

Helsinki Plus: Towards a Human Security Architecture for Europe

**The First Report of the EU-Russia Human
Security Study Group**

To Be Presented to:

**The Spanish Presidency of the EU
The High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs
and Security Policy, Lady Catherine Ashton and
The President of the Russian Federation, Dmitry Medvedev**

May 2010

Helsinki Plus:

**Towards a Human Security
Architecture for Europe**

**The First Report of the EU-Russia Human
Security Study Group**

To Be Presented to:

**The Spanish Presidency of the EU
The High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs
and Security Policy, Lady Catherine Ashton and
The President of the Russian Federation, Dmitry Medvedev**

May 2010

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	4
Introduction	6
Background	7
A New Approach	10
Illustrative Issues that Cut Across all Three Baskets	13
<i>Conflict and Crisis Management</i>	13
<i>Arms Control</i>	15
<i>Non-Traditional Threats</i>	17
<i>Energy</i>	18
<i>Global Issues</i>	19
Conclusion	20
Members of the EU-Russia Human Security Study Group	25
Acknowledgements	26
Background Papers	27

Executive Summary

In June 2008, President Medvedev put forward a proposal for a new European security architecture. In November 2009, he published a draft European Security Treaty, which focuses on what is known as ‘hard security’ –the security of borders and the use of military force. President Medvedev’s proposals offer an opportunity to revise and revive the EU-Russia security relationship and open up a public debate within the EU and Russia about security but it should go beyond traditional concepts of hard security.

We live in a more multipolar multilateral world, where global challenges like the threat of climate change and financial turmoil can have serious consequences for security, multiplying new and old risks such as xenophobia, religious fundamentalism, increased crimes rates and terror. In particular, both the EU and Russia were severely affected by the financial crisis. They need to cooperate in the modernisation of their economies and protection of the environment but this can only be achieved if they also cooperate on security.

The concept of human security encompasses the ‘three baskets’ of the 1975 Helsinki Accords. It is about the security of individuals and the communities in which they live – the third basket of Helsinki. It is about material security as well as physical security, about life threatening risks that emanate from poverty or from natural disasters and that require economic, scientific and cultural cooperation – the second basket of Helsinki. And it is about the extension of rule-governed as opposed to war-based security – the first basket of Helsinki.

A human security lens offers a different lens through which to understand some of the key components of European security. Instead of defining conflicts in terms of geo-politics or ethnic rivalry, and taking different sides, Russia and the EU could cooperate in crisis and post-crisis management so as to enhance the human security of individuals affected by conflicts. Instead of linking weapons of mass destruction to sovereignty and pursuing arms control approaches, which tend to entrench Cold War thinking, weapons of mass destruction (WMD) should be reconceptualised as massive threats to human security. Instead of geo-political competition for energy, a human security approach to energy would focus on universal access, on combating climate change and on the stability and development of suppliers. Instead of focusing on future military attacks, a human security approach would put much more emphasis on so-called non-traditional threats such as the spread of drugs, organised crime, terrorism, or natural and man made disasters. And instead of trying to counter the rise of emerging powers, Russia and the EU

should cooperate to strengthen global solutions to the global challenges of our time.

We propose an EU-Russia security dialogue that is both top down and bottom up, involving governments, international institutions, parliamentarians and civil society that could become the cornerstone of a new inclusive process throughout the Euro-Atlantic region about how to establish a human security architecture for Europe. It would cover: cooperation in crisis and crisis management, especially in the Caucasus and the Balkans; investigating how to increase freedom of movement, especially displaced persons and those who live in small unrecognised states; ways to eliminate WMD in Europe; specific transnational institutions for addressing non-traditional threats; how to achieve universal access to energy, how to open up and depoliticise energy markets, increase energy efficiency and develop renewable forms of energy, and how to diversify the economies of energy suppliers and increase transparency; how to work together on global issues and promote a global human security capacity.

Introduction

I think that only by openly and honestly sharing all our concerns with each other can we make progress in building a genuine greater Europe. Our predecessors during the Cold War years managed to draw up the Helsinki Final Act (which, as the legal foundation for the European system, has withstood the test of time despite all the difficulties encountered), and so why should we not be able to take the next step today? Namely, drafting and signing a legally binding treaty on European security in which the organisations currently working in the Euro-Atlantic area could become parties.

