

# EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

1999



2004

---

*Session document*

4 April 2002

B5-0191/2002

## **MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION**

further to the Council statement

pursuant to Rule 37(2) of the Rules of Procedure

by André Brie, Pedro Marset Campos, Luigi Vinci and Alexandros Alavanos

on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group

on the common security and defence policy of the EU

**European Parliament resolution on the common security and defence policy of the EU**

*The European Parliament,*

- having regard to the Charter of the United Nations,
  - having regard to the conclusions of the European Council meetings of Cologne, Helsinki, Lisbon, Feira, Laeken and Nice on the European security and defence policy,
  - having regard to the EU Programme for the Prevention of Violent Conflicts,
  - having regard to the decision of the Göteborg European Council on EU-UN cooperation in conflict prevention and crisis management,
  - having regard to UN Security Council resolution 1396 (2002) of 28 February 2002 on Bosnia-Herzegovina,
- A. whereas the UN Charter forms the political and international legal basis for ensuring peace and international security,
- B. having regard to Articles 1 and 2 of the Charter of the United Nations, especially to Article 2, paragraph 4, which reads: ‘All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations’,
- C. whereas Article 24/1 of the UN Charter states that the UN Security Council bears the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security,
- D. whereas the UN Member States must comply with the obligations enshrined in the UN Charter to bring about peaceful settlements of conflicts and to respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all states and the right of peoples to self-determination,
- E. whereas the European Parliament in Resolution A4-0162/97 pointed out that the security policy of the European Union should be based on a plan for global and common security to be achieved by cooperation based on the principles of equality, justice and reciprocity; whereas the preconditions for such security are cooperation, confidence-building measures, transparency, gradual disarmament, conversion and demilitarisation and freedom from the constant threat of hunger, disease and repression,
- F. whereas the US is using the threat of terrorism and efforts to fight it to develop a unilateral approach in numerous areas and to strengthen its hegemony in the world,
- G. whereas the recent declarations by President Bush on the ‘axis of evil’ seem likely to be followed by new military operations in other regions of the world,

- H. whereas the United States has recently threatened a series of other States with the use of its nuclear arsenal; whereas the United Kingdom, too, does not exclude the use of nuclear weapons,
- I. whereas the EU's greatest contribution to the prevention of terrorism worldwide should be measures to eliminate the main causes of terrorism and to promote the building or rebuilding of democratic institutions, social and economic infrastructure, good governance and a vibrant civil society all over the world,
- J. whereas the actions against terrorism should not impinge on the political, social and human rights of citizens, and should not be a pretext for supporting or accepting repressive acts by governments against their citizens and other States,
- K. whereas there is a technological gap between the United States and the Member States of the European Union which even in the long term cannot be overcome; whereas participation in an arms race with the United States is counterproductive for European and international security as well as for the economies of the present and future Member States of the European Union,
- L. whereas the trend towards replacing the system of international relations based on law with a system of international policy based on military power is a dangerous one, which will lead to a new arms race and proliferation of weapons of mass destruction; whereas the position of the United States as a superpower would be strengthened in such a system of international relations,
- M. whereas the European Union has strong potential in the field of crisis prevention because of its economic strength, its historical relations with countries all over the world, its civil society values and other aspects; whereas this potential should be the basis for strengthening the international position of the EU,
- N. whereas the experience of Europe itself shows that conflicts cannot be solved by military means; whereas the European Union itself is a successful example of conflict prevention by peaceful means which could be an interesting model for other regions of the world,
1. Is opposed to the manner in which the current security policy of the EU and its Member States is dominated by military considerations and the fact that crisis prevention does not play the role it should;
  2. Is critical of the fact that with the incorporation of the Petersberg tasks the European Union has established the option of military intervention by combat forces in crisis areas all over the world, including peace-making;
  3. Emphasises that in order to ensure lasting peace and international security it is necessary and indeed feasible to switch from a security plan determined by military considerations to a civil security system which addresses the economic, social, ecological, ethnic and cultural causes of conflicts and adopts a preventive approach to defuse and tackle the causes of foreseeable and acute conflict situations in Europe and worldwide;

