



Young Europeans Conference on Security and Defence

“Better European cooperation is required”

The German association of EuroDefence organised from August 30th to September 3rd in Bonn, Germany, a “Young Europeans Conference on European Security and Defence“ on „Internal and External Security – Mutual Interdependence and the Need for an European Perspective“. 42 young participants from Austria, Luxembourg, France, Netherlands, Portugal, Hungary, Spain, Italy, United Kingdom and of course Germany came together to respond to their most fundamental right and obligation: discuss, what is and what should be the future of THEIR Europe. The conference was kindly supported by EADS and T-Mobile.

Conference topics

Day one:

Security Policy, a new Dimension, by

Rear Admiral rest. Jörk Reschke, President EuroDefense Germany

„**European Armament Cooperation**“ by Hans-Jürgen Wieland, Vice Chairman NATO Industrial Advisory Group

„**The European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP): State of Affairs and Perspective**“ by Hans-Bernhard Weisserth, Council of the European Union, General Secretariat

„**European Intelligence: A new challenge**“ by Dr. Peter Roell, president Institute for Strategy-Policy-, Security- and Economy Consultation

„**The European Community Mechanism for Civil Protection Assistance Interventions**“ by Dr. Horst Miska, member of the Civil Protection Commission with the Federal Minister of Interior

Day two:

„**Maritime Terrorism. A threat to Europe’s coastline security and its global interest**“ by Dr. Michael Stehr, Editor, Magazine MARINEFORUM

„**Security Aspects at T-Mobile**“ by Pascal Geier, Vice President Group Strategy and Georg Chr. Wenger, Head of International Support Security & Fraud Management

„**Managing Crisis: Experiences by an international mobile operator**“ by Doug Cook, T-Mobile International Vice President Corporate Security and Crisis Management

During the first two days, the participants were introduced to European Security Responses, projects and topics. On day one, after an introduction on „security policy, a new dimension“ by the German association's president Rear Admiral, strategic security issues were addressed by the invited experts.

These speeches and topics, conferences & discussions built the basis for day three, on which the participants formed working groups to discuss given questions on Europe and European Security matters.

The Young Europeans were encouraged to express their views.

Group 1: „How do you define Europe“? **Group 2:** „Security in Europe – what does it mean“?

Group 3: „Creative steps to more security in Europe – which are or could be the next steps“?

Here are the thoughts of our European „future generation“:

“Europe and the European Union: equal and different at the same time” (Working Group 1)

„Europe is a set of different political systems and projects, cultures, identities, nationalities and

desires. In other words, it is a community of States and peoples sharing History, tradition and values, based on the ancient Greek philosophy, Roman Empire's heritage and Christianity. Accordingly, Europe has faced, and continues to face other cultures, in order to reinvent its values and to increase its internal and external influences.

Another way to define Europe is geographically, between the Atlantic and the Urals, Scandinavia and the Mediterranean. Europe, as well as its borders cannot be defined clearly. Factors influencing this decision are of political, social, geographical, cultural, economical, ethical and military origin. These factors are not only influencing each other, but can also be in opposite contradiction. Numerous examples demonstrate this fact in daily business. Nevertheless, European countries share a wide range of common values, which constituted the basis for the creation of the European Union. Europe is a vision which has been built on the lessons of the past: Cooperation instead of confrontation, peace instead of war, common economy instead of national poverty, cultural identity, common respect. The European States have finally discovered, after the end of Second World War that inner-European confrontations instead of cooperation was the wrong way and that the challengers of the multi-polar world were not to be managed anymore by everyone individually.

Furthermore, the European States need a political and economical cooperation, and resulting from these a necessary individual national and continental security. The preservation of European and national interests, the security of the citizens of the European Member states can today only be achieved through inner-European cooperation and outer-European cooperation, implication, but also the readiness of confrontation. The concept of the EU is for Europe only useful as long as it can implicate the European States, their interests and citizens.

A successful cooperation (and this is what EU should be for its Member States) is based on common interests and visions. Differences are without doubt sustaining. Too many differences and diverging interests are harmful for every long-term cooperation. Europe's culture is based on common values (democracy, rule of law, human rights and respect of minorities) and common cultural and ethnical roots. The concept of EU – in duty of European Idea – must as well be a project that preserves and develops not only European Interests and values, but also stability at international level and local development.“

The European Way of Managing Security (Working Group 2)

“The European Security Strategy adopted in December 2003 was the first EU document providing a comprehensive overview of European security. *A Secure Europe in a Better World* outlines strategic objectives and a number of key threats facing the European Union: terrorism, weapons of mass destruction, regional conflicts, state failure and organised crime. However, the security strategy gave only general policy advices regarding the political implications of these challenges. It provided a vision, but not a concrete strategy on how to tackle the mentioned threats and challenges.

Three years have passed since the adoption of the security strategy. The enlargement of the EU and the failure of the Treaty on the Constitution, significantly complicated the progress of devising security policy in the Union. The terror attacks in Madrid and London, the increasing insecurity of Europe's energy supplies and the drastic increase of organized crime, especially in human and drug trafficking highlight the vulnerability of the EU's security environment.