Dmitry Medvedev

Speech at Meeting with German Political, Parliamentary and Civic Leaders, Berlin, June 5, 2008

President Dmitry Medvedev's proposal for a new security architecture for the Euro-Atlantic area presents a real opportunity to create an institutional framework, which unlike other Euro-Atlantic organisations, includes Russia. Among other innovative ideas, the proposal envisages an umbrella organisation to include not just states, but also the regional organisations to which those states already belong. However, the proposal concentrates entirely on what has become known as 'hard security' – the security of borders and the use of military force. Citizens living in the Euro-Atlantic area face a range of known and unknown risks that include and extend well beyond conventional military threats and cannot be managed by military means alone. That is why we need a discussion across the region about how we could jointly address the insecurities that threaten our communities. President Medvedev has set in motion that discussion and, it is to be hoped, this could conclude with a new agreement or set of agreements that update the 1975 Helsinki Accords to reflect the realities of the 21st century. An essential preamble in designing new agreements and institutions is the elaboration and development of the philosophy of security that made the original Helsinki Accords so significant.

This is a moment when new crises hit our headlines daily – the Greek financial meltdown, the Haiti earthquake, the ash cloud from the Icelandic volcano, the Iraqi elections, the oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico, and the continued counterinsurgency in Afghanistan. The world, including the EU and Russia, has to confront a number of extremely difficult challenges – global financial turmoil, the effects of climate change, the apparent (and perhaps related) rise of both xenophobia and religious extremism, the spread of

terrorism and organised crime, the worldwide consequences of natural disasters that appear to increase in frequency and severity – which affect us all and which can undermine our security. At the same time, the political environment in which we confront those challenges has also changed; it is both more multipolar, including new emerging powers like China, India and Brazil, and more multilateral. We desperately need a new shared understanding about the nature of security that can help us construct appropriate responses to the challenges and the insecurities that accompany them.

This report is an attempt to contribute to that understanding and to both the dialogue between Russia and the EU, and the wider discussion about Euro-Atlantic security including the United States and all other non-EU European countries. Both Russia and the EU are post-Cold War political entities – the Russian federation was established in 1991 and the European Union, in its current form, in 1992, although it has continued to evolve with the Eastern enlargement and the Lisbon treaty. Both entities are still engaged in a process of reflexive experimentation about their identities (post-national in the case of the EU and post-imperial in the case of Russia) and how these identities are expressed in their relationships with other states and organisations, their roles in the world and their methods of protecting their populations. In neither case do traditional security concerns fit easily the current global context and the sorts of problems faced by Europeans in the region as a whole. Both the EU and Russia see themselves as security providers but they also need to understand that they are sometimes perceived as sources of insecurity.

Written by a group of academics and practitioners from Russia and the EU, the report is intended to stimulate public debate in Russia and the EU and to promote a discourse about security that goes beyond traditional ideas about military security to the concept of human security – that is, a concern about how to secure the basic needs of individuals and communities in times of peril. Although it primarily addresses the security of people living on the European continent, it recognises that European security is indivisibly linked to global security.

Background

Medvedev first proposed restructuring Europe's security architecture in June 2008, soon after becoming Russian president. He saw this as a way in which Russian-Western relations, which had seriously deteriorated since the end of the 1990s, might be set on a new, cooperative course. There were a number

of reasons for the tensions in Russian-Western relations: on the Russian side, the enlargement of NATO was perceived to undermine Russian security; NATO's new strategic doctrine, and the role it played in the Yugoslav wars, seemed to confirm this. The Russian government also seemed to believe that the inclusion of the former socialist countries of East-Central Europe in the European Union had served to set the EU against Russia. Moreover, it seemed to them that the concentration of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) on democratization and election monitoring had given it a distinct bias against the Soviet successor states, and particularly against Russia. On the Western side, the second Chechen war in 1999, the apparent backlash against democracy in Russia during the Presidency of Vladimir Putin, and Russian pressure on its neighbours, fuelled apprehension that a resurgent and hostile Russia might soon present a threat to the rest of Europe. As relations deteriorated, so both sides rapidly reverted to Cold War thinking and language.

Initially Western leaders were rather dismissive of Medvedev's proposal, but several soon began to support the idea of creating a structure that would tie Russia more closely into maintaining European security. In response to their complaint that the proposal was too vague, Medvedev circulated and published his proposed European Security Treaty on 29 November 2009.¹

The draft invites all states 'in the Euro-Atlantic and Eurasian space from Vancouver to Vladivostok', as well as international organisations such as the OSCE, NATO, EU, Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) and Collective Security Treaty Organization (CSTO) to adhere to the treaty. It contains a clause similar to NATO's clause 5 – every party will consider an armed attack against any other party to the treaty as an armed attack against itself – but allows, in accordance with the UN Charter, military assistance to the attacked state only until the UN Security Council has taken measures to restore peace and security. In fact, article 9 of the draft insists that the Security Council retains primary responsibility for international peace and security. The draft is vague about the institutional arrangements of this European security architecture, but it stipulates that decisions – which will be binding – are to be taken by consensus. It says nothing about dealing with non-military threats to security, although Russia's Foreign Policy Concept, adopted in July 2008, makes it clear that Russians recognise that:

new challenges and threats (first of all, international terrorism, narcotraffic, organized crime, spread of weapons of mass

