

## **The contribution of the EU to Peace and Security in an unbalanced world \***

The first and foremost contribution from European states to a peaceful world is without any doubt the integration process itself. Finally, after two disastrous World Wars, a courageous attempt was made to overcome the devastating effects of nationalism. It was the dream of the founders of Europe – Schuman, Spaak, de Gasperi, Adenauer and others – to create the conditions for durable peace among European nations. In particular Jean Monnet played an outstanding role by dethroning the idols of European nationalism and forging a system of states in which nationalism was transcended. Monnet, combining vision with practical steps, achieved what was until then considered to be impossible. He convinced leading statesmen that the moment had come to replace the rule of the jungle between states by the rule of law. Creating a zone of peace. Uniting people instead of states!

The integration process proved to be a highly successful endeavour. Since 1945 the countries of the EU are living in peace among each other. The longest period ever in European history! A war between member states is henceforth well nigh inconceivable. Truly an impressive result after centuries of bloodshed!

Already soon after its start the integration process exercised a magnetic effect on an ever widening circle of European nations. Membership increased in a relatively short period from 6 to 9, 12, 15 and in 2004 to even 25 states. In 2005 negotiations will start for a further extension to Turkey, Rumania and other countries. The positive influence of the integration effort was even felt before accession took place. The perspective alone of eventually joining the European zone of peace and prosperity caused prospective candidates to resolve long outstanding conflicts (Hungary - Rumania). This outstanding success of the European integration model is of the greatest geo-political significance for our present world. It sets a prominent example for other nations still in the ban of nationalism and encourages the formation of other regional structures.

### **A European security policy?**

A Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) is of the highest importance for the EU in a world confronted with major security threats. At present the USA is still the only superpower but colossal powers are emerging. China and India are rapidly catching up. Other nations like Japan, Russia and Brazil carry considerable weight. The European Union, comprising 25 states with well over 450 million people and commanding huge economic and financial resources is unquestionably a major global actor. It is the greatest trading partner, and produces nearly a quarter of the world's Gross National Product. As such it therefore carries a considerable responsibility for a peaceful, just and sustainable world order. A responsibility which can only be met if it succeeds in developing an effective CFSP.

A CFSP is also a prime condition for the EU to meet threats to its own territory and to protect its vital interests elsewhere in the world. Moreover, the EU claims to be a community of values such as respect for human dignity, freedom, democracy and human rights. Values which are not supposed to lose their meaning beyond European borders, but demand to be translated into effective policies dealing with urgent world problems.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Article 2 , EU Draft Constitution, adopted in the Brussels Meeting of June 2004. The EU and member states now contribute more than 50% of all international development aid and humanitarian aid.

The discussion about the feasibility of a European Security policy has been going on for decades. Those in favour point to the need for upholding Europe's identity, comprising not only the protection of its vital interests but also enabling it to carry out its responsibility as a global actor. Opponents, on the other hand, claim that the EU neither needs an independent security policy nor a separate military force. They fear a weakening of NATO, still seen as Europe's best guarantee for security. A viewpoint which apparently ignores the dramatic changes since the collapse of the Soviet Empire. The vanishing of the communist threat and the emergence of new dangers has created – as we shall see later – an entirely new situation.

Without a CFSP few European nations will succeed to escape from a vassal status. A rather uncomfortable position, as it implies being held responsible for policies beyond our influence; policies, which could be highly detrimental to essential European interests. This applies in particular to the Middle East and the States on our Eastern border! The war in Iraq should have taught the EU a lesson about the political and military dangers of being swept into military adventures with disastrous consequences!

Unfortunately it took a long time before any progress was made in this field. But finally, during the Maastricht Summit in 1993, a historic decision was taken. The adoption of the Treaty on the European Union established a Common Foreign and Security Policy.<sup>2</sup> A beginning was also made with “the progressive framing of a Common Defence Policy (ESDP), which might lead to a common defence”. During subsequent EU Councils important headway was made in a further development of the structure of a CFSP, comprising basic elements of a European Security and Defence policy (ESDP). The EU now has at its disposal a Minister of Foreign Affairs (combining this function with Secretary-General of the Council), a *Policy and Early Warning Unit* (joint analysis of international issues and their impact), a *Political and Security Committee*, a *Military Committee* and the *Military Staff*. A goal was also set of being able to deploy a force of 60.000 personnel within 60 days.