4. Is critical of the development that in the post-11 September world the fight against international terrorism is being carried out by military means and misused to change international relations towards superpower dominance and violent interference in the internal affairs of other countries; criticises the Member States of the European Union for not using their opportunities as allies of the United States to restrain this dangerous policy rather than following it;
5. Stresses that the European Union should define its own security interests and advocate them in its relations with the United States; reaffirms its view that only a comprehensive preventive, cooperative, civil security policy, international relations on the basis of mutual respect, equality, democracy and cooperation, the strengthening of the United Nations and a revitalised OSCE is in the security interests of the EU, its Member States and neighbours; requests the European Council and the Commission to explain and insist in their relations with the United States on these European security interests;
6. Deplores the fact that the European Union has, thus far, not clearly expressed its commitment to the unique responsibility of the UN Security Council and thereby holds open the option of self-mandating for peace-making and peace-keeping missions; urges the European Council to state clearly that operations in the framework of the EU common security and defence policy can only be carried on with a mandate from the Security Council and in accordance with the rules of the United Nations Charter;
7. Notes that the defence of the territory of the EU Member States is not a part of the common security and defence policy of the EU;
8. Stresses that military production in the European Union should be strictly limited to military equipment for defence purposes; reaffirms its position that democratic control over military production and trade is of major importance and that, bearing in mind the closer European cooperation between military industries, national parliaments and the European Parliament should be involved in such democratic control; calls for additional incentives for the conversion of arms industries;
9. Notes that the European Council, through the Programme for the Prevention of Violent Conflicts, has reaffirmed the commitment of the European Union to pursue conflict prevention as one of the main objectives of the EU's external relations and initiated a process of improving the conflict prevention mechanisms;
10. Notes, however, that instruments of this kind can only be effective if the political will is there to engage in speedy crisis prevention focusing on the causes of crises and if the objective of preventing conflicts is at the centre of foreign and security policy;
11. Stresses that common positions of the EU on international policy could be an important factor for international peace and security and for strengthening the EU's role in the international arena; criticises the Member States for their inability, in many cases, to agree on common positions and for very often not following agreed common positions; notes that this situation weakens the international position of the European Union;
12. Calls on the Presidency of the European Council to undertake, in cooperation with the

Commission, a comprehensive needs-based study on civilian crisis management capabilities, to enable the EU to define its goals in the areas of civil administration, to refine and extend its capability goals in other areas of civilian crisis management, and to ensure that identified crisis management needs can be met by coherent and concerted deployment of Member States' capabilities and Community instruments, and that these efforts are integrated with and support longer-term conflict prevention initiatives;

13. Calls further on the Presidency to report in full, in its proposed report on conflict prevention (Seville), on all progress that has been made in line with the recommendations of the Göteborg Action Plan, the Commission Communication and Parliament's report on conflict prevention adopted on 16 December 2001; in particular, on the issues of mainstreaming of conflict prevention in all EU external relations, the involvement of international and local civil societies in activities for conflict prevention and management, and intensified cooperation with the UN and the OSCE;
14. Stresses the importance of the economic, social, democracy and human rights aspects of security; emphasises that the elimination of economic and social disparities, the strengthening of democracy and the protection of human and minority rights in Europe and worldwide constitutes the decisive aspect of crisis prevention;
15. Notes the offer made by the European Union to provide an EU Police Mission (EUPM), from 1 January 2003, to follow the end of UNMIBH's mandate, as part of a coordinated rule of law programme, and the EU's intention to also involve non-EU Member States in the EUPM; notes the UN Security Council's acceptance of this offer and the fact that this mission will be carried out in close cooperation with the UN; requests the Council and the Commission to report regularly on the preparation and implementation of this mission before the European Parliament;
16. Reiterates its view that the control and restraint of arms exports and disarmament, as well as an efficient policy to counter the global proliferation of small arms to regions of tension and to all types of official and less official combatants, should be an important and efficient measure to prevent and manage violent conflicts; calls in particular for Member States to apply a binding code of conduct on the arms trade, prohibiting the supply of arms and other military, paramilitary and security equipment to areas of conflict and to countries which do not respect human rights; reaffirms its view that the final aim should be the reduction and prohibition of arms exports;
17. Notes that 12 years after the fall of the Berlin wall Europe has no comprehensive security system covering all countries of the continent, that NATO, WEU and the OSCE act in parallel with the emerging EU security and defence policy, that European countries such as Russia, Ukraine and many others are excluded; emphasises that it is high time to remedy this situation radically by the dissolution of NATO and the WEU and the construction of a new and comprehensive security architecture for the whole of Europe; emphasises that European security can only be built in close cooperation with Russia;
18. Emphasises that, owing to its basic security policy orientation, its composition and its democratic structure and human rights focus, the OSCE is the most appropriate framework for an overall European security system; regrets the lack of political will to

develop the OSCE and realise its full potential; calls on the European Union and its Member States decisively to contribute towards strengthening the OSCE and endowing it with adequate material and financial resources;

19. Recommends the early establishment of a fully-fledged parliamentary delegation for relations between the European Parliament and the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly;
20. Criticises the fact that the national parliaments as well as the European Parliament have so far been practically excluded from the decision-making processes on the EU's security and defence policy; urges that the parliamentary dimension of the common European foreign, security and defence policy be developed and that the parliaments should be fully involved in all the stages of the development and implementation of this new policy; urges the Convention to take the appropriate decisions;
21. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the European Council, the Commission, the governments and parliaments of the Member States, the US Congress, the governments and parliaments of the candidate states and the Secretary-General of the OSCE.