the continent. EU actions must aim at preventing, identifying, localizing and bringing to justice any authors of terrorist acts. The role of the EU, so far, is based on coordination with an emphasis on exchanging and sharing information among Member States. A specific programme designed to create a **Legal Enforcement Network (LEN)**, facilitating the exchange of information between police forces, has been launched. An improvement in the intelligence work should also be ensured by means of better **cooperation between intelligence services**. Other agencies, such as Europol, Eurojust and, recently, the European Border

Agency, promote close cooperation. In addition, within the Council, a body called SitCen brings together external and internal intelligence experts to coordinate strategies. Although anti-terrorist measures are the competence of each Member State, a better cooperation is necessary at EU level given the web and transnational nature characterizing terrorists groups.

While judicial and police coordination is necessary, joint strategies should not lead to the restriction of citizens' basic civil liberties. By compromising on human rights in the fight against terrorism, success will be granted to the cause of terrorists; this cannot be allowed to happen. In the fight against terrorism firm measures may be necessary, but we reject any watering down of international law. Illegal imprisonment and treatment is not acceptable. In the international fight against terrorism the fundamental principles of international and national public and criminal law should continue to be at the foundations of each action undertaken.

#### *New factors of conflict*

The perception and identification of threats has evolved considerably throughout the years. Today's system witnesses new challenges endangering security in addition to the classical or "hard" threats to stability. These must be reflected in evolving policies and strategies. Climate change will play a major role in the future in terms of strategic thinking, demonstrating how new factors can have a significantly destabilizing role. Issues such as transnational droughts, epidemics and the extension of tropical diseases (malaria, cholera, schistosomiasis) as well as water crises and extreme weather phenomena will multiply in the coming years.

There is a critical link between natural resources and conflict, preventing several countries and regions from

gaining the stability necessary for their development. Precarious energy and climate conditions can trigger conflict and the UN estimates that there will be more than 50 million environmental refugees in the year 2010. The initiative in the Diamond sector, the Kimberley Process Certification Scheme, is the best example of how governments, civil society and industry can act together on conflict prevention through good cooperation and team work. Natural resource revenues are an important source of income for the governments of over 50 developing countries. If adequately managed, these revenues can serve as a basis for poverty reduction, economic growth and development as opposed to corruption, social divisiveness and conflict. The **Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI)** targets resource-rich countries through the verification and full publication of company payments and government revenues from oil, gas and mining. This is a step forward but is undoubtedly not enough. This initiative, which works to build multi-stakeholder partnerships in developing countries in order to increase the accountability of governments, preventing corruption and conflicts, should be developed further. EITI is a global initiative but only some twenty countries in Africa, Asia, Europe, and South America have either committed to EITI or are now actively implementing it.

## **2. The European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP): A more active and a more capable European Union**

The Union possesses a wide range of foreign policy instruments which are particularly suited to respond to today's challenges. The **European Security and Defence Policy** (ESDP) certainly is the most evident illustration and the EU should ensure the use of its full potential. With the ESDP, the European Union is now capable of carrying out a wide variety of peace missions both of a civil and of a military nature. These missions range from humanitarian and rescue operations to peacekeeping tasks and military interventions to resolve crises and to restore peace. Much progress has been recorded since its creation in 1999. During the last three years, ESDP operations have proven their value and have contributed to the further development of the EU as an international actor. Through its ESDP instruments, the EU has now reached a point where it can think more strategically about its involvement in international affairs. Today, the ESDP has a series of available tools and structures to accomplish its missions.

The combination of military and civil instruments in EU crisis management constitutes the strength of the ESDP.

Since the Nice Treaty, the EU has a **Military Committee (EUMC)** and a **Military Staff (EUMS)** defining and implementing their own military operations. In July 2004, the **European Defence Agency** was launched to strengthen the industrial and technological capacity of the EU and to create a truly European market for defence equipments. These tools are essential to ensure the cooperation of the Member States' armies on the ground and the use of compatible material.

However, the EU is also confronted with inherent problems. With defence remaining a competence of Member States and triggering fears of competition with NATO, progress has been slow, hindering deeper integration at a European level. The EU, potentially the second largest military in the world, must define its priorities in order to develop a common strategy.

### A more active European Union

#### *European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) operations confronting present and future challenges*

Since 2003, the EU has deployed military forces and civil capabilities in a series of operations inside and outside the European continent. The two first military missions "Concordia" and "Artemis" marked the entry of the ESDP in its new operational phase. With "Concordia", the EU took over NATO operation "Allied Harmony" in March 2003 in an effort to guarantee the security and stability of the country and in order to facilitate the implementation of the Ohrid Framework Agreement. It was the first concrete application of the **"Berlin +" agreements**. "Artemis", which took place in the Ituri region in August 2003, was also outstanding in many respects: for the first time an ESDP operation was led

autonomously, without NATO assets, outside European borders. Moreover, lessons learned from this operation generated some new ESDP concepts such as battle groups, a rapid response and an EU operation centre. The current "Althea" or "EUFOR" operation in Bosnia-Herzegovina is the largest EU operation with an average of 7,000 men and women involved. It is the first operation of substantial size and represents a good test, on the one hand to manage a complex mix of civil and military tasks and on the other hand to attest the good collaboration between the EU and NATO. "Althea" contributes to the EU robust presence in Bosnia-Herzegovina. In fact, several parallel operations using different instruments, including EUPM, EUMM and EUSR, have been set up.

The experience of "Althea" has brought new elements in expanding the scope of what the military is prepared to do. The mandate of the mission covered and the support of the mission's implementation plan from the Office of the High Representative, including issues such as fostering economic development and consolidating the rule of law, represent the most innovative components. The military made a major contribution towards the pursuit of these objectives, notably by engaging in the fight against organized crime. The EUSEC RD Congo operation, which provides advice and assistance to the Congolese authorities for security reform, is another example of the progression of **ESDP military tasks**. Military experts are carrying out the reform of the chain of payment of the Congolese Defence Ministry. These actions are all the more important since they encourage civil-military cooperation.

As of today, the EU has launched **13 ESDP operations**. Apart from the FYR of Macedonia, the Democratic Republic of Congo and the Western Balkans, the EU presence is, or was, also effective in Georgia, Aceh/Indonesia, Palestinian Territories and Darfur. By making more progress at the operational level and extending its actions to new regions of the world, the EU has revealed its ambitions to become a **worldwide actor on the international scene**. The EU has begun to develop a "strategic autonomy" for its security strategy, namely the ability to carry out operations within its scope independently of other actors. A necessary further development will require interoperability and a more sustainable and reliable supply chain based on mutual support and assistance, avoiding duplication and the suboptimal use of scarce resources at European level or between Member States.

It is important to stress that ESDP projects are open, which means that the involvement of non-EU members, under certain conditions, is welcome. Involvement refers to offering additional contributions in concrete operations. However, it also means having consultations with the EU on a regular basis outside times of crisis and participating, on an equal foot, in the day-to-day management of missions.

Exchanges in the field of training between the military academies of all European countries, as well as the human contacts experienced in practice during common exercises, operations and joint training centres, must be encouraged and stimulated. The new **European Security and Defence College** has a major role to play by contributing to the construction of a “common strategic culture”.

#### *Civil-military cooperation*

The integrated civil-military crisis management structures elaborated by the EU, within which both the Commission and the Council Secretariat (the civil/military cell) are represented, is of primary importance in fostering civil-military cooperation. The geopolitical realities will increasingly lead the EU towards complex crisis management activities for which it will be obliged to draw upon the wide range of civil and military instruments in its possession. The new institutional developments in this field, including the creation of the civil-military cell and the coordination between the **ESDP and Community instruments**, must be upgraded. An active and coherent approach towards crisis management should be promoted. The EU must forge strong links between the progressively integrated crisis management capabilities in the second pillar and the long-term policies in the first pillar, such as aid and trade. This ‘internal’ integration within the EU structures should also, where relevant, contribute to the strengthening of the broader integration efforts led by the United Nations in its multifunctional peace operations.

In the same context, the use of the military to support disaster relief should be examined. In its initial orientations on the follow-up to Hampton Court, secretary general/ high representative Javier Solana underlined that military resources, in particular transport means, can make an important contribution to disaster relief. Although the use of military capacity outside strictly military situations seems obvious, the ESDP should not replace EU humanitarian action. When necessary, it should rather bring useful and concrete support to other actors actively responding to a humanitarian crisis.

In order to be able to face more complex tasks of an increasingly larger scale, the PES finds it necessary to improve the EU’s civil-military capabilities applied to crisis management avoiding a duplication of effort.

Socialists and social democrats understand that without development the security of all will be in jeopardy. Development affects all security dimensions with an impact on human security through diseases, shortage of water supply and hunger as well as physical security and infrastructure. Security and development are closely linked and development policy must become the pillar of a global peace strategy bearing security implications. At the same time, we must be aware that in concrete conflict situations organizations and people involved in humanitarian projects cannot be looked at as instruments of a security operation. In conflict situations, the need for a certain degree of ‘humanitarian space’, in order to separate the impartial delivery of immediate relief from the more political issues of security, state-building and long-term development operations, should be respected.

#### *A more capable European Union*

#### *The effectiveness of the European Security and Defence Policy undertakings*

The first concrete step on the part of the ESDP to enhance military capabilities was taken in 1999 when EU Member States signed the **Helsinki Headline Goal 2003**, which included the creation of a European Rapid Reaction Force (60,000 troops within 60 days and sustainable for at least one year). However, it soon became clear that the objectives outlined in the Helsinki Headline Goal were not attainable. In May 2004, EU defence ministers approved **Headline Goal 2010**,



thus extending the timeline for the EU project. The desire behind the project is to improve forces interoperability and deployability and their support capacity.