Notwithstanding all these steps forward some formidable hurdles have to be taken before the EU will have established an effective Foreign and Security Policy. Whether the progressive development of a CFSP (comprising an ESDP) continues will to a large extent be determined by the adoption of the European Constitution. At this moment an effective CFSP seems a far fetched dream. Although the EU is in economic terms a giant, it is politically speaking still a dwarf. Consequently its possibilities to contribute to peace and security are seriously hampered. And this occurs at a crucial moment in which the world is confronted with major problems. A grave deficiency, which became sadly apparent during the Bosnia conflict and the Iraq crisis.

### **Why is the actual role of the EU so modest?**

One of the major obstacles on the road towards a relevant common foreign and security policy is the lack of common vision on external issues, not only on the nature of the challenges but also on the means to deal with them. In most member states traditional patterns of thinking still persist, in some cases even historic feuds!

Furthermore widely divergent views about security are held between Atlantic oriented countries (UK, Netherlands) and others, which tend to be more continental (France). A

---

<sup>2</sup> Title V of the Treaty on European Union constitutes a separate pillar of the EU, since the way it operates and its intergovernmental nature distinguish it from the traditional pillars of the Community.

painful divide occurred also during the Iraq crisis between ‘old’ and ‘new’ member states. The latter nations – recalling more than 40 years of Soviet occupation – showed a marked tendency to look upon the USA as their principal guardian for security. These states however should realize that the EU stands or falls with the implementation of solidarity in all domains, not only in the economic field but also in its external relations! A truly European spirit, a sense of belonging together, would also be the best resistance against external pressures to drive member states apart.

Under present circumstances, the decision-making process in matters of security and defence is rather laborious; a serious state of affairs as the notorious lack of unity among member states undermines the credibility of the EU. Improvement in this lamentable situation is unlikely as long as some member states persist in clinging to the power of veto.

Another major reason for the relatively modest role of the EU is the deficiency in ‘hard power’. Whereas the EU disposes over considerable ‘soft power’, its military power is insufficient for meeting acute challenges. An unnecessary state of affairs, as all EU countries together spend about 60% of the colossal US military budget. The ‘effectiveness’ of this enormous sum is however much lower, chiefly as a result of deficient cooperation between EU partners. National interests – both economic and political – not seldom prevail over common European ambitions. But instead of giving in to pressures for an increase in defence budgets – thus putting an undue burden on taxpayers – other ways should be found to enhance prospects for an adequate military force. Much could be achieved through better coordination, further adaptation of military forces to current operational requirements and common procurement of military hardware.

The present lack of unity among EU member states is highly unsatisfactory. Yes, even irresponsible, as it puts EU members at prey of the whims of greater powers. *United we stand, divided we fall !*

### **The rift in Atlantic relations**

The drifting apart of the Atlantic partners started soon after the vanishing of the threat of the Soviet Empire. Major trade disputes and differences in perception of real and presumed security threats came to the fore. The US – deeply aware of its overwhelming military power – did not shun the use of unilateral employment of military forces whereas European nations showed an obvious preference for the use of soft power. On the other hand we saw a growing irritation about European indecisiveness and inability to act promptly in crisis situations, even in its own backyard!

The terrible events on 9/11 galvanized the American nation and prepared the way for a much tougher approach towards security threats. The ‘war on terrorism’ was declared and the world was divided in simplistic terms between *those for or against us*. The United Nations were considered to be ineffective for coping with security threats. The Document on *American Security Strategy*<sup>3</sup> declared explicitly that unilateral preventive military action would be taken whenever considered necessary in the national interest. This severe blow against the international order of law – in particular against the UN – raised considerable worldwide anxiety, even among faithful allies in the Atlantic Alliance.

---

<sup>3</sup> The National Security Strategy of the United States of America, 23/09/2002, <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/print/nssall.html>>.

The harmful consequences of this strategy became soon manifest during the military intervention in Iraq. Not only for millions of Iraqis, subjected to immense suffering, but also for the USA and Europe. Since then the security situation in our world has significantly deteriorated. Certainly, the cruel dictator Saddam was removed but the number of terrorists increased rapidly. Radicalism is spreading in the Islamic world and virulent anti-Americanism risks to spill over into an anti-Western mood. A highly dangerous development for Europe, not separated by an Ocean from the Arab and Islamic world, but closely interconnected with it around the Mediterranean and through the presence of nearly 20 million Muslims in our midst. Expanding the EU good neighbour policy and developing mutually advantageous relations are therefore of paramount significance. Hence the widespread European reluctance to participate in military actions in this sensitive region.<sup>4</sup>

Another matter of great significance for the transatlantic relations is related to the changing role of NATO, originally founded to preserve the security of all European allies. The Atlantic Alliance however has been undergoing a dramatic change since the demise of the Soviet empire. Surely it would be too simplistic to state that Nato's role has changed *from an umbrella for all, to a sword for one*. But it cannot be denied that the American administration has recently shown a tendency to utilize NATO mainly as an *instrument* to serve US global interests.