¹ President of Russia Official Web Portal, European Security Treaty, <http://eng.kremlin.ru/text/docs/2009/11/223072.shtml> (accessed 24 May 2010)

destruction and means of their delivery, regional conflicts, demographic problems, global poverty, including energy poverty, as well as illegal migration and climate change) are global problems that require adequate response of the entire international community and solidarity efforts to overcome them.²

There is, of course, no shortage of regional security organisations in the Euro-Atlantic and Eurasian space. Why then should there be a need for a new European security architecture? First, because there is little confidence that the existing institutions are capable of keeping Europe secure. The traditional military focus of security institutions seems to have little to do with the every day insecurities that Europeans actually experience. For Russians, the Yugoslav wars and the August 2008 Georgian war provide concrete evidence that the existing security arrangements in Europe are ineffective. Second, because members of the organisations covering the Euro Atlantic area do not recognise the Eurasian organisations (CIS and CSTO) as legitimate multilateral institutions. Third, because Russians believe that NATO and EU enlargement undermines Russian security and their trust in the OSCE has severely diminished.

In effect, the three baskets of Helsinki have become untethered. Russia is excluded from the first two baskets – hard security (NATO) and economic and social cooperation (EU). And the OSCE and the Council of Europe, of which Russia is a member, lack the means to implement the third basket – the human dimension – because they are not longer tied to the other two baskets.

The EU together with Russia could potentially play a pivotal role in helping to bring the three baskets together again. Both the EU and Russia were severely affected by the global financial crisis of 2008. For the EU, the crisis exposed the fragility of the common economic and monetary union in the absence of a common fiscal mechanism, which, in turn, is a consequence of the weak and fragmented nature of European political authority. Indeed, there is a real risk of disintegration if substantial measures are not taken to establish institutions that can protect the weakest members of the euro. For Russia, the crisis exposed the over dependence on rents from oil and gas and the inadequacy of Russian financial regulatory institutions.

In both cases, the crisis has a security dimension. For the EU, a common foreign and security policy is critical for building effective political authority.

² Foreign Policy Concept of the Russian Federation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs website, <http://www.mid.ru/ns-osndoc.nsf/0e9272befa34209743256c630042d1aa/d48737161a0bc944c32574870048d8f7?OpenDocument> (accessed 15 April 2010).

People only trust their institutions if they believe those institutions keep them safe. For Russia, military interventions can undermine investor confidence, as became evident during the Georgian war of 2008, when net private capital outflows increased dramatically, although, of course, corruption is a more important factor. Above all, the material insecurity that results from the economic and financial crisis is also associated with new risks such as racism and xenophobia, increased crime rates and terror.

The EU and Russia could help each other to overcome their economic problems. They could collaborate in developing the institutions and infrastructure required to restart economic and social development, and to diversify into new green sectors, recognition of which was reflected in the EU's offer of a 'partnership in modernisation' in 2009. The goal could include a common European economic space including a free trade area and an energy community. But this would also require a common Euro-Atlantic security area. Security and economy cannot be kept separate and North America is integral to Europe's security arrangements.

Euro-Atlantic security can never be assured without an organisation that includes Russia in decision making. Cooperation between Russia and the West and improved Russian-Western relations is a precondition for tackling the interlinked crises of today. But if we are to try to construct a new security organisation that is effective and inclusive and can command public confidence, it is essential that the understanding of what European security means is expanded to encompass human security – in other words a concept that addresses the insecurity of individuals and that brings together material and physical insecurities, that crosses the divide between so-called traditional and non-traditional threats.

A New Approach

Human security is the concept that expresses the coming together of the three baskets in the Helsinki Accords of 1975. The parties to the Accords hit upon a formula that still has the potential to provide the basis for a new way of thinking about security, much more relevant to the twenty first century than the more traditional purely military based notions. The term 'human security' is an appropriate way to express that formula.

First of all, human security is about the security of individuals and the communities in which they live. This is the third basket of Helsinki – the human dimension. By emphasising the security of individuals rather than states, human security implies a commitment to human rights but it does not deny the importance of threats to state security. Indeed, the threat, for

example, of an attack by an enemy state can also be described as a humanitarian threat.

Secondly, human security is about the interrelationship between freedom from fear and freedom from want, and about physical as well as material insecurity. Indeed, the Human Development Report, which first used the term, referred to seven types of insecurity – economic, food, health, environmental, personal, community and political.³ This is the second basket of Helsinki: the emphasis on economic, scientific and cultural cooperation. It means that human rights do not only cover political and civil rights but also economic, social and cultural rights.