Capability-building in the ESDP is fundamentally a bottom-up process: Member States are requested to declare on a voluntary basis which capabilities they are willing to make available to the EU. Although their replies are listed in the Helsinki Force Catalogue, they lead to “shortfalls” because of the difference between what the EU needs and what the Member States are willing to offer. Shortfalls are identified in areas such as strategic air- and sealift and deployable force headquarters as well as advanced command, control, communications and intelligence. Most EU Member States continue to maintain a wide range of national capabilities in the army, the navy and the air force. At the European level, the result leads to fragmentation, duplication and a very unbalanced rapport between cost and effectiveness. In relation to technology research, for instance, there are currently three nationally driven projects to develop an unmanned air vehicle within the EU, with sometimes the same private companies participating in more than one project and thus collecting taxpayer’s money more than once. These “capability gaps” have a deleterious impact on the credibility of the EU vis-à-vis its citizens and must be thus addressed and fixed. The emergence of additional coordination in operational capabilities, by pooling and sharing assets, should be encouraged. The development of the Airbus transport aircraft A400M (strategic airlift) illustrates the benefits of further cooperation with some European countries joining the program to increase interoperability while at the same time reducing overhead and unit cost. The military observation satellite Helios constitutes another eloquent case. Helios IIB will be launched by Ariane V during the first half of 2009. Led by France, in partnership with Belgium, Spain and Italy, it is the second satellite of the second-generation Earth Observation System for security and defence. The capacity building of the ESDP being mainly a bottom-up

process, operating and sharing capabilities on a bilateral or multilateral basis must be promoted.

Since the defence budget is decided at a national level, Europe’s defence expenditures differ widely between Member States. The amount of resources allocated for defence purposes depends on national political objectives and priorities. However, it is important to rationalize defence expenditures and to change the way European Member States allocate their defence budgets. Fragmentation generates inefficiency as a result of limited competition, duplication of effort and higher costs, which should be overcome by better multinational cooperation, including NATO. Some current initiatives in which training, capabilities and expertise are shared between groups of Member States should be followed by other Member States. The issue is not about EU-members’ spending half as much (approximately EUR 172 billion for EU-27) as the United States on defence, but that European defence capacities are estimated to be a mere 10-15% when compared to those of the US. It does not mean that budget increase is necessary but there should be a collaborative programme between all EU nations.

In the long run, the ESDP should be further developed, including by increasing the synergies and integration between European forces ready to be mobilized under a UN mandate. Only in this context will we be able to fully gain the product of joint capabilities. Of course, this requires mutual trust and entails a very long path, but we should set a long-term target. Self-sufficiency in defence is not an option given the nature of our current international order as it simply generates duplication and waste. In practice, the pooling of resources by a group of Member States under the format of “structured cooperation” could be the starting point for further integration and increased effectiveness in defence.

#### *Encouraging the role of the European Defence Agency*

The creation of the European Defence Agency is definitely a positive step for the ESDP. Created in July 2004, the Agency’s main task is to coordinate, optimize and harmonize as much as possible the different facets of national policies (operational, technological, industrial and budgetary) in the preparation of future defence systems to match more closely the needs of the ESDP. The EDA could help avoid the splintering of European resources into

national defence programs and could support the European restructuring of the defence industry.

Being a European actor, the EDA can take the initiative and propose concrete solutions for specific EU-level capability shortfalls. With the decision-making power in the hands of the Member States (the Steering Board is composed of defence ministers and is their only formal forum), it is up to the EDA to present attractive proposals convincing Member States to agree on specific solutions. Yet, the first experiences demonstrate that it remains difficult to persuade Member States to take into account the aggregate needs of EU Member States as a whole. The EDA should neither be ignored nor used as a veto-platform to secure national priorities. Despite the results achieved in the fields of command, control and communications, the potential of the EDA could lead to much more ambitious targets.

The **Code of Conduct (CoC)**, launched in July 2006, represents a new step on the way to building a European defence equipment market. The CoC is a voluntary, non-binding intergovernmental regime dedicated to the application of competition in defence procurement and covering defence equipment purchases, which are exempted from the EU single market normal cross-border competition rules. In this regard, EDA structures and functions represent a mix of bottom-up and top-down approaches. The recent Long Term Vision adopted at the Informal Meeting of EU Defence Ministers in the beginning of October 2006 demonstrates the will of the EDA to agree in the long term. A conceptual dimension is necessary to develop a top-down approach but concepts must find a practical application. The Long Term Vision should initiate some concrete projects and allow the EDA to take further, pragmatic steps.

We want a strong and independent European defence industry with autonomous technology research and development capacities that are able to adequately protect

the essential security interests of the EU and its Member States. In order to ensure the protection of the security interests of the EU and its Member States and the creation of a truly integrated European defence technological base, the common market rules for defence-related products to be employed should grant: (1) preference to products of European origin over those originating from third countries, (2) full effect to the principle of reciprocity in trade relations and (3) the use of technology protected by European industrial property rights in accordance with international and community law.

### Cooperation with NATO: Enhancing the transatlantic relationship on an equal footing

Since the end of the Cold War, the world has witnessed a fundamental reshaping of the transatlantic relationship, especially on security and defence issues. In response to a new environment and new threats, NATO has begun its transformation in order to adapt its military capabilities and conduct missions outside its traditional field of action in Europe. The transformation of NATO following the end of the Cold War is essential for world security and must proceed in a balanced way. To be successful, the process must follow some fundamental principles and every NATO operation must be conducted according to international law and the **UN Charter**. NATO must preserve its politico-military purpose and should not be oriented towards humanitarian objectives. Finally, as an intergovernmental organization preserving the full sovereignty of the Member States, every decision must be taken by consensus.

Alongside NATO, the EU has developed its own security and defence policy and has deployed military and civil capabilities in a series of missions ranging from monitoring borders to peacekeeping. The respective changes in the two organizations must not lead to a competition between them: the EU and NATO must work together in a coordinated and synergic manner to promote common interests and address common challenges in the global arena. With a view to transatlantic relations and the United States being a strategic partner, the focus should not only be on the nitty-gritty details of operations but also on strategic issues. NATO-EU cooperation should be stepped up. To do so, however, we need to complement this relationship with the deepening of relations between the EU and the US. Key security challenges, including terrorism and energy, cannot be

adequately addressed by NATO. In such situations, NATO must operate in conjunction with the EU.

The EU, and particularly the ESDP, being viewed either as a “counterweight” to NATO or a key element of transatlantic security, opinions in the two sides of the Atlantic diverge. However, only the latter is true for as long as the EU and the United States are effective partners: **The ESDP should develop in parallel to NATO** and competition should be avoided. A strong ESDP contributes to NATO’s interests. Since the EU is primarily a political and economic organization and NATO a military alliance, they have to use their complementary strengths and prevent unnecessary duplication. It is time to end counterproductive competition between the EU and NATO and acknowledge the mutual need for good cooperation. We should not forget that the **EU and NATO make use of the same national capabilities**, which constitute both their budget and their soldiers. However, a rigid division of labour is not desirable and it should certainly not be assumed that the EU will undertake the “soft” or civil tasks while NATO will only address the hard-core military operations. The key issue is not to ask what NATO can do for the EU or what the EU can do for NATO, but rather ask what the EU can do with NATO and vice versa. Furthermore, as neither the EU nor NATO is likely to be solely responsible for any particular crisis area, strong and practical measures are needed for enhancing integration not only within the EU, but also with the UN and its agencies, the international financial institutions and regional organizations.

The EU has established a regular consultation and cooperative military mechanisms with NATO, institutionalizing the use of NATO’s common assets while ensuring enhanced transatlantic security and mutual decision-making autonomy. The most significant cooperation mechanism is the “Berlin +” arrangements under which NATO’s collective assets and capabilities are made available to the EU for operations in which the Alliance as such is not involved. These agreements, signed

in the “NATO-EU Declaration” of December 2002, have been successfully applied in two operations: Concordia in the FYR of Macedonia and Althea in Bosnia-Herzegovina. The idea has therefore been raised to create an “inverse Berlin +” that would give NATO access to the EU’s civil and civil-military capabilities. Given the nature of the Alliance, NATO should not launch itself into an entirely new field, that is, civil operations. Yet, this does not mean that NATO cannot introduce a civil dimension to its military operations. Work is actually under way in NATO on this matter. The EU has also established a planning cell at NATO’s Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe (SHAPE) to coordinate Berlin + missions.

Although some positive achievements have to be acknowledged, it has to be recognized that disagreement remains across the two sides of the Atlantic. Due mainly to the geographical position, historical and cultural traditions and domestic pressures, the EU and the US do not necessarily share the same strategic vision on international relations. Although a dialogue between the two organizations takes place in regular meetings at various levels (PSC/NAC – EUMC/NATOMC – PMG/PCG), the real dialogue on key political issues of common interest makes little progress.

The most appropriate forum for shaping positive outcomes is a **direct EU-US dialogue**. NATO is less suitable as a forum to discuss multidimensional issues with implications beyond the political-military sphere. Although the “Transatlantic Gymnich” constitutes a transatlantic platform where wider multidimensional issues are discussed, it should not remain the only one. A more regular dialogue should be established at a political level. A discussion framework aimed at shaping common regional approaches to areas of mutual concern, such as the South Caucasus or Asia, could fulfil this need as a pilot test. At present the US is the only military super power – yet, it is reliant upon international cooperation. New powers want to climb up onto the world stage and play their role. We need an anticipatory international political leadership which has the ability of recognizing new developments in advance and shaping them in a spirit of understanding and fair compromise. A strengthening of progressive, transatlantic cooperation is paramount.

Above all, neither the United States nor the European Union can satisfy their own interests by working alone. Working together is not simply an option, it is a necessity; and cooperation must be built on the three principles of transparency,

coherence and equality. In the same vein, the EU's own operations should be developed in close cooperation with the UN in order to underpin and enhance, not compete, with the UN's own efforts.