The decision to extend military operations to areas outside the territory of the member states opens therefore the possibility of basic conflicts of interests between the Atlantic partners. Not an imaginary danger but a real possibility since the US embarked on a security strategy, which envisages unilateral preventive military actions. A strategy, which carries the risk for Europe to become involved in out-of-area conflicts where European states would opt for a more cautious approach.

Of course there will be cases where joint action is clearly in the common interest. Bosnia and Afghanistan constitute two such examples. There can also be no doubt about the necessity of mutual consultations whenever a security threat arises. But the EU would be well advised *to come up first with its own assessment* of the situation *before* participating in these NATO deliberations. This prudent *modus operandi* is required now that the present robust American security strategy risks to imperil vital European interests, not only in the Middle East but also on Europe's Eastern border. Joint action can no longer *automatically* be taken for granted, as – unfortunately – in these days American and European interests do not always run parallel! Despite this state of affairs there are still European politicians who prefer to stick to the traditional practice among the Atlantic partners to consult each other first, before an EU point of view is defined.

### **Rebuilding the Atlantic partnership?**

Although the rebuilding of the Atlantic partnership will be a difficult undertaking, it should be attempted, in view of its fundamental importance in a highly dynamic and insecure world.<sup>5</sup> Especially now it is of crucial importance to remember that we, as Atlantic partners, have more in common than we have with any other world powers! The Alliance rests not only on

---

<sup>4</sup> Samuel Huntington: *The Clash of Civilizations*; Simon and Schuster 1996. See page 312 for his warning: "Western intervention in the affairs of other civilizations is probably the single most dangerous source of instability and potential global conflict..."

<sup>5</sup> Rightly repeatedly stressed by M Barroso, President of the European Commission; see; 7<sup>th</sup> ECSA World Conference 30 November 2004.

many bonds, shared values and genuine feelings of friendship, but also on the magnitude of mutual economic interests. During the Cold War, there was above all the *common* perception of the formidable threat to our mutual security. Regrettably this is no longer the case as divergent views persist on both sides of the Atlantic about the major threats to our security and the manner to handle these.

Any healing of the gap must therefore begin by an effort to reach consensus on the five or six major global threats to humanity. These threats, which directly or indirectly involve also our security - are not just limited to WMD and Terrorism but should also include hunger, poverty, spreading of diseases and the alarming rate of environmental destruction. All of these are threatening human security. When millions of people yearly die from hunger and disease this is not only a moral scandal for the affluent nations but also a major risk to their security. It is a dangerous illusion to think that in an interdependent world the rich countries could peacefully coexist with billions living in abject poverty.

Those still clinging to the old concept of security, clearly ignore the simple truth that meeting the basic needs – *providing human security* – is an essential condition for ‘living in peace’. Indeed, there will be no peace without justice and solidarity! The same could be said for the urgent need to stop the increasing rate of destruction of our natural environment.

The critical world situation makes it imperative for the Atlantic partners to develop a common strategy addressing the key problems not as rivals but as friends, deeply aware that we are seated in the same boat in treacherous waters. Hence the relevance of a joint American - European effort to take a fresh look on the five or six major threats to our security and the way these common threats are actually being dealt with.<sup>6</sup>

Such a joint consultation might focus on some pertinent questions such as:

- a) how are we actually dealing with these pressing world problems? Do present policies facilitate effective solutions? What are our priorities in spending?
- b) what should be done in order to compete effectively in peace? To what extent should policies be readjusted?

This joint attempt could also prove to be highly beneficial for a substantial improvement of the battered transatlantic relations!