In other words, human security covers these newly perceived risks that were not traditionally thought of as security risks but at the same time the term avoids the excessive securitisation of each and every social phenomenon. The ability to cause life-threatening harm is the benchmark for human security – the threshold that determines whether a problem qualifies as a human security risk or threat.

Thirdly, human security implies an extension of rule-governed security as opposed to war-based security. It implies that relations between states are governed by a law paradigm rather than a war paradigm. This is the first basket of Helsinki – it is what President Medvedev refers to in his proposed treaty. It is about the non-use of force in relations between states and the extension of law-governed security to the whole Euro-Atlantic area.

This rule-governed approach is also important for many of the new security issues that are inherently transnational and cross border and need to be addressed at all levels from the local to the global, but especially at regional and macro-regional levels.

The term human security has been widely used and it has been criticised for meaning whatever anyone wants it to mean.⁴ For some, the term is too 'soft'. It treats economic and social development as security issues and neglects the real dangers people face in the context of political and criminal violence. But if we tie the term to the Helsinki baskets, then it has to have a hard dimension. It has to be about protecting people from foreign military aggression, genocide, ethnic cleansing, sectarian warfare, terrorism, violent crime, or other human rights violations as well as from extreme poverty and disease.

³ UNDP, 'Human Development Report 1994: New Dimensions of Human Security'
http://hdr.undp.org/en/media/hdr_1994_en_chap2.pdf

⁴ Roland Paris, 'Human Security Paradigm Shift or Hot Air?', *International Security* Vol. 26(2) 2001

For others, the problem is the opposite. It is a way the great powers legitimate the use of military force.⁵ NATO justified the war over Kosovo in 1999 in terms of humanitarian intervention. Foreign Minister of Russia, Sergei Lavrov used the term 'human security' to justify the invasion of Georgia in August 2008 and later claimed that Russia was the first country to stand for human security in the battlefields of South Ossetia. But human security is different from concepts like 'humanitarian intervention' or 'responsibility to protect'. It is about the right to be protected, not about the right of outside powers to do the protecting. Neither the Kosovo war nor the Georgian war can be described as human security. Whatever the goals, the means did not conform to human security.

In other words, human security is a means as well as a goal. It may involve the use of force and thus can be regarded as a hard security policy but the use of force has to be directed towards protection rather than fighting or revenge. It means using the military in a different way, more like policing than war fighting.

Human security is security based on norms. It combines the norms of territorial integrity and human rights. It is universally applicable, which is why the right to self-determination can only be respected if it does not violate the rights of others. What is needed is a set of common procedures within which the status of entities like Kosovo, Abkhazia, and South Ossetia could be discussed and decided on the basis of human security. What matters is the human security of people who live in those regions and the surrounding areas rather than abstract principles. Or rather abstract principles have to be applied according to whether or not they promote human security. Human security puts more emphasis on everyday life – access to food, energy, shelter, water and sanitation, education or healthcare, and the rule of law – than on the issue of status, even though issues of status may need to be resolved in order to address those daily concerns.

Human security presupposes human equality. This means that no state can protect its own citizens at the expense of citizens in other countries. This was the common security idea of Olof Palme or the Common European Home proposed by Mikhail Gorbachev.⁶ Human security overrides geo-political

⁵ David Chandler 'Human Security: The Dog that didn't Bark' *Security Dialogue* Vol. 39 (4) 2008

⁶ Gorbachev formulated his Common European Home idea in his Address to the Council of Europe, Strasbourg, 5 June 1989 reported in Soviet News 12 July 1989; Common Security was the concept that came out of The Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security chaired by the then Swedish Prime Minister Olof Palme (the Palme Report): Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues, *Common Security: A Blueprint for Survival*, Simon and Schuster, New York, 1982

concerns. This does not mean that states like Russia, the United States, China or even the EU do not pursue geo-political competition – this is inevitable. But they must do so within certain shared assumptions, in the same way that domestic political competition takes place within an agreed framework about the non-use of force and democratic principles. Those assumptions are already enshrined in the Helsinki Accords of 1975. This implies that people continue to have Russian, American, British, German or Hungarian identities but they also accept their common humanity and common Europeanness and the rules of human behaviour agreed on the European continent.

Illustrative Issues that Cut Across all Three Baskets

How could a human security lens help to revitalise the Helsinki agenda, by reframing the perception and analysis of threats and by developing new ways of responding to new and old security challenges? In what follows, we reflect on a range of issues, which are recognised components of contemporary security and which frequently cause divisions between Russia and the EU, to illustrate how rethinking them along human security lines could provide the basis for more constructive cooperation and collaboration.

These issues concern both traditional security, including sub-regional and minority conflicts and arms control, and those which represent newer forms of insecurity such as terrorism, drugs and organised crime and energy security .