### 3. The future of the European Security and Defence Policy: Getting closer to European citizens

The European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) constitutes an important factor of European integration and contributes to the construction of a citizen Europe. The ESDP should convey a strong image of Europe to European citizens. They will identify more easily with a Europe capable of dealing efficiently with the responsibilities it has in building a world of peace, stability and security. The European Security and Defence Policy will fail to progress swiftly without the support of the European citizens. It is therefore imperative for public opinion to be informed and to be aware of the objectives of the ESDP. The results of the European barometer show that the majority of **European citizens** is in favour of the idea of a European defence. The latest results of the "Eurobarometer" public opinion polls on the ESDP revealed that 77% of respondents support the ESDP.

The support of public opinion must be combined with the backing of the different parliamentary assemblies in charge of security and defence matters. Using their proximity with the citizens, parliamentarians, in addition to their decision-making contributions, could also deliver the essential message on security and defence issues. Citizens should be aware that all the men and women involved in developing the ESDP are at the service of the citizens of Europe, just as much as the soldiers serving their countries are.

European citizens will continue to support the ESDP and the CFSP only if coherence remains the key principle. Until now

there has not been a real common EU vision on security and defence matters and the recent enlargement of the EU has made it ever more heterogeneous. In order to solve existing problems, a strong political will is needed. Despite the good progress of the ESDP and CFSP, some issues are still characterized by controversy and a lack of political will to exit the impasse. The European Union should think about pragmatic solutions to forge political convergence and act as one. It is of the utmost importance to make the distinction, and find the best balance, between "means" and "ambitions", "realism" and "idealism".

The PES is determined to occupy a pivotal position in the shaping of a future European security and defence policy which will allow the EU to play an active role on the international scene, thus contributing to a more just, balanced and peaceful world.

# Regional cooperation:

Projecting peace  
and prosperity  
through partnership

**R**egional international organizations are of crucial importance towards overcoming antagonism and conflict among countries and people. The Council of Europe and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe have demonstrated this ability through their successful work. We must continue to support these two institutions in the future and similar institutions in other regions must be developed and strengthened.

Several experiences of regional integration are taking place in different parts of the world. Some include a political dimension, such as the African Union or the MERCOSUR, while others are just trade agreements. This phenomenon reflects the need to reach a new momentum in terms of political cooperation as well as economic and trade relations to address adequately the challenges of today's world. EU developments in the field of external relations show an increasing interest in regional or subregional organizations as partners, more pronounced in economic issues such as development, trade and the environment and less prominent vis-à-vis political issues including diplomacy and security. The EU should cooperate especially with projects of regional integration with a political dimension. The EU should also pay attention to both the economic and the political aspects in supporting the emergence or the strengthening of regional organizations and in associating them to its policies. The EU must continue to provide them with the means to become more capable in tackling security challenges on their own. However, support for local ownership does not mean "disengagement": objectives are the same and the mere difference lies in the way to attain them. For instance, the "African Peace Facility", specific to Africa, is based on the principle of local ownership. It helps the African Union (AU) and the subregional organizations taking care of African conflicts and stimulating the pursuit of an African continental solution. The AU's mission in Darfur, Sudan, is the first to be supported by the Peace Facility for Africa. This cooperation must be deepened and made more predictable in order to strengthen the capacity of the AU to plan and lead effective peace operations.

The European Union being a model, it must follow closely other experiences and share its acquired knowledge. The EU itself is a good showcase and should promote best practices. By doing so, the EU, eventually, will also be able to learn from the experiences of regional integration processes elsewhere in the world. There is a genuine interest in renewing an experience which has brought peace and prosperity.

## 1. The Balkans on the path to EU integration

The **Western Balkan countries** face several key deadlines and believe that integration within the EU remains the only way to achieve regional security, stability and economic prosperity. The EU should recognize the importance of the current political moment in South Eastern Europe, a time of genuine shaping of the region's true European character, where countries are engaged in difficult reform processes deeply transforming their societies. The progress in political and economic dialogue achieved in recent years gives the region an opportunity to be open and clear when outlining priorities and deciding actions needed to achieve sustainable economic development and good social policies aimed at improving living conditions.

The **Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe** was the first comprehensive conflict-prevention strategy of the international community, intended to strengthen the efforts of the countries of South East Europe in fostering peace, democracy, respect for human rights and economic prosperity. The Stability Pact provides a framework designed to stimulate regional cooperation and expedite integration into European and transatlantic structures. A decisive step for the transformation from an internationally led Pact to a regionally owned **Regional Cooperation Council (RCC)** was made when the Regional Table of the Stability Pact adopted the RCC Statute and endorsed the nominations of the RCC's first secretary general and the seat of the RCC Secretariat.

The region has made progress in the sphere of regional cooperation by strengthening the **South-East European Cooperation Process (SEECP)** as a political and economic framework of discussion. It provides opportunities for regional cooperation with the objective of creating an atmosphere of trust, good neighbourly relations and stability. The basic goals of regional cooperation within SEECP include the strengthening of the security and political situation,

the intensification of economic relations and cooperation in human resources, democracy, justice, and the battle against illegal activities. A special characteristic of SEECP is that it is an original form of cooperation that the countries in the region launched themselves, and not on the initiative of some other international organizations or countries. In that regard, the SEECP seeks to define itself as an authentic voice of SEE, complementary to the Stability Pact (followed by the Regional Cooperation Council) and SECI (South-east European Cooperative Initiative). SECI is an international organization with the objective of combating and improving coordination against trans-border crime in South-east Europe Customs and Police. The countries in the area work together within a mutual project through direct cooperation. The Project does not overlap with any other initiatives as it does not involve political cooperation but outright operational coordination. It works under the guidance of the recommendations and directives of INTERPOL and WCO.

106

It is of great importance to continue discussing the exit strategy of the Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe, the further development of the conditions in SEE with an emphasis on the relevance of the Euro-Atlantic integration processes and the role of SEECP as a political forum that will assume the leading role in SEE regional cooperation.

Kosovo must become a multi-ethnic society, governing itself democratically and with full respect for the rule of law as well as the highest level of internationally recognized human rights and fundamental freedoms. The EU has to work closely with Serbia to find an acceptable way of implementing the plan for Kosovo as outlined by United Nations envoy Marti Ahtisaari. The EU must keep speaking with one voice on this issue.

The PES, through the **PES Balkan Network**, its member parties and partners from South-East Europe, is committed to deeper and wider cooperation, expressed through: (1) More contacts between

parties at a local, regional, national and European level; (2) better exchange of information; (3) mutual support during electoral campaigns; (4) shared education and training of members; and (5) increased cooperation at a regional and EU level, including at Leaders level.

It is time to start a new era of regional cooperation, with new and stronger relations between political parties and national authorities. It is time to define the framework for a new regionalism, time to define a complete European future for the region by building a mutually beneficial relationship based upon a vision we all share – a vision of a new, united, democratic Europe – a Europe of tolerance, dialogue, solidarity and cooperation.

## 2. The European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP)

The ENP offers a reinforced partnership to the Eastern European countries with the aim of preventing the emergence of new dividing lines between an enlarged EU and neighbouring states. With the ENP, launched in 2004, the EU seeks to promote greater economic development, stability and better governance in its neighbourhood. Adding the number of EU inhabitants (450 million) to the number of inhabitants in the ENP partner countries and candidate countries, the total reaches about 1 billion inhabitants, a figure that cannot be neglected in the understanding of the ENP.

This project of close cooperative relations and integration with third countries called neighbours is inspired by the mechanisms of pre-accession proposed to EU candidate countries. However, it is not in any way part of the pre-accession process. On the contrary, the ENP suspends temporarily the debate regarding new membership in the EU as it does not offer the prospect of membership.

The **European Neighbourhood Policy** concerns the countries of the Mediterranean basin who became members of the

107

political framework of the Barcelona Process and whose Euro-Mediterranean Association Agreement is in force. As a member in the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership, Turkey will be eligible to regional and cross-border programs, but will not participate in the ENP since it is an EU accession candidate. It is worthwhile mentioning that the PES Leaders decided in Madrid in November 2004 to set up a **PES High Level Advisory Group on Turkey** to examine the situation in the country and EU-Turkey relations. The HLAG is assessing the progress of Turkey regarding the respect of democratic rights, women rights, minority rights, trade union rights and modern labour laws. The HLAG is monitoring the development of EU-Turkey negotiations for accession according to the political, economic and institutional criteria set in Copenhagen in 1993. The PES supports the negotiations between Turkey and the EU and the European Commission's observations and guidelines stipulating that *"this is an open-ended process whose outcome cannot be guaranteed beforehand"*. The PES HLAG is also following the role of Turkey concerning the issue of regional stability, which is of utmost importance for EUROMED relations. It is crucial that this new process is implemented so that it can actively contribute to the continuous modernization of Turkey, also in the own interest of Turkish people.

Regarding the countries of the Eastern Schengen borders, Ukraine and Moldova are currently concerned by the ENP. For justified political reasons, Belarus has been excluded and is considered ineligible. Finally, three Southern Caucasus countries, Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia, are included in the ENP as potential bordering countries in the case of Turkey's accession to EU membership. All these countries, except Israel, suffer from greatly unequal development conditions when compared to EU countries including those who became members in 2004. So far, few countries have accomplished political reforms and others have expressed their will to undertake such processes. Therefore, providing European neighbourhood agreements at the end of the ENP process can encourage step-by-step progress including full access to the internal market, participation in the European security and defence

policy and close cooperation in the field of justice and home affairs. Other important benefits are: (1) an improvement in energy network links benefiting both the EU and its partner countries; (2) an increase in trade and tourism, which can enhance transport networks and can also improve links between the partner countries; (3) cooperation in environmental matters, such as water management, waste management, air pollution and combating desertification; and (4) cooperation on legal and illegal immigration. However, the ENP should not only strengthen ties between the EU and the neighbouring countries but also promote regional integration between these countries. In order to guarantee the implementation of **Action Plans** and to execute the Neighbourhood Policy strategies between the EU and its partners but also between partners, especially for South-South or South-East projects, the **European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument (ENPI)** has been set up for the period 2007-2013. The funding available to this Instrument should reach about EUR 13 billion from the European Investment Bank over a period of 7 years. This financial support, which is higher than the one set for the period 2000-2006 - the total of MEDA and TACIS programs over 6 years was EUR 8.9 billion - is intended for those countries who have signed an Action Plan as well as Russia.