The need for a new approach arises. To cope with these new challenges, Europe has to develop a common and coherent security policy. *A Secure Europe in a Better World* makes the first step in this process by providing normative guidance and broadly identifying the threats facing the EU. However, it also poses a problem. The limited assets of the EU are insufficient to tackle the numerous security problems. To provide an *actionable strategy* the EU needs to develop a hierarchy of priorities to distribute the existing assets on the most pressing problems and to indicate where

new capabilities need to be developed. Considerable obstacles, such as national interests, the lack of a public debate on European policy-making and practical problems such as the issue of burden sharing have to be overcome to develop a more integrated supranational security policy. In the following we propose a new approach to how the process of developing a hierarchy of priorities may be accomplished.

The Solana Doctrine presents a “comprehensive” approach to the current security environment, that attempts to address social, economic and political challenges through the integration of internal and external security and economic apparatus. Notwithstanding the validity of this approach, this working group considers that this is currently hindering the EU’s capability to clearly define a concrete set of practical measures which can be used to address security threats. As a result, this group attempted to address this issue by developing a working concept to translate EU threat assessments into mission types and capability requirements. This entailed differentiating between internal and external manifestations of threats: in the current security environment, threats must be addressed using different means dependent on the context in which they appear – i.e. either within the European space, or in other regions of the world. The pragmatic approach this group is suggesting will allow the EU to identify the different economic, human and military resources that are required in different operating areas. The following table illustrates how this approach applies to specific security issues:

Threat example	Internal operating area (within EU)	External operating area (worldwide)
<i>Terrorism</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish an EU intelligence service or centre; • Put in place mechanisms to monitor suspect money transfers, • Harmonise EU and Schengen borders. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote rule of law and economic and social development abroad; • Expeditionary military intervention capabilities to target terrorists „at the source“ (e.g., approach taken by US and UK in Afghanistan).
<i>Weapons of Mass Destruction</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unify export controls and monitoring mechanisms, especially for dual use equipment; • Standardisation of security controls for imports within EU. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish, or join, initiatives such as the Proliferation Security Initiative; • Co-operate with strategic partners.
<i>Energy Security</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adopt a common approach to energy policies; • Develop sustainable energy alternatives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure security of Sea Lanes of Communication (SLOCs) and strategic choke points (e.g. Malacca Straits, Straits of Hormutz). • Develop strategic partnerships with other countries, such as Russia.

In light of such an operational awareness, this group believes that there is a need for the EU to clearly define its foreign policy priorities: to what extent should it be a global player, with associated military capabilities? How can this external role be combined with its internal security needs? The approach outlined above is a functional way to fully visualise the various means by which threats can be addressed operationally, and therefore helps member states identify the individual contributions they can make to meet each or all of these options. Such an approach also provides a basic platform from which the EU can assess its relationships with other strategic partners and organisations (such as NATO, the United States, the UN).

In implementing this concept, this working group considers it advisable that each EU member state explores the possibility of producing a White Paper to outline: a) what they see as the foreign policy priorities of the EU; b) what contributions they are willing to make on the basis of the evolving role of the EU. The White Papers then should be submitted to the EU and used as a cornerstone for the development of a more coherent and comprehensive European security policy.“

“European threats and challenges” (Working Group 3)

We consider that the EU encounters several threats such as terrorism, WMD and related technology proliferation, organised crime but also state failures and regional conflicts globally, we believe the best way to deal with these challenges requires a more efficient use of coordinated instruments. The application should take into consideration and be in conformity with international law as well as human rights.

Firstly, as far as political and institutional measures are concerned, we call for a change in the voting process in the EU (i.e. Council), as a first step towards speeding up the decision-making process to guarantee an accurately and timely reaction. To achieve this the Commission and Parliament should get a more active role as ESDP policymaker, simplifying the representation by establishing a foreign affair minister. Secondly, in the aftermath of the draft constitution, some key aspects of it should be passed separately. Furthermore, the Union should support and strengthen sensitive sectors (Energy, Aerospace, Biotechnology and Communication and Information Technology). Thirdly, considering security forces, we emphasize the use of existing policy instruments to increase the networking and coordination among member states. In this context, we call for the establishment of an open pool of military assets, which is available to member states at short notice in order to enhance the Union’s operational capabilities. Better cooperation is therefore required. In this sense EDA’s role should be emphasised in coordinating and improving interoperability and member states’ C4ISTAR capacity.

In addition, regarding police and border patrol, interconnectivity between member states’ authorities is essential. Information technology provides the ideal basis for such a network to be established. A common database of shared information will support European preventive actions and facilitate faster responses.

It was a successful three days conference, which has proven once more the added value of EuroDefence's network: bringing actual and future decision makers together, provide useful information, make the European Youth participate & implicate, but most important of all: ask their opinion!

Bernd Oliver Bühler