Conflict and Crisis Management

Conflicts in the Caucasus and the Balkans have been a persistent feature of the post-Soviet and post-Yugoslav era. The ostensible cause of these conflicts was the break-up of the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia and the conflicting claims of different ethnic groups for self-determination. Within the framework of these conflicting claims, however, these conflicts have become black holes where a toxic mixture of crime, terror, economic hardship, and human rights violations have become self-perpetuating and spreading phenomena. As well as causing misery for those caught up in violence, dispossession and disruption, they reveal sharp differences in security narratives and norms between Russia and the rest of Europe. Far from being a focal point for cooperation in building regional stability, these festering conflicts have become flashpoints for disagreements about security.

The dominant security narratives treat these conflicts in terms of the interests of different ethnic or religious groups and whether they conform to international norms as well as the broader interest of outside powers. In Kosovo, Georgia and Abkhazia, which are examples of the most recent violence, international norms have also been used as a mask for political expediency, and to justify bad policy. The flawed debates about territorial integrity and self-determination, and sovereignty and minority rights tend to produce solutions that benefit one group rather than another, and also lead to accusations of normative double standards.

There is also a tendency to view conflicts in the Caucasus and Balkans through the prism of major political issues, either in terms of East-West relations, or of Russia's special security needs in the post-Soviet space, and to view all conflicts in the regions as the same. Indeed, Russia and the West have supported different 'sides' in the conflicts often for geo-political reasons. Thus Russia supports the Serb interest in Kosovo while the US supports the Georgian interest in South Ossetia and Abkhazia, and this polarization tends to lead to a reversion to Cold War thinking.

This dominant view of conflicts as issues of self-determination or of geopolitics leads at best to complex conflict resolution from above, involving partition and power sharing, often at the expense of human rights, and, at worst, to military intervention on one side or the other that tends to add to insecurity. Military intervention of a traditional kind is not only the wrong tool to resolve conflict but, by creating casualties, displacement and destruction, it aggravates the very vulnerabilities that lead to conflict in the first place.

A human security approach focuses on how to improve the lives of individual citizens living in conflict zones – the return of displaced people, the rule of law, legitimate ways of making a living, or the provision of basic services. The aim is to treat everyone the same regardless of their legal or civic status so that security for one person cannot be at the price of another's insecurity. In the Caucasus security remains elusive not only because states are not recognised, but because people in the region are isolated, their governance is dysfunctional and they cannot earn a living. In Kosovo, both Serb and Albanian communities face uncertainty because they do not have reliable access to electricity and water or jobs, not only because their political status is unsettled. Other dynamics such as religious fundamentalism or the proliferation of weapons graft easily onto basic insecurity.

A human security way out of this impasse is to address the local layers of the conflict rather than only concentrating on their regional and international

ramifications, and to provide a greater role for civil society groups in conflict resolution. The EU has begun to develop the tools needed for such an approach both through the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) and the Stability Instrument. EU interventions in places like Aceh, the Democratic Republic of the Congo or Kosovo have focussed on human rights monitoring, bottom-up consultations, the rule of law and governance, as well as the provision of basic needs. As the EU strategy in Georgia has shown, conflict resolution can be both top down at the negotiating table but also bottom up, monitoring human rights on the ground. But while these conflict management tools provide technical solutions to stabilisation, EU missions often lack political will and backing, and more could be done on the model of the Helsinki process to involve organisations like the Helsinki Citizens Assembly or national Helsinki Committees.

Russia on the other hand views the post-Soviet space as an arena for its own special security and political interests. Inviting Russia to work with ESDP crisis management initiatives in the Caucasus, and to take an active and constructive role in international efforts to improve human security in the Balkans, could help combine more effectively technical and political approaches. By developing a common human security narrative (and the appropriate tools) as opposed to conflictual strategic narratives, there is a chance of achieving the kind of sustainable peace that Russia and the EU need and to break the pattern of fractured responses in other unsettled conflicts. Nagorno-Karabakh and Transnistria are examples of where Russia and the EU could combine their different comparative advantages and develop a consensus about how to sustain stability and pool resources on the ground. This consensus building could add to confidence building in the EU and Russia in general, and in the longer run.

Arms Control

The United States review of nuclear capabilities combined with the crisis triggered by Iran's determination to develop nuclear power are recent examples of the opportunities for restarting global discussions about arms control. Yet the arms debate is still presented in traditional terms which draw on Cold War rhetoric developed in the 1970s and 1980s, and which frame the problem and its solution as zero-sum geo-politics.