#### A **PES Working Group on Eastern European Neighbours (WG EEN)**

has been set up to assess the political development of several countries, including Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Moldova, Russia and Ukraine, and their relations with the EU.

The fact that the ENP is managed through a co-decision procedure and that the European Parliament is a joint decision maker favours public debate on EU action. The ongoing negotiations show that both the Council and the Parliament are willing to fully exercise this role. The EU should ensure that the primary and overarching objective of assistance provided under the ENPI is the eradication of poverty in the context of sustainable development, including the pursuit of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) as enshrined in the European Consensus on Development.



The EU should transmit clearer messages to its neighbours. Given the stipulated goal of the ENP, that is, to create a circle of stable, secure, democratic, prosperous and friendly countries around Europe's borders, the EU should stress its ambition to intensify political and economic cooperation, as well as its intention to spread values that will bring the periphery closer to Europe. Yet, cultural particularities which may or may not coincide with those values that are perceived as being western should be accounted for, and the EU should be careful not to standardize or Europeanize them. The EU should underline the possible areas of mutual cooperation with the different partner countries that may lead to a normative rapprochement in the long-run. A more egalitarian discourse should be adopted. Establishing bilateral relations and building those relations on the basis of individual country assessments is a positive aspect of the ENP. In this sense, the relationship must appear as one in which the partners are on an equal footing. Yet, the EU still needs to define itself vis-à-vis the ENP's 'target countries' and should not give a negative image of the West as being hegemonic and comprised of countries that, in the eyes of many, tend to impose certain ways of living and thinking. The EU should not be discriminatory nor compromise its principles. Otherwise, the EU would certainly lose its credibility, particularly in relation to the public. If countries violate international and European standards on the respect of human rights and democracy, the EU should be ready to restrict or suspend aid and even cancel agreements. The European Neighbourhood Policy distinguishes itself from US bilateral cooperation, which, in the last few years, has become an omnipresent actor in the region through the close linkage it establishes between political, economic and social reforms. The American "Broader Middle-East and North Africa" (BMENA) proposition, approved by the G8 in December 2004, emphasizes developing capacities intended for political and financial reforms and neglects the social dimensions of democratization and development.

In the meantime, civil society, which currently is not associated to the ENP elaboration nor to its evaluation, must be involved, especially in the partner countries.

### EUROMED relations: Relaunching dialogue

Globalization has made us even closer than we used to be and has progressively transformed the Mediterranean Sea into a political and economic space of fundamental importance. By capitalizing on the assets that history and geography have granted us, we should be able to shape a common destiny by building common solutions. A process whose aim is to foster relations and enhance cooperation in the region is already in place. The **Barcelona declaration** of 1995 has defined the framework for the EU, and in particular Mediterranean EU members, providing an important instrument to foster regional cooperation, confidence building measures, mutual understanding, reconciliation and Middle East Process progress. The Barcelona process has identified three spheres of dialogue: the political and security area, the economic and financial area, and the social, cultural and human one. No rigid boundary should exist between these three fields of action. They complement each other and require a coherent, non exclusive approach.

The **EMP (Euro-Mediterranean Partnership)** has to act in synergy with the ENP. The EMP has to ensure that its agenda addresses the real concerns and needs of people in this region. Any attempt to impose reforms from the outside, without the partner countries having a sufficient stake in, or firm commitment to, the processes and means employed to achieve them, is bound to fail. The relation between the ENP, the EMP and the EU's strategic Partnership with the Mediterranean and Middle East, including East-Jordan countries, has to be clearer. The EMP has to take on board the normative commitments of the bilateral Neighbourhood Policy to reinforce its regional and multilateral nature and to remain complementary to the latter.

It is important to review the dynamic of the EMP as it remains the only regional forum where political and security dialogue among all Euro-Mediterranean partners is possible.

The ENP needs to be deepened by a long term vision for the development and the stability of the region. The European Neighbourhood Policy offers a range of bilateral instruments with which the EU can contribute to making the Mediterranean Sea an area of peace and stability, an area of shared prosperity, and an area where people come together to exchange values and cultures. Yet this could prove not to be enough. It is indeed necessary for individual Member States to shape new opportunities of collaboration for the future.

Partners of South Mediterranean countries have to be considered as a whole and the multilateral and regional approach has to remain the favoured one. Advancing political reform through human rights and democracy is the key to achieve sustainable security and stability. The challenge of creating an enormous and diverse regional group promoting peace and freedom through inclusion is still vivid. Indeed, reality is far behind the aims and economic reforms have largely failed to encourage political reform. The EMP has to turn into specific actions designed to create a Euro-Mediterranean Community of Democratic States. The proposal for a “Democratic Facility” in the framework of the ENP should be made stronger. The EU must start tackling the dimension of human rights and democracy with a far greater commitment than what has been the case so far. The EMP provides an important framework for deepening political dialogue. Co-responsibility and ownership is the only formula for a **Euro-Mediterranean Community of Democratic States**. It means dealing with institutional asymmetry and integrating Southern representatives. The five-year programme decided at the Barcelona Conference in 2005 remains vague on how the aims of the civil society dialogue for 2005-2010 should be achieved. We have to guarantee that democracy in the Southern Mediterranean is not only a facade. We seek a dialogue with all forces committed to peaceful talks based on human

rights and democracy. Therefore, the Arabic Initiative must be reconsidered, relaunched and given more resources and a new Democracy Fund should be established to promote democracy, human rights, civil society and gender equality in the Muslim world through international cooperation. The 35 networks of the Anna Lindh Foundation should play a central role in this regard. There should also be a visa facility for the actors of the partnership. The **ERASMUS Mundus** programme enables students from third countries to participate to Master classes in Europe and offers EU students funding to study in third countries. The programme should be easily accessible to third country students, especially from Mediterranean countries.

Efforts have to be intensified through initiatives combating discrimination, racism and xenophobia, which have been increasing dangerously since 9/11. It is more than urgent to give a fresh boost to the Euro-Arab dialogue. In order to de-escalate extremism, it is necessary to correct misinformation and encourage constructive action. The recommendations of the report from the **“Alliance of Civilizations”** should be followed by refusing to reduce the Muslim world to the nest of terrorism. The Arab identity is not incompatible with the notion of modernity nor with democratic reforms. The westernization of Arab societies is not the only route to democracy and the rule of law. European socialists and social democrats want to intensify dialogue with the Muslim world. The aim is to promote understanding of fundamental values and cultures and to replace confrontation with dialogue. This is also a reason why the sensitive issue of migration should not only be addressed from a security angle but, rather, in a way that makes migrants and their descendants central actors in the integration process. A reflection on the links between development and migration has to be developed.

In the trade area, the signature of **Association agreements** has not produced yet the expected results. The asymmetry existing between the two coasts (economic, social and demographic) remains unchanged. The process of liberalization can have a

negative impact in the short term if not properly accompanied. Therefore, the date of 2010 for the creation of the Free Trade Agreement (FTA) should be reviewed. Moreover, the FTA can be considered as a growth opportunity only if it is adapted to the social and economic realities of the recipient countries and it further encourages the regional process. Fiscal reforms have to be set up before opening the markets. EU trade policy with South Mediterranean countries should not prevail over development goals. The fragility of some sectors has to be taken into account and the asymmetric level of development has to be considered. The FTA cannot be achieved at the expense of social disparities. It has to be associated with funds mitigating the social costs of adjustments by promoting education, training and administrative modernization. More than 30% of the population lives with less than EUR 2 a day. The absence of regional integration is recognized as one of the developmental barriers of the area due to narrow and compartmentalized markets. The Three pillars of Barcelona are linked and have to evolve at the same time to make the process successful. It cannot only be trade-focused.

Two projects, if implemented, would give space to major developments in the region and lay down the foundations for a better degree of intensity as to economic dynamics: the establishment of a **Euro-Mediterranean Development Bank** and the institution of a **Euro-Mediterranean ECOFIN**. A precise set of recommendations is necessary to clarify the scope and the mission of these entities. It is important for words to find concrete application to deliver the results needed. Since 2002 the European Union has a Facility for Euro-Mediterranean Investment and Partnership (FEMIP), administered by the European Investment Bank (EIB) and having the objective of participating in the economic and social development of the Southern Mediterranean. There is a limit to the impact this instrument can have. Although it is without doubt cheaper to set up and run a facility than to create a new entity, its 'light' nature means that it will be perceived as a short-term intervention with only little long-term stability and therefore unable to exert a profound influence on an economic system. There is another limit on the FEMIP's capacity to

function: a low demand for funding by the local market due to the limited development of the private sector. That is why it is essential to relaunch the idea of a solid international financial institution, a Euro-Mediterranean Development Bank (EMDB), with equal shareholdings held by all countries in the area and open to others, whose mission is to give priority to the support of small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), and the development of which is needed to ensure a mature process of economic and social growth for a community. In addition to the EMDB, the Euro-Mediterranean countries should push for the creation of a Mediterranean ECOFIN, that is, a forum at ministerial level having the task of coordinating the economic and financial policies of the countries in the region. A body of this kind, initially of an exclusively intergovernmental nature, would act as the starting point for a process ultimately leading to a full and solid community. While a Gas-OPEC option has been suggested by Algeria and other exporting countries, a memorandum of understanding on energy cooperation between the EU and this country, already discussed, has still not been agreed upon. A stable institutional forum would help to give our partners a stable perspective, it would help establish confidence measures, it would allow the coordination of respective agendas and finally it would do so with a regional focus. This would represent a first pilot centre aimed at achieving close cooperation also in non-economic areas for all Mediterranean countries. The creation of a solid international financial institution, supported by the introduction of a truly Mediterranean ECOFIN, could act as an instrument facilitating progress in the field of cooperation and the establishment of intense economic relations on which to build a common future.