**There is however one caveat – for both partners!**

**Unless the EU creates an effective CFSP, and the United States revises its present unilateral Security Strategy, a further estrangement must be feared!**

### **The Solana Report – a significant step in the right direction**

As mentioned before, progress has been made in recent years to arrive at a Common Foreign and Security Policy. In December 2003, Javier Solana, the EU minister of Foreign Affairs launched an important document on European Security Strategy under the heading: ‘*A secure Europe in a better world*’. This first effort to define a European Security Strategy constitutes a long overdue start to arriving at a well coordinated, comprehensive external policy. It

---

<sup>6</sup> In the National Security Strategy of the USA there is an interesting little phrase on page 2, from President George W. Bush pointing into the same direction: “*Today, the international community has the best chance since the rise of the nation-state in the seventeenth century to build a world where great powers compete in peace instead of continually prepare for war*”.

contains several elements of a new comprehensive security concept.<sup>7</sup> Yet it is not free from a certain ambivalence.

Already in its introduction the Report strikes a key-note: “*The end of the Cold war has left the United States in a dominant position as a military actor. However, no single country is able to tackle today’s complex problems on its own.*” A realistic assessment and at the same time an unmistakable warning not to be tempted by unilateralism!

As the title of the Report already suggests, it seeks to situate Europe’s security in a world wide context. In line with this sensible approach it opens with a brief sketch of some global challenges, such as poverty, hunger and spreading of disease in the developing world. It also acknowledges that these problems give rise to pressing security concerns. The Solana paper even states categorically that: “*internal and external aspects of security are indissolubly linked*” and “*Europe should be ready to share in the responsibility for global security and in building a better world.*”

It comes therefore as a surprise that the Report falls short in drawing the conclusions from this analysis by not including these same urgent world problems in the subsequent enumeration of Key Threats. This list of items remains restricted to WMD, terrorism, regional conflicts, failed states and organised crime. An inventory, which more or less corresponds with the limited agenda of the US administration. A disappointing development, which is clearly a step backwards from earlier EU statements which were more inclusive.<sup>8</sup>

This omission to include major global challenges among the Key Threats is of critical importance as it obscures the urgency for a far greater effort to deal effectively with these pressing problems. The impression that the Solana paper is too much focussed on the military aspects is supported by the repeated assertion: “*security is a precondition for development*”. Obviously this is a half-truth, because it completely ignores the perhaps even more self-evident half-truth that “*just and sustainable development is a precondition for lasting security*”

If Europe really wants “*to share in the responsibility for global security and in building a better world*”, it should be prepared to implement its commitment to a culture of non-violence, based on a new comprehensive concept of security.<sup>9</sup> Only then there will be – in our interdependent, highly vulnerable world – a chance to deal *effectively* with the major threats to human security!

There is definitely some truth in the statement that: “*The best protection for our security is a world of well-governed democratic states. Spreading good governance, supporting social and political reform, dealing with corruption and abuse of power, establishing the rule of law and protecting human rights are certainly important for strengthening the international order...*”.<sup>10</sup>

But all of this will be to no avail if the prosperous countries in the North do not demonstrate a greater willingness to take appropriate actions themselves. Here, a revision of several EU

---

<sup>7</sup> ‘*A secure Europe in a better world*’, *European Security Strategy*. December 2003.

<sup>8</sup> Conclusions Göteborg Summit 15/16 June 2001. Here agreement was expressed on a strategy for sustainable development and an *environmental* dimension especially added to the Lisbon process for employment, economic and social cohesion.

<sup>9</sup> Edy Korthals Altes, *Heart and Soul for Europe*, Van Gorcum, Assen, 1999. Chapter 10,

<sup>10</sup> ‘*A secure Europe in a better world*’, *European Security Strategy*. December 2003. p.9

policies, particularly in the field of trade and agriculture, would make eminent sense. This would also be more in line with the realistic assessment in the Report that: *“In contrast to the massive visible threat in the Cold war, none of the new threats is purely military; nor can any be tackled by purely military means. Each requires a mixture of instruments. Proliferation may be contained through export controls and attacked through political, economic and other pressures while the underlying political causes are also tackled. Dealing with terrorism may require a mixture of intelligence, police, judicial, military and other means...The EU is particularly well equipped to respond to such multi-faceted situations.”*<sup>11</sup>