Discussions about this type of arms control tends to reproduce Cold War thinking, by emphasising the primacy of hard security, and by linking the possession of nuclear weapons to state sovereignty. Agreements that focus

on numbers of weapons are anachronistic and run the risk that we define the East-West relationship all over again in terms of relative military capabilities, and repeat the mistakes of a previous generation which used arms control as a substitute for security cooperation. Such agreements are also anachronistic because third countries are looking for nuclear status now for different reasons than during the Cold War. The key to addressing the nuclear agenda in the twenty-first century is not by pursuing a universal regime aimed at managing risks as much as making systematic efforts to resolve the regional conflicts that drive countries' nuclear ambitions.

The ratification of the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) and the review of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) should be completed but we can also work on developing an alternative discourse, which sees weapons proliferation and arms control in terms of human security in Russia, Europe and the world, and not just as a geo-strategic issue. This alternative discourse should be a political initiative not a technical discussion, and involves rethinking the concept of a European security community based not on either mutual defence or destruction but on redirecting military spending away from both conventional and nuclear weapons. In particular, nuclear weapons are fundamentally inconsistent with a human security approach; their use would constitute an unprecedentedly massive violation both of international humanitarian law and of human rights law.

Arms control exposes deep divisions within the EU. Baltic member states express fears about a decrease in the US nuclear umbrella, other former Eastern European member states say they are nervous about the abandonment of missile defence. The imbalance in defence spending between the US, large EU member states and Russia is also used to fuel feelings of insecurity, and concerns about exclusion and marginalisation. A human security approach would address these insecurities by questioning the utility of traditional military approaches to security and through emphasising the role for international law and principles of citizen protection rather than balance of power concerns. A common EU-Russia approach could thus help to solidify the EU itself.

President Barack Obama has opened a global route towards the ending of nuclear weapons. Russia and the EU should use the momentum created by concern at moves by Iran, and the new US focus on nuclear capabilities, to put forward a European initiative that raises the possibility of eliminating WMD on the European continent.

Non-Traditional Threats

The spread of drugs, human trafficking and other types of organised crime, and terrorism and the challenge of climate change have expanded the security agenda since the Cold War. What is new about these threats is not their prevalence, which may have increased, but our perceptions of the risk they pose to our societies, and our attempts to find effective ways of responding to them. As the threat of inter-state war fades, so other risks are perceived as more urgent.

So-called non-traditional threats reflect a broader understanding of security, but there is a danger that expanding notions of what constitutes an urgent risk could lead to attempts to securitise daily life, justifying extreme measures in the name of 'wars' on drugs, terrorism and health pandemics. The cumulative effect of securitisation is to undermine the rights of individuals and restrict the spaces for normal civic life. This is why dealing with new threats requires new decision-making processes and a complex interaction between political calculations and the perceptions of the public and media. How we address such threats reflects not just values and interests but the formative experiences of decision makers and publics in framing the severity of threat and appropriate policy responses.

New threats such as illegal drugs, terrorism or natural disasters – that are inherently transnational – offer an example of how the EU and Russia can approach security issues in general. They blur boundaries between internal and external security and require multilateral initiatives across multiple policy domains. One fruitful approach is the creation of issue-specific functional hubs that can include different interested actors – the EU, , Russia, other European countries, North America – and that can form the basis for developing broader cooperative networks and/ or be linked to other relevant institutional mechanisms through a network-type relationship. While such hubs fall short of overarching proposals for a new security architecture, they could represent an effective mechanism for dealing with urgent threats instead of mere talking shops. They could also represent building blocs towards a broader European security framework.

Non-traditional threats are less politicised than others, which offers opportunities to improve cooperation on single issues, although there is some tension between traditional concepts of security and human security approaches to new threats. The trade in illegal drugs offers an example. Russia and the EU have become important transit and consumer countries,

but despite shared concerns about narcotics trade and consumption, their cooperation is hindered by the lack of a EU policy on drugs and differences in approach. Whereas the EU places special emphasis on the demand side, such as health issues and law enforcement of the drug trade, Russia's counter-narcotics policy reflects the perception of the problem as a threat to national security and consequently focuses on tougher interdiction and prevention measures. Avenues for cooperation include the reduction of demand – an area where Russian authorities can benefit from European experience – and countering of regional trafficking. Regional cooperation to combat trafficking can be expected to be most successful in Russia and eastern European states, as the EU's interests and commitment in more distant Central Asia is limited.

Actually, some such approach to the new threats *has* to be adopted whatever happens in the broader security debate. There have to be new mechanisms for dealing with the so-called non-traditional threats because at present they are the main cause of insecurity in Europe.