Regarding the resolution of **conflicts in the Middle East**, the EU becomes more vocal in publicly announcing its actions. The Lebanese issue gave a new responsibility to the EU. The UNIFIL has given an input to Europe's new role in the Middle East and Lebanon.

The EU has also reiterated the need for a political perspective reinvigorating the **Middle East Peace Process (MEPP)** through

a relaunch of negotiations. The stability of the whole region is depending on the two states solution for the Israeli-palestinian conflict. The objective has to be the end of the occupation started in 1967 and the creation of an independent, democratic and viable Palestinian State coexisting in peace and security with a safe and secure Israel and its other neighbours. The EU must contribute actively and strongly to the elaboration of a political solution, respecting the road map and the UNSC resolutions. There is no unilateral and no military solution. Attacks against civilians are unacceptable and must be condemned.

We are convinced that the conflict must be the top priority of the international community as without advancing on peace talks, it will be difficult to make progress on other issues. The EU must encourage Hamas and Hezbollah to move away from violence and Iran and extremism to move towards a political process of talks and negotiations. The PES has set up a **High Level Advisory Group on the Middle East** to foster relations with the SI member parties of the region, to influence EU politics and to step up the role of the EU in the resolution of the conflict.

History has accustomed us to the idea of a frontier erected as a barrier, as a defence, as an instrument at the disposal of states to guarantee the security of their citizens. Frontiers, at least on our continent, have become a point of meeting and not of conflict, a place of exchange and not a sign of diffidence; that is, they have become a space and no longer a line. The PES will play an important role in promoting this evolution and helping the progressive actors to engage public opinion in a new constructive process. We must make this sea a new space of peace-oriented cooperation and unity, in other words, to turn also the Mediterranean into a European space.

### Engaging a new partnership with Russia

The Union's 2004 and 2007 enlargements have brought Russia closer to EU borders. As the largest neighbour of the EU, it is a

key priority of the European Union to build a strong strategic partnership with Russia. The Russian Federation is one of the most important partners for the European Union. The legal basis for EU relations with Russia is the Partnership and Cooperation Agreement, which came into force in December 1997 for an initial duration of 10 years and will be automatically extended beyond 2007 on an annual basis unless either side withdraws from the agreement. The EU is currently working with Russia on a **new agreement post-2007** to replace the existing Partnership and Cooperation Agreement (PCA). The new agreement must reflect the changes occurred since the entry into force of the PCA in 1997. At the St. Petersburg Summit in May 2003, the EU and Russia agreed to reinforce their cooperation by creating in the long term **four 'common spaces'** in the framework of the Partnership and Cooperation Agreement and on the basis of common values and shared interests<sup>6</sup>.

Russia's political stability should go along with the deepening of a democratic culture in the country. After the presidential elections of 2000, Russia has experienced a consolidation of presidential powers and a strengthening of the state. Such dynamics have taken place with a tendency towards the weakening of opposition and media independence. In general terms, President Putin's domestic policy has been characterized by his search for law and order. In practice, this has meant State control over information exchange, restriction of power for governors and less separation of powers. European socialists and social democrats pay close attention to the consolidation of democracy, civic institutions, as well as media pluralism, at a time when central State power is being reinforced after 10 years of weakening. Russia faces a great challenge in terms of effective implementation of new legislation, requiring a deep reform of the public service and of the judiciary. The issues of poverty, public health and social protection have to be tackled urgently in a country where inequalities between groups of population and regions have been growing rapidly.

6. (1) The Common Economic Space, covering economic issues and the environment; (2) The Common Space of Freedom, Security and Justice; (3) The Common Space of External Security, including crisis management and non-proliferation; and (4) The Common Space of Research and Education including Cultural Aspects.

In its resolution on the **Annual report on Human Rights in the World 2005**, the European Parliament welcomed the start of the EU Human Rights consultation with Russia in the hope for these consultations to develop “into a frank and genuine EU-Russia Human Rights dialogue”. Yet, concerns about the new NGO legislation are expressed and “*extrajudicial killings, disappearances and torture in custody in Chechnya*” must be criticized.

Russia has a new ability to wield soft power resources and to expand the economic and political influence stemming from its oil power. Energy remains a most pressing issue. Russia’s decision at the start of 2006 to temporarily cut off gas supplies to Ukraine was a wake-up call for many Europeans. Although Russia has for decades been a reliable supplier of oil and gas, many Europeans fear that this may change in the future. The State’s growing control of oil and gas production and its worrying propensity to use pipelines to serve geopolitical ends cause concern among many. The “**bilateral Energy Dialogue**”, launched at the EU-Russia Summit in Paris in October 2000, aims at securing Europe’s access to Russia’s vast oil and gas reserves (one third of the world’s known gas reserves). The dialogue is based on the assumption that interdependence between the two regions will grow - for the EU due to reasons of security of supply; on the part of Russia, to secure foreign investment and facilitate its own access to EU and world markets.

Russia now has few staunch allies among the CIS countries with the exception of, arguably, Armenia, Belarus and Kazakhstan. Most countries in the region want to determine their own destiny – although most have been ineffective and unsatisfactory in their attempts to improve their economies and build solid democracies. Russia has at times made it even harder for them. It has helped to prop up separatist regimes on the fringes of Georgia and Moldova.

A strategic partnership with Russia is indispensable for the European Union. Russia’s opening to Europe safeguards peace and stability. It brings economic prospects for people on both

sides. In our opinion, partnership and further development of democracy and the constitutional state go together. At the same time, we should not refrain from raising problematic issues with Russia when we believe it necessary.

### Cooperation with Black Sea countries

The European Commission has established a **Black Sea Cross-Border Cooperation** program under the European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument (ENPI). This program focuses on supporting civil society and local level cooperation in Black Sea coastal areas. It came into existence as a unique and promising model of a multilateral political and economic initiative aimed at fostering interaction and harmony among the Member States, as well as at ensuring peace, stability and prosperity by encouraging friendly and good neighbourly relations in the Black Sea region. The EU should be ready to strengthen contacts with the **Organization of the Black Sea Economic Cooperation**, contributing substantially to the success of the Black Sea synergy efforts.

Given its focus on regional partnership and networks, the **Black Sea Forum for Dialogue and Partnership** could be particularly useful at the non-governmental level. This is an inclusive and transparent process of reflection about the region, its identity and its future, bringing together all contributing actors with a view to fostering synergy, enhancing confidence building and facilitating achievable regional projects that address genuine regional needs. The Black Sea Forum is a process of refined interaction at various levels, led and owned by countries in the region with the support and contribution of the European and Euro-Atlantic community.

The European Union’s presence in the Black Sea area provides a chance for new perspectives and prospects. This requires a more coherent, long term effort to help fully seize these opportunities and to bring increased stability and prosperity to the region. Greater EU engagement in Black Sea regional cooperation will contribute to this goal.

### 3. EU and Africa: Bridging the gaps!

During the past few years, the African Union (AU) has become an important actor on the international stage. Its contribution to the strengthening of democracy, greater stability and conflict resolution, plays an important role for the African continent as a whole, in its regional integration and economic development. The AU has become a major interlocutor for the EU/Africa strategy. A lot is expected from AU action but the EU has to make the dialogue as productive as possible. The aims and priorities of the EU-Africa dialogue have to be taken forward in the field of human rights. The **EU-African Dialogue** was initiated in Cairo in April 2000. The second summit scheduled for Lisbon in April 2003 took place at the end of 2007. The issues at the centre of the dialogue can be synthesized under the following headings: Democracy (together with human rights and good governance), regional integration, development of the continent and prevention and settlement of conflicts. The institutional ties between the EU and the AU should be strengthened at all levels, not only through participation of the EC to the AU summits.

Democracy is perhaps the most powerful instrument we have for peace and development. Support to the fragile democracies of Africa is essential. Further efforts have to be made in this direction. EU-Africa cooperation on human resources development, universal primary education in particular, has to be deepened. Themes including support for African institutions and fight against corruption are part of good governance. In relation to the latter, the AU has introduced a "Peer review Mechanism" linked to the New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD), the continental strategy of development and the main "economic weapon" of the AU. Further pressure has to be put on countries that offer their support to non-democratic regimes.

Conflict, together with poverty, constitutes one of the major issues for Africa and the EU. Africa has 3.3 million refugees. Combined with the displaced and repatriated, the UNHCR cares for a total of 6.5 million people on the continent, soon to be one third of the worldwide total. Many are victims of conflicts that have raged for years. For the EU, the fight against illegal immigration should not prevail over the protection of refugees. Moreover, every African country has become either a country of origin, transit or destination or a combination of the three and the global response to internal displaced people is ineffective. The AU has to be assisted in this respect. The EU should make greater efforts for displaced persons by helping the AU to improve coordination and information sharing with humanitarian agencies and to gain the trust and respect of the population it is there to serve. The issue of illegal or irregular migration cannot be addressed by security considerations only and should be based on broader development frameworks and on mainstreaming migration in development strategies. In October 2006, the EU and Africa agreed on a Joint Declaration on migration and development. They agreed to be involved in a certain number of measures related to these issues. They also shared the will to have the second EU-Africa summit in Lisbon in 2007. Different initiatives have been launched for the security and development strategy of Africa in July 2006, particularly regarding governance and infrastructures partnerships. Regarding the settlement of conflicts, a Peace Facility was decided in December 2003, at the demand of the AU, to support African-led peacekeeping operations in Africa and to sustain capacity building for the emerging security structure of the African Union. The AU plays a key role in the decision-making process relating to these operations but is often lacking financial resources and under-equipped. The AU's mission in Darfur was the first to be supported by the Peace Facility agreed upon. The conflict in Sudan, which began in 2003, has killed some 200,000 people and driven millions away from their homes. The African Union Mission in Sudan (AMIS) forces, which are already in Darfur but with an inefficient conduct, need the effective deployment of the hybrid force composed of United Nations and African Union peacekeeping troops.