Notwithstanding this level-headed recognition of the complexity of issues and the limitations of military power there is a little phrase which opens the door for preventive military adventures. In the section on Strategic Objectives we read, after a reference to the traditional concept of self-defence: *“With the new threats, the first line of defence will be often abroad. The new threats are dynamic”*.<sup>12</sup> Is this meant to be an endorsement of the Bush Doctrine? If so, how does this then relate to the implicit rejection of the unilateral approach in the section on ‘An International Order based on Effective Multilateralism’? *“We are committed to upholding and developing International Law. The fundamental framework for international relations is the United Nations Charter. The United Nations Security Council has the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. Strengthening the UN, equipping it to fulfil its responsibilities and to act effectively, is a European priority.”*<sup>13</sup>

About the relations with the USA, we read in an interesting paragraph: *“The transatlantic relationship is irreplaceable. Acting together, the European Union and the United States can be a formidable force for good in the world. Our aim should be an effective and balanced partnership with the USA.”*<sup>14</sup> There can be no doubt that the EU together with the USA could be a formidable force for good in the world. If we would join forces to meet the major global challenges we could – in fact – contribute to a more peaceful, just and sustainable world order.

Whether this should be done through NATO is however open for discussion. Against the background of what has been said before it would make sense to consider whether a bilateral High Level Group – between the EU and the USA – would not offer a better perspective for an effective partnership.

One of the priorities for the EU is the development of good relations with the neighbouring countries of the enlarged EU. This is clearly recognized in the Solana paper: *“Our task is to promote a ring of well governed countries to the East of the European Union and on the borders of the Mediterranean with whom we can enjoy close and cooperative relations”*.<sup>15</sup> The Report draws from this sensible assessment the conclusion that the resolution of the Arab/ Israeli conflict should be a strategic priority for Europe. The same could be said about our relations with our Eastern Neighbours. Here again actions should be avoided which may lead to distrust and estrangement.

---

<sup>11</sup> *ibid.* p.6

<sup>12</sup> *ibid.* p.5

<sup>13</sup> *ibid.* p.7

<sup>14</sup> *ibid.* p.12

<sup>15</sup> *ibid.* p.6

The concluding section on policy implications is rather meagre as it appears to look at the world primarily from a military perspective and falls short in dealing with other urgent global challenges: *“We need to be able to act before countries around us deteriorate, when signs of proliferation are detected, and before humanitarian emergencies arise. Preventive engagement can avoid more serious problems in the future. A European Union which takes greater responsibility and which is more active will be one which carries greater political weight.”*<sup>16</sup> Certainly, the EU needs to be more active, more capable and more coherent. But this should apply to the full spectrum of global challenges, not just to the military threats. Above all it should be kept in mind that many humanitarian emergencies exist already as a result of chronic deprivation!

After all what was said at an earlier stage about major global challenges and the limited use of military means one would rather expect to see a number of policy recommendations for a much wider agenda. Conflict prevention and threat prevention should be seen in this wider context! Obviously there is a need to transform our militaries into more flexible, mobile forces in order to enable them to address the new threats.

Whether this should be achieved by making more funds available for defence is open to question. First of all because substantial improvements could be obtained through rationalization, a more effective use of resources and a systematic use of pooled and shared assets. In this connection the fundamental question must be raised whether the huge military forces, with their ultra-modern expensive equipment, are not more designed for meeting requirements of a major war than for dealing with actual military challenges. And if this is indeed the case, how realistic is then this approach? Does the apocalyptic potential of modern weapons and the extreme vulnerability of modern society not make it imperative to avoid any major war? Should the EU therefore not come out much more strongly for a comprehensive concept of peace and security, offering a greater chance on survival?<sup>17</sup> Secondly – directly related to the previous point – there is an urgent need to reconsider present priorities in spending in the light of the actual global challenges. Military expenditures(world wide) have reached astronomical proportions, while only a small fraction of these massive resources is made available for coping with the major global challenges. The EU could effectively contribute to a ‘better world’ if it would muster the vision and courage to drastically revise present priorities in spending.

In final analysis it could be said that the Solana report – notwithstanding its incontestable merits – suffers from a certain ambivalence. It definitely provides refreshing insights for a constructive EU policy but at the same time it cannot be denied that it contains also some elements based on a concept of security which should really belong to the past. Some of the weak points in the Report are:

- It identifies global threats, but omits to incorporate these in the key threats.
- It recognizes that the global threats to security require a multifaceted approach but highlights a military approach.
- It puts emphasis on a multilateral approach through the UN but opens the door to unilateral military action
- It recognizes the importance of the use of non-military means but neglects the urgency for a substantial increase in efforts of conflict prevention in the broadest sense.