Energy

The security of energy supplies have always been an integral part of national security strategies. Over the last few years, the energy sector has been treated increasingly as a new source of insecurity and an example of a perceived 'new' threat to European stability even though it has been conceptualised in rather traditional terms. Energy dependence – by consumers on secure supplies, and by companies and states on oil and gas revenues – has been used to draw attention to the destabilising potential of energy and has been framed as a core component of national and global security. EU-Russian energy relations could be said to be excessively securitised in this traditional sense; Russia and European countries pursue geo-political approaches to energy relations and pipeline politics. These are not only economically wasteful but also politically harmful and create distrust between producing, consuming and transit countries. Europe is worried about Russian leverage, while Russia perceives European efforts to geographically diversify its sources of energy as a challenge to its role as an energy supplier. Both Russia and the EU act in protectionist ways in relation to energy investment.

A human security approach would require a broader understanding of energy security. At present energy security tends to mean the needs of industrialised countries, their security of oil and gas supplies, the protection of their

investments and the security of their energy infrastructure. First, a human security approach to energy would encompass individual need and this would imply universal access to energy, thus addressing global energy poverty. This would require energy cooperation and a redistribution of energy supplies. Second, energy policies need to address new issues such as climate change and the post-petroleum economy, which will be a challenge for both consumers and producing countries. The traditional concept of stable and adequate supplies at affordable prices is not sustainable in the future in either economic or environmental terms. Fundamental changes in the economies of import dependent states and a refocusing of economic policy in producing countries are needed. And third, such an approach to energy would emphasize the stability of supply, which means addressing the sources of insecurity associated with rentier economies – the so-called resource curse. The finite character of energy resources and production also means that the profits from the production and sale of fossil fuels must be used to diversify and develop local economies. A new concept of energy security therefore needs to address not only the flow of gas, but also the flow of rents and their use for economic development in Russia and Central Asia.

President Medvedev has proposed a new legal framework for energy cooperation that emphasises the 'indivisibility of sustainable global energy security'. Prime Minister Putin has proposed that gas and oil, like coal and steel in the early days of European integration, could provide the potential backbone of a new continent-wide economic space. This idea of pooling resources and technologies is a constructive counter to protectionism and resource nationalism. Energy trade and investment are too politicized. A more economic approach would include the freedom of movement of long-term investment, while restricting short-term speculative capital that merely contributes to price volatility. Medvedev's new legal framework for energy cooperation addresses many aspects of the current Energy Charter Treaty (ECT) and it could form the basis of an ECT process. There is considerable overlap between Medvedev's proposal and the ECT's provisions. A reinvigorated ECT process should include key players, even beyond Russia, and have greater scope to deal with new issues such as climate change and governance.

Global Issues

The world has changed since the Helsinki Accords were signed in 1975. Interconnectedness has dramatically intensified along with new communications technologies and cheap air travel. Power has shifted from the

Euro-Atlantic area to Asia, with China and India playing much more central global roles than before. The global financial crisis not only exposed domestic weaknesses within the EU and Russia but also the inadequacy of the current set of international institutions established in the twentieth century and the way that globalisation has weakened state capacity. Far from responding to this challenge, both the EU and Russia have retreated to state-centred preoccupations. The post-Lisbon political arrangements, which were supposed to strengthen unity and consolidate the Union seems to have had the opposite effect. Russia seems increasingly preoccupied with restoring economic influence over the former territory of the Soviet Union and countering the expansion of competing poles – the EU and China. Any dialogue about European security has to take into account the global context and what Russia and the EU could do together to reverse these backward tendencies and contribute to the construction of local, regional and global institutions capable of addressing the global challenges that profoundly affect European security. Indeed both traditional and non-traditional threats are global threats, whether we are talking about the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, climate change, energy security or nuclear proliferation.

If Russia and the EU were cooperate more closely together in global fora, their combined weight could have a pivotal influence on global institution building. Much more could be done to foster cooperation on issues like ending the war in Afghanistan or the Arab-Israeli conflict or strengthening global financial regulation. In particular, Russia and the EU could work towards expanding and reforming a human security implementation capacity, involving civil-military cooperation and operating according to human security principles⁷, within the framework of the United Nations, for deployment in global crisis zones.

Conclusion

The biggest obstacle to what we have proposed is a perceptual and conceptual gap between Russia and the EU. Both are new political entities groping their way towards domestic consolidation and global roles. Both have inconsistent and different foreign policy stances. The EU veers between being a 'soft' normative power, a collection of national traditions, and a junior partner of the United States. Russia veers between a commitment to multilateralism

⁷ See the Barcelona and Madrid reports: A Human Security Doctrine for Europe <http://www.lse.ac.uk/Depts/global/Publications/HumanSecurityDoctrine.pdf> and A European Way of Security: The Madrid Report of the Human Security Study Group. <http://www.lse.ac.uk/Depts/global/PDFs/Madrid%20Report%20Final%20for%20distribution.pdf>

and pluralism and a reassertion of *realpolitik* Soviet preoccupations with hard power and non-interference in internal affairs. Many in the West are wary of Russia's human rights record and fear that top-down cooperation could mean a sort of collusion. There are tendencies especially in East Central Europe, to revive past fears, even though they may be for instrumental reasons. Many in Russia are suspicious of the West's expansionary intentions or use those suspicions to justify their own expansionary interests.