The EU showed its commitment to support transition through political action and assistance as well as military missions and police missions Artemis, EUPOL Kinshasa and EUSEC RD Congo. These missions were successful, securing elections and supporting the inter-Congolese dialogue and the integration of children soldiers into society. If the conflict settlement has to be ensured by humanitarian and stabilization forces, the cooperation to exit the war must have an adequate follow up. Measures to improve the governance of natural resources within the EU-African dialogue on conflict prevention have to be implemented as control of valuable resources is often a source of conflict. The AU gives priority to addressing conflicts and the EU has to continue supporting efforts, financial and military but, above all, political.

**Other priority of the dialogue:** the integration of Africa in the world economy. Africa is the forgotten continent in the world's economy and far away in terms of MDGs achievements. It should be one of the priorities of the EU. By encouraging regional integration, the EU is trying to create the basis for an African involvement in the global economy but a strategy to deepen the link between trade and development to reach the aim of poverty eradication is missing. Such an approach was foreseen by the Action Plan of the Cairo Summit but development as a field of action has not been translated into an item high on the agenda. The EU has a major role to play in supporting Africa's priorities towards development. The EU plan for Africa should be a concern of the utmost importance in the European development policy.

#### 4. Opening a new era: Cooperating with emerging powers in Asia

Asia is an extremely diverse political and economic, social and cultural, religious and geographic entity. The region includes the two most heavily populated countries in the world, namely China and India, and some of the smallest, such as Brunei and Bhutan.

India, the world's largest democracy, bears the uncomfortable presence of several countries still subject to military or theocratic dictatorships. The continent comprises some of the richest countries in the world, Japan and Singapore in the lead, while also being home to some of the poorest. Asia could not be of more central importance for the EU. The relationship is one of partnership and cooperation. Yet, the status and impact of Asia on the international system requires additional efforts. The significance of Asia must be pivotal for the EU.

EU's dialogue with **Asian countries and regional organizations** is of fundamental significance as regards global and regional security issues. Several parts of Asia, including Kashmir, Sri Lanka, Afghanistan, Aceh, Mindanao and the inter-Korean border, are still characterized by tension and are susceptible to conflict. The development of nuclear capabilities, together with the proliferation of other weapons of mass destruction, is reason of major concern. The smooth integration of China into the regional economy and polity, together with the relations between Japan and its neighbours, are crucial determinants in the evolution of the region. The EU, as a major international community actor, should find a role for itself in this process. It is clear that the emergence of an extended geopolitical area of interest by the EU, in conjunction with a broadening of its defence and security strategy, has rendered Asia a high priority on the EU agenda. More intense cooperation and involvement could enhance Asia's regional security and its role on the world stage.

In the context of the relations between the EU and Asia, the **Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN)** holds a role of prime importance as a key actor. Following the expansion of its membership to include Burma, Cambodia and Laos, ASEAN now encompasses a total of 10 South East Asian countries. The organization, also thanks to its 26 members Regional Forum, constitutes a unique locus of exchange and should be utilized as a stronger catalyst of dialogue, fostering more firmly and intensively political change, peace and stability. The biennial

**ASIA-Europe Meeting (ASEM)** and EU-ASEAN Ministerial Meeting do not constitute in their current form a satisfactory locus of cooperation and require to be more regular for an adequate dialogue laying the foundations for successful outcomes. The Nuremberg Declaration on an EU-ASEAN Enhanced Partnership, adopted at the 16th EU-ASEAN Ministerial Meeting in Nuremberg in March 2007 as a major contribution to taking EU-ASEAN relations to a higher level, recognizes the need to strengthen and deepen EU-ASEAN relations in the fields of political and security, economic and social and development cooperation. Bilateral summits with China, India and Japan, placed within a wider framework of intense multilevel dialogue, already show some progress in this regard, establishing stronger commitments to reinforcing political relations. Direct involvement on the part of the EU in the specific regional security issues which characterize the inter-Asian relations of these three countries remains nevertheless underdeveloped. While dialogue frequency and channels are evolving positively, there is a need for the EU to address those disputes, initiating a communication process aimed at the immediate engagement in issues which are regional in their nature and global in their impact. Contacts with Australia and New Zealand need to be strengthened. The EU, Australia and New Zealand share similar views in the field of foreign and security policy. The two countries play an active role in regional security questions and in regional economic cooperation through, inter alia, the **ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF)** and the **Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC)**. Their strong relations with, and their solid involvement in, Asia renders them an invaluable bridge instrument between the EU and Asia.

The wider Asian and Asia-Pacific region accounts for 56% of the world's population, 25% of world's GNP and 22% of world's international trade. In relation to the EU, Asia accounts for 21% of EU's external exports and is our third-largest regional trading partner. Asian countries also constitute both the recipient and the source of a significant share of foreign investment flows. Within the WTO, Asia plays a role of prime importance. China's entry into the WTO has the potential of a most positive effect

on the organization. Eight Asian countries, however, are on the UN Least-Developed list. Asia accounts for two-thirds of the world's poor, with 800 million people living on less than USD 1 per day. Questions of food-security, health and access to basic services are still pressing issues in the lower-income countries of the region. Serious disparities of income and opportunity are shared by middle-income states. The EU and Member States are attempting to tackle these critical issues as major donors, with 30% of total aid flows to developing Asia. We hope for stronger efforts on the part of the EU, with or without the assistance and contribution of Member States and other international actors. The economic miracle achieved by South-east Asian countries from the 1970s through to the 1990s was followed by the 1997 financial crisis. The crisis underlined the need for a more comprehensive approach to development. Economic growth does not constitute alone an indicator of success. Development must not be reduced to the attainment of economic goals and must be accompanied by institutional, social, educational, health care, environmental and infrastructure reform.

Asia is a crucial partner of the EU. The past few years have witnessed a substantial increase in cooperation and interaction as the EU has become increasingly conscious of the centrality of this partnership. The EU, however, must advance political contact further. We strongly believe that constructive dialogue aimed at the protection of human rights and the spreading of democracy and the rule of law should be at the very foundations of bilateral and multilateral negotiations between the EU and its Asian partners. The EU must strengthen its efforts vis-à-vis Asia to address adequately global security and environmental issues including democratization, terrorism, migration and climate change.

Europe must also develop a genuine strategy vis-à-vis **Central Asian Countries**. After 15 years of independence, the five Central Asian republics are still in the process of transformation, fluctuating between quasi market economy and guided democracy. The countries in the region – Kazakhstan,



Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan – rely upon “authoritarian modernization”. The state initiates reforms which in many cases preserve the power of elites rather than serving the needs of the people. In general terms two scenarios can be formulated: one in which the region will push forward democratic reform and another, more regrettable, where these countries will create a façade democracy. “Authoritarian modernization” progresses and democratic success is still endangered by political and economic instability and corruption. The EU must send a clear message, advocating for these countries to push ahead with genuine reforms and modernization. A clear “no” must be expressed by Europe to the governments’ desire to enforce stability to the detriment of human rights. EU policy should be centred on change through a role model. The partnership and cooperation agreements of the EU also serve this purpose.

The United States and Russia have opposing interests in the region; while Russia would like to use the republics as sources of energy in order to supply its own southern regions directly, and European neighbours indirectly, the US is planning to bring Central Asia and South Asia closer. Washington’s aim is to open up Central Asia to the south, to supply South Asia with energy resources and to stabilize Afghanistan. The EU should be guided by the principles of democratic reforms, the goal of stability and the creation of a peaceful, stable environment. There is a further need to focus on the EU’s energy security. Until now, the political will required for approaching this goal has been lacking in Europe. Time is running, certainly not for the best, and the EU should strengthen its ties with the countries in the region.

## 5. EU and Latin America: Beyond a trade partnership

Latin America’s political weight on the international stage is growing. As a strong partner, the EU should give a further boost to consolidate its position within the multilateral system. Latin America is facing many challenges and the EU should create

synergies to strengthen stability and prosperity by giving a new impetus to the political dialogue. Cooperation has to target the political objectives of the partnership, namely fostering social cohesion, combating poverty and social inequity as well as promoting regional integration.

The new political face of Latin America, shifting to the left, is of crucial importance. This is an historic opportunity to create more and deeper links between us. It is our ambition to get more involved in the dialogue with Latin America’s left governments and parties by focusing on common topics, beyond the internal divergences. There is a window of opportunity for joint initiatives. More generally, better mutual understanding and knowledge is necessary to adapt to the new challenges. The PES can contribute by, inter alia, encouraging the Socialist International to put this dialogue higher on the agenda.

In parallel to the bi-regional strategy between the EU and Latin America, the EU has initiated a number of specialist dialogues with subregional groups, such as the MERCOSUR, the Andean Community and Central America, and with specific countries, including Mexico and Chile. Further steps towards regional and subregional integration will strengthen the strategic bi-regional EU-LA partnership, facilitating progress towards an effective international multilateral system, while at the same time accelerating economic growth. Politically, they will allow Latin America to become a more influential player on the global scene. In economic terms, they will help the region to fulfil its potential, to improve the inter-connectivity of its network infrastructures and to facilitate the integration of individual countries into the international markets. The signature of the Political and Association Agreement with MERCOSUR has to be concluded immediately to give a new impulsion to regional integration. However, should the Political and Association Agreement be signed in its current form, it would only benefit the large agricultural companies of MERCOSUR and the transnational corporations established within the European Union. The Political and Association Agreement entails considerable

risks for MERCOSUR in the fields of regional development, technology transfer, assistance to disadvantaged people, consumer protection and the environment. A fairer and more equitable approach is necessary for the negotiations to be finalised and for the Agreement to be a mutual and real success. The European Union, on its part, has to acknowledge the limits of the negotiations and set the preconditions for exiting the impasse. A more equitable Agreement would still grant European transnational corporations free access to MERCOSUR public markets. Yet, it would also satisfy the needs of small and medium enterprises, which play a vital role towards structural development and the labour market. In parallel to the process of the Political and Association Agreement, the creation of common institutions and of social funds would be welcome to that end. We have to recall that regional integration has to be prioritized even when taking into account the diversity of the whole region.