---

<sup>16</sup> *ibid.* p.10

<sup>17</sup> *ibid.* p.10

The great merit of the Solana Report is that it provides a first sketch of a European Foreign and Security Policy, reflecting a sense for a new comprehensive security concept in a multipolar world. From its concluding observations emerges a deep awareness of Europe's potential and vocation:

*An active and capable European Union would make an impact on a global scale. In doing so it would contribute to an effective multilateral system leading to a fairer, safer and more united world.*<sup>18</sup>

Hence the relevance of reflecting on the next steps on the road of the EU towards a better world!

### **What could be the EU contribution to peace and security ?**

The EU should not aspire to become a dominant, self-centred, awe inspiring military power. A *fortress of Europe*, chiefly interested maintaining its own prosperity and security, was definitely not in the mind of those who stood at the cradle of the integration process. It would constitute a betrayal of Europe's highest values. Surely the EU should dispose over a right mixture of 'hard' and 'soft' power, in order to serve peace and security in a global world. But when it has to decide to use military force this should be always be according to international law and within the context of the United Nations. Ultimately the 'humane approach' will prove to be the only reasonable and 'realistic' way.

A major contribution of the EU to peace and security has resulted from the extension of its zone of peace and prosperity. Beyond this notable achievement the EU could – if it musters the political will and lives up to its values – perform a constructive role if it succeeds in developing an effective CFSP comprising:

- 1- An active approach to major challenges to peace and security, based on a comprehensive concept. These threats to security should not be limited to WMD, terrorism, failed states and organized crime. Other urgent world problems such as hunger, poverty, underdevelopment, health issues and environmental deterioration should be included. These problems not only claim millions of lives in affected areas but also form a threat to our security. Internal and external security are closely linked!
- 2- As most of these threats are non-military, they cannot be tackled by mainly military means. The EU should, in case of conflicts, not exclude the use of adequate military force but show a preference for non-military means. Military force should only be used in last resort, within the context of contributing to an international order. Particular restraint should be applied in regions with religious susceptibilities!
- 3- A reappraisal of present priorities in dealing with the major threats to security and peace. The present emphasis on excessive military expenditures stands in no relation whatsoever to the meagre resources available for an effective approach to deal with major world problems. Consequently there should be a substantial shift of resources towards eliminating causes of potential conflicts and security threats.
- 4- Strengthening the international order, not only by effective EU policies in dealing with pressing economic and humanitarian problems affecting the poor and lesser developed nations, but also by spreading good governance, supporting social and political reform, dealing with corruption and abuse of power, establishing the rule of law and protecting human rights.
- 5- The EU should come out in favour of gradual worldwide reduction of military outlays. A more capable Europe needs above all a more effective use of resources and a systematic use of pooled and shared assets.

---

<sup>18</sup> *ibid.* p.13

- 6- Encouraging a multipolar world, based on justice, peace and solidarity. Strengthening the rule of law in international relations, rejection of the unilateral approach in case of conflicts. Reform of international organizations, notably the UN, World Bank and IMF.
- 7- A resourceful effort to eliminate terrorism, based on a careful analysis of its causes and the use of appropriate means. No participation in counterproductive actions. Practising utmost restraint in using military pressures in sensitive regions where religion plays a major role.
- 8- Promoting constructive and balanced relations between the USA and Europe. A commitment to work together in as many fields as possible, making full use of possibilities for complementary actions. Balanced relations, not in an antagonistic sense, not as rivals but as partners. Based on mutual respect for each others vital interests! A permanent frank dialogue in a spirit of friendship.
- 9- Expanding the good neighbour policy with countries on the Eastern and Southern borders. In particular, pursuing an active Middle East policy, drawing on all available means to contribute to a peaceful solution of the Israel - Palestine conflict.
- 10- Encouraging a global culture of living together in a pluriform, highly diverse world. Supporting inter-religious cooperation, creating a common front against extremism. Activating internal policies aimed at a solidarity culture particularly in countries with large minorities. Granting full citizenship based on a careful balance between integration and respect for identity.

***A Common Foreign and Security Policy, protecting vital interests and inspired by the values of the EU, is of paramount importance at this crucial moment. This is so vital, that in case the 25 Member states were to prove unable to agree on an effective common approach, a coalition of the willing should seize the torch of Europe's freedom and responsibilities!***

-----

15/01/2005

\*Edy Korthals Altes  
Former Ambassador of the Netherlands