This inclination to further cooperation, together with the will and the potential to be a more active actor on the international stage, makes of Latin America an ideal partner in peace keeping missions for collective security. Latin America has long-standing experience in the fields of civil war management and post-conflict rehabilitation and could contribute significantly to the needs of the international system.

The question of a suitable framework for dialogue remains pending but the institutionalization of the relations needs to be completed. A step has been achieved with the creation of a EuroLat Parliamentary Assembly inaugurated on 8 November 2006 with the first session of its three committees (“Political Affairs”, “Economic Development, Finance and Trade”, “Social Affairs, Human Exchanges, Environment, Education and Culture”). This constitutes a positive stimulus to strengthening the parliamentary dimension of the EU and Latin America. Commitments should now be put into action. Regarding the existing biennial summits with rotated Presidency, there should be more implementation measures between one summit and another. The establishment of a representative institution in Latin America could ensure this follow up, bringing stability and continuity to the dialogue.

The integration process has fundamentally changed the European continent. The EU should share its experiences and lessons more proactively in a region where common cultures and values make it easier to replicate the successful European model of regional integration. MERCOSUR can affect the political, economic and social course of Latin America. The EU must ensure that MERCOSUR will be another success story.

## 6. A new strategic partnership for transatlantic relations

The transatlantic relationship has a fundamental impact vis-à-vis the EU’s standing in the international system. The United States is the world’s only superpower and a major financial and political heavyweight. The EU shares fundamental values with the US concerning democracy, human rights and stability in the world. The US is a deciding factor for the course of history and people’s security, opportunities and welfare. With the expansion of the EU to include 27 Member States, the European Union project has assumed an entirely new dimension. The total gross national product of the EU is today on a par with that of the US. The EU has more than 450 million inhabitants and the largest exporting power in the world. The EU and the US represent 10% of the world population, account for about 40% of world trade and over 60% of world GDP and are each other’s main trading partners, representing the largest bilateral trade relationship in the world. It is self-explanatory why the EU should be committed to working in partnership with the United States. When the EU and the US share common ambitions, the world can expect positive developments. With the close relation that is uniting us, we must reserve the right and duty to criticize America’s policies when we believe it necessary. The US and the EU share basic values such as human rights and democracy, but we are not indifferent to who governs America. The policies of the conservative Bush Administration contain some important exceptions to these shared values. Its policies embrace some important elements with which European socialists and social democrats cannot agree, such as those concerning death penalty, opposition to the International

Criminal Court, reproductive health (abortion), the importance of the UN, the use of torture and binding international agreements on disarmament and the environment. In these areas we clearly have more common values with European countries and progressive forces in America. It is for this reason that European socialists and social democrats should on the one hand pursue a European path more strongly, and on the other hand work with progressive forces in America, while simultaneously engaging in a more critical dialogue with the Bush government.

The US no longer is a signatory to the **Kyoto Protocol**. According to the Bush Administration, binding caps on emissions, mainly from burning coal and oil, would have a detrimental impact on US jobs and Kyoto wrongly excluded developing nations from the first round lasting until 2012. The decision on the part of the US to focus on voluntary goals for cutting the amount of carbon emitted per dollar of economic output by 18% in the decade to 2012, a lower target than Kyoto's caps, is not sufficient. The promise to favour big investments in new technologies, such as hydrogen or "clean coal", does not represent a satisfactory commitment. The European Union is at the lead of international efforts to combat climate change and has played a key role in the development of the two major treaties addressing the issue, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and its Kyoto Protocol. The US, considering its world system status and its environmental impact, should be at the forefront in, and one of the most fervent proponents of, effective strategies concerning the environment and climate change. Despite divergences concerning Kyoto, the EU and the US agreed to establish a dialogue in recognition of the serious and linked challenges in tackling climate change, promoting clean energy and achieving sustainable development globally. We consider this an important initiative and a considerable step forward to overcome differences constructively. Dialogue, however, must be followed by commitments and implementation. We cannot afford to relegate the environment to the margins of security challenges as a peripheral issue.

The yearly summits between the president of the European Commission and the European Council and the president of the United States constitute the highest-level forum of a much wider, multilevel, intensive dialogue. The gradual identification of the EU as a defence and security community is generating the preconditions for an EU-US partnership based on synergy, complementarity and cooperation. The EU and the US recognize their responsibility to respond to global challenges including civil conflicts, the threat of the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, international terrorism, the fragile peace process in the Middle East and climate change by promoting peace, stability, democracy and development around the world. The need to address these issues is acknowledged by the **New Transatlantic Agenda (NTA)**, marking the shift from a relationship of consultation to one of joint action. A Joint EU-US Action Plan, with its extensive list of specific actions to which the EU and the US have committed themselves, complements the NTA. Commitments, however, must be reflected in determination to ensure firm efforts and genuine will to fulfil obligations. It is evident that stronger efforts are necessary for the attainment of these ambitious objectives.

The PES has launched a **transatlantic dialogue** in 2003 to foster relations with the US Democrats on new policy approaches to key international challenges including Weapons of Mass Destruction, climate change and Decent Work. The "Global Alliances for the 21st Century" dialogue has been renamed Global Progress in 2005.



# Our role as Party of European Socialists

**E**uropean socialists and social democrats are willing to take on their share in the joint effort directed at reforming international institutions and strengthening international cooperation in pursuit of the common objectives of global peace, development and justice.

In this collective cause, we are willing to work with progressive forces around the world. As EU Member States are not capable of winning the challenges posed by globalization alone and are looking at joining forces through the European Union, so must European socialists and social democrats unite at the international level. Primarily with member parties of **Socialist International** across the globe, European socialists and social democrats will engage in dialogue and cooperation aimed at influencing EU and international institutions' policy.

However, the **PES** should also look beyond the traditional social democratic family and build alliances with progressive political parties from other continents.

In synergy with SI, the PES parliamentary group in the European Parliament, the PES political group in the Committee of the Regions, ECOSY, IUSY and the **Global Progressive Forum (GPF)**, we are committed to initiating dialogue, promoting new ideas and taking actions, making a real difference. Our duty is to build a strong alliance with progressives, trade unions, social movements and NGOs which will promote an agenda with social justice and social progress at its core.

The international trade union movement, which has united under the banner of ITUC, International Trade Union Confederation, is a strategic partner of the GPF. The involvement of the Global Progressive Forum in the World Social Forum, as member of the International Council, constitutes an additional instrument to commence a new convergence with social movements.

EU development policy should be participatory and receive contributions from a broad range of **European civil society partners** - working with development NGOs, but also local government, women's and youth groups, trade unions, business associations and academia. It is important for the EU to involve civil society, building on local ownership and participation. This means strengthening the voices of local people and giving them the opportunity of bringing about changes to their social and economic conditions with PES' support.

The **PES Foundation for European Progressive Studies**, established end of 2007, as well as social democratic foundations and think tanks are associated to the new reflection on the EU role on the international scene.

This strategy is a compulsory path to achieve our ideal of a **sustainable peace** for the world. A sustainable peace guided by the principle of solidarity through democratic international institutions promoting peace and human development.

<b>ACP</b>	African, Caribbean and Pacific countries
<b>APEC</b>	Asian-Pacific Economic Cooperation
<b>ASEAN</b>	South-East Asian Countries
<b>ATT</b>	Arms Trade Treaty
<b>AU</b>	African Union
<b>BSS</b>	Basic Social Services
<b>BWI</b>	Bretton Woods Institutions (IMF and the World Bank)
<b>CERF</b>	Central Emergency Response Fund
<b>CFSP</b>	Common Foreign and Security Policy
<b>CPA</b>	Cotonou Partnership Agreement
<b>CSOs</b>	Civil Society Organizations
<b>DDA</b>	Doha Development Agenda
<b>DPS</b>	Development Policy Statement
<b>EBA</b>	Everything But Arms initiative
<b>EC</b>	European Commission
<b>EMP</b>	Euro-Mediterranean Partnership
<b>ENP</b>	European Neighbourhood Policy
<b>EPAs</b>	Economic Partnership Agreements
<b>ESDP</b>	European Security and Defence Policy
<b>ESS</b>	European Security Strategy
<b>EU</b>	European Union
<b>FAO</b>	Food and Agriculture Organization
<b>FTA</b>	Free Trade Agreement
<b>GATS</b>	General Agreement on Trade in Services
<b>GSP</b>	Generalized System of Preferences
<b>ILO</b>	International Labour Organization
<b>IFF</b>	International Finance Facility
<b>IFIs</b>	International Financial Institutions
<b>LDC</b>	Least Developed Country
<b>MAE</b>	Multilateral Agreements on Environment
<b>MDGs</b>	Millennium Development Goals
<b>MFN</b>	Most-Favoured Nation
<b>NAMA</b>	Non-Agricultural Market Access
<b>NATO</b>	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
<b>NGO</b>	Non-Governmental Organization
<b>NPT</b>	Non-Proliferation Treaty of Nuclear Weapons
<b>NTA</b>	New Transatlantic Agenda
<b>ODA</b>	Official Development Aid
<b>OSCE</b>	Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe
<b>RTA</b>	Regional Trade Agreement
<b>SA/LW</b>	Small Arms and Light Weapons
<b>SDT</b>	Special and Differential Treatment
<b>SIAs</b>	Sustainable Impact Assessments
<b>TDCA</b>	Trade, Development and Cooperation Agreement (EU-South Africa)
<b>UNDP</b>	United Nations Development Programme
<b>UNGA</b>	United Nations General Assembly
<b>UNSC</b>	United Nations Security Council
<b>WMD</b>	Weapons of Mass Destruction
<b>WSSD</b>	World Summit on Sustainable Development
<b>WTO</b>	World Trade Organization
<b>YEN</b>	Youth Employment Network

# Authors

## Jean Asselborn

was born on 27 April 1949 and now lives in the town of Steinfort, where he served as mayor between 1982 and 2004. In 1967 he left school to work for Uniroyal laboratories. He then became involved in the trade union movement and was soon elected to the post of youth representative of the Federation of Luxembourg Workers (Lëtzebuenger Aarbechterverband), precursor to the current OGB-L (Independent Federation of Trade Unions of Luxembourg). In 1968 he joined the civil administration of Luxembourg City, but left a year later to return to Steinfort and serve in the local administration. In 1976 he enrolled in evening classes and obtained his secondary education diploma from the Athénée de Luxembourg. Shortly thereafter, he was appointed administrator of the inter municipal hospital of Steinfort. He then enrolled as a student at the University of Nancy, where he was awarded a master's degree in private judicial law in October 1981, only three days before his first election to the post of mayor of the municipality of Steinfort. In 1984 he was elected to the Luxembourg Parliament for the first time and has been returned to his seat there at each subsequent election. In 1989 he was appointed head of the parliamentary group of the Luxembourg Socialist Workers' Party (LSAP), and was elected chairman of the party in 1997. From 1999 to 2004, he served as vice-president of the Luxembourg Parliament. In addition to his national mandate, he was appointed member of the Committee of the Regions of the European Union and served as vice-president of the Party of the European Socialists from 2000 to 2004. In July 2004, following the June 2004 parliamentary elections, Jean Asselborn was appointed deputy prime minister and minister for Foreign Affairs and Immigration.



*Jean Asselborn, coordinator of the PES ministers of Foreign Affairs Network, minister of Foreign Affairs, LSAP, Luxembourg.*

## André Flahaut

was born in Walhain in 1955. He holds a master's degree in Politics and Public Administration from the ULB. He joined the PS in 1973. In 1979 he worked at the Emile Vandervelde Institute, study centre of the Parti socialiste. He served as chairman of the PS federation of Walloon Brabant from 1983 to 1995. In 1989 he held the post of manager of the Emile Vandervelde Institute. He served as councillor of Walhain between 1982 and 1994 and provincial councillor of Brabant from 1987 to 1991. In 1994, 1995 and 2003 he was elected member of Parliament but was replaced to attend to his duties as minister. He was appointed minister for Civil Service in 1995 and held this function until 1999. André Flahaut was minister for Defence from 1999 to 2007. He is currently a member of the federal Parliament.



*André Flahaut, coordinator of the PES Defence ministers and spokespersons Network, former minister of Defence, PS, Belgium.*

# Heidemarie Wieczorek-Zeul

After studying English and History at the University of Frankfurt (1961-1965), Heidemarie Wieczorek-Zeul was a teacher at the Friedrich Ebert School in Rüsselsheim for almost ten years. In 1965, she joined the Social Democratic Party of Germany (SPD). She began her political career as a councillor in Rüsselsheim and as a member of the District Council of Groß-Gerau. From 1974 to 1977, she was federal chairperson of the SPD Youth Organization "Jungsozialisten" (Young Socialists). In the 1980s she became a member of the SPD Party Executive and of the SPD Presidium. She was the deputy chairperson of the SPD from 1993 to 2005. In 1979, Heidemarie Wieczorek-Zeul moved into European politics, becoming a member of the European Parliament. There she worked in particular in the Committee on External Economic Relations and in the Committee on Women's Rights and Gender Equality. The main focus of her work during this time was on foreign trade, European development policy and international agreements. She has been a member of the German Bundestag since 1987. She represents the constituency of Wiesbaden, which elected her directly with large majorities at the last three elections. She was the SPD Parliamentary Group's spokesperson on European policy until 1998. Heidemarie Wieczorek-Zeul has been the federal minister for Economic Cooperation and Development since October 1998. During this time, she has campaigned in particular for debt relief for the poorest heavily indebted countries, an equitable world trade order and an increase in development spending. She was instrumental in the EU Member States' decision to increase their official development aid to 0.7% by 2015. Since 1998, two major debt relief initiatives for the developing countries, amounting to in excess of



Heidemarie  
Wieczorek-Zeul,  
*coordinator of the  
PES Development  
ministers and  
spokespersons  
network, federal  
minister for Eco-  
nomic Cooperation  
and Development,  
SPD, Germany.*

USD 100 billion, have been launched at international level with German support. Minister Wieczorek-Zeul has made the fight against HIV/AIDS a priority area of German development policy. Together with the members of the Utstein Group, she has supported the initiatives launched by the then World Bank president, James Wolfensohn, to reform the World Bank. In 2004, 100 years on from the forced displacement and murder of the Herero and Nama in Namibia, she became the first German minister to ask forgiveness for the crimes committed during the colonial period.

# Carin Jämtin

was born in Stockholm in 1964. She is married and has two children. She studied at Stockholm University (1987-1989). She started her career as treasurer, in the Swedish Social Democratic Youth League (1992-1994). She then became chairperson of the National Council of Swedish Youth Organizations (1993-1995). From 1994 to 1995, she was acting secretary of the Swedish Social Democratic Youth League. In 1995-1996, she was Swedish Social Democratic Party official. In 1996-1997, she became member of the Reference Group on a New Swedish African Policy. From 1996-1999, she was policy officer at the Olof Palme International Center, of which she became deputy secretary general (1999-2003). Since 2001, Carin Jämtin has been Board member of Stockholm Consumers Cooperative Society. From 2003 to 2006, she was Sweden's minister for Development and Cooperation. Since 2006, Carin Jämtin is vice oppositional mayor of Stockholm.



Carin Jämtin,  
*former minister  
for International  
Cooperation,  
PES Presidency  
member, SAP,  
Sweden.*

## Espen Barth Eide

was born on 1 May 1964. He studied political science at the University of Oslo and Ciencias Políticas, Universidad Autónoma de Barcelona. He started his professional career as political adviser to the Labour Party in the Oslo Municipal Government in 1988. A few years later he became project director and acting secretary general of the Norwegian European Movement during the campaign preceding Norway's 1994 referendum on membership to the European Union (1991-1994). From 1994 to 1996, he was researcher at the Norwegian Institute of International Affairs (NUPI), then Director of NUPi's UN Programme (1996-2000). In the first Stoltenberg (Labour) Government, which lasted from 2000 to 2001, he was state secretary (deputy Foreign minister) at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. From 2002-2005 he was director of the Department of International Politics at NUPI. Since 2005, he is secretary of state for Defence in the Norwegian government (Stoltenberg II). Espen Barth Eide has been an active member of the Norwegian Labour Party since 1979. He has held several positions in the Labour Party Youth (early 1980s), later in the Norwegian Labour Party particularly in relation to the international work of the party.



*Espen Barth Eide, secretary of state for Defence, PES Presidency member "Foreign Affairs", DNA, Norway.*

**Alain Richard** was born on 29 August 1945 in Paris. He studied Law, Political Science, Literature and History. In 1971 he entered the Conseil d'Etat (High Court for public matters and legal firm of the Government) as junior member, while teaching Public Law and Finance in universities. A socialist activist since his college years, he was elected as mayor of Saint-Ouen l'Aumône, a Paris suburb, in 1977 and has been reelected ever since; he served as vice-mayor during his time in government. He was also leader, 1989-1997, of the inter-city corporation in charge of developing the new town of Cergy-Pontoise (now 190,000 inhabitants and 85,000 jobs). He was elected MP for Val d'Oise (North of Paris region) in 1978 and reelected until 1993, then elected senator in 1995. In Parliament, he specialized first in legal affairs, later in finance and public management, with a commitment in European and Atlantic relations. He acted as socialist whip in the Legal Committee, then as majority leader in the Finance Committee, during the first two terms of Socialist majority (1981-1986 and 1988-1993). After the victory of the Left, he served as minister of Defence from June 1997 to May 2002. In this capacity, under Jospin's leadership, he carried out a complete restructuring of the French armed forces following the decision of ending the draft and going professional, and he monitored the reorganization of defence industries (EADS, Thales, DCNS). He contributed to the first steps of ESDP, starting with the preparation of the Saint-Malo Franco-British initiative and developing with the new tools in Brussels and the first common operations. He now serves as senior member in the Conseil d'Etat. A long-standing member of the national board of the Parti Socialiste, he sits in the PES presidency since May 2003.



*Alain Richard, former minister of Defence, PES Presidency member "Defence", PS, France.*



# Luciano Vecchi

was born in 1961. Modenese, he is married and has one daughter. In the 1980s Luciano Vecchi was an executive of the Italian Federation of Communist Youth (FGCI), first in Modena and then nationally. He served as International Secretary and he was involved in the activities of the International Union of Socialist Youth (IUSY). From 1989 to 1999, during his post as member of the European Parliament, he was also secretary general of the Democratici di Sinistra (DS) Delegation. At the European Parliament he held several institutional offices as member of various committees. He was vice chairman of the EU-Turkey Joint Parliamentary Committee (1989-1991), deputy chairman of the ACP-EU Assembly (1992-1999) and coordinator of the Socialist Group in the Cooperation and Development Committee. From 1999 to 2001 he held the post of senior assistant to the deputy secretary of state for Foreign Affairs, dealing with Africa, the Mediterranean and Development Cooperation. Following the Congress of Pesaro, Luciano Vecchi was appointed coordinator of the DS International Department and deputy director of Foreign Affairs. Luciano Vecchi has been at the head of Foreign Affairs for the DS since February 2005, becoming member of the national party leadership. Since the Porto Congress (2006) he has been a member of the PES Presidency. Since 2002 he has been representing DS in several bodies of the Socialist International (Ethic Committee and Committee for Finances and Administration). He was active in the creation of the Democratic Party in Italy. He was elected member of the National Constituent Assembly by the primary elections (October 2007) and member of the National Coordination Committee of the Democratic Party (November 2007).



*Luciano Vecchi,  
international  
secretary,  
PES Presidency  
member "Develop-  
ment policy",  
DS, Italy.*