We propose a dialogue that is both bottom up and top down and aims to overcome this perceptual and conceptual gap so as to establish a shared basis for a European security architecture based on the concept of human security that is derived from the Helsinki principles and that combines both hard and soft security. The Helsinki principles blurred the difference between internal and external – to demilitarise contestation about different domestic practises and different global roles. In other words, they opened up the argument and made possible engagement as a way of bringing about change, as opposed to mutual threats, which had had the effect of suppressing change.

There needs to be a new inclusive process within the OSCE space that starts from the normative base of the original Helsinki Accords, as well as other treaties and declarations such as the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights or the UN Declaration of Human Rights, and includes not only governments but also international and regional organisations, parliamentarians, and transnational civil society. The cornerstone of this process could be an EU-Russia security dialogue. Rather than an exceptional event, a contained negotiation or a distraction from substantial energy and trade deals, this security dialogue should be a permanent and structural feature of EU-Russia relations. The dialogue should be public and transparent, centred in Europe and open to other European countries, as well as European citizens, but with a global dimension too. It would focus on issues rather than grand designs in security architecture, providing opportunities for new approaches that could bring security to citizens even in the most remote corners of the Old Continent.

We propose nine recommendations that cut across the three baskets of Helsinki:

- 1) The EU should participate fully in the debates that have emerged after Medvedev's proposal for a revision of Europe's security architecture as a leading security actor in the Continent, rather than trying to contain the

debates within the OSCE Corfu process while restricting bilateral Russia-EU negotiations to trade and energy issues.

2) Any EU agreement with the Russian Federation should be negotiated in a transparent and inclusive manner vis-à-vis the non-EU member countries of Europe and other important allies. This includes the US, Norway and Turkey, each with their own bilateral agenda with Russia, and the Western Balkans, but it refers in particular to the countries of the Eastern Partnership.

3) A Russia-EU dialogue on crisis and post-crisis management is another possible area for contributing to human security. The next step could be a clear framework for joint missions, the participation of Russia in EU missions – for which there are already positive precedents – and even the participation of EU troops in Russia-led missions. Russia could work with the EU in developing the ESDP.

4) The EU and Russia should establish common procedures for debating and deciding the resolution of conflicts on the basis of human security. Such procedures need to involve those affected by conflict (both governments and civil society) as well as the parties to the conflict. More immediately, Russia and the EU could revive ad hoc groups of which they are members and that deal with conflicts in Europe and the neighbourhood and find ways in which these groups could adopt a more bottom-up approach involving civil society. Examples of this include the Contact Group Balkans, the OSCE Minsk Group for the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict (where the EU should take over France's role as a co-chair), the 5+2 format for the negotiations over the status of Transnistria or the Quartet for the Middle East Peace Process. Perhaps a 'Contact Group South Caucasus' could be envisaged, with the inclusion of the three countries of the region, some other relevant neighbours (such as Turkey and Ukraine) and the US. Rather than focusing on the long term solution of the outstanding questions of status, the group could envisage more general initiatives on issues such as safe mobility that progressively improves the situation of people in the area within a human security framework.

5) The populations of the partially- or non-recognised independent territories of Europe suffer from an intolerable and protracted situation of isolation and vulnerability. Their plight, and that of refugees and internally displaced people, might be considerably improved if some general, status-neutral agreements could be reached through a joint initiative of Russia and the EU, allowing them to use their basic administrative documents (such as identity documents, secondary school diplomas, driving licenses and so on) without implying a

'recognition through the back door'. The citizens of these areas have suffered enough and it is high time for Russia and the EU to propose ways of improving their personal situation without precluding a final settlement. Indeed, improved mobility would allow more exchanges between different groups that might make a settlement easier.

6) The EU and Russia should establish a joint forum involving governments, international institutions and civil society to discuss new approaches to disarmament that could begin to dissolve the link between sovereignty and WMD. Within such a forum, it would be possible to lift the current taboo on discussions about eliminating nuclear weapons in Europe.

7) The EU and Russia could also propose the creation of issue-specific transregional institutions for addressing non-traditional threats, and invite other European and/or Central Asian partners to join them. Some areas seem particularly promising for these functional hubs, including:

- Civil protection, in specific areas such as the fight against forest fires in south-east Europe
- The interoperability of civil and military capabilities in large-scale natural disaster relief in order to make mutual assistance more likely and more efficient when such a disaster occurs
- The fight against trafficking of narcotics and people, and against criminal networks – terrorist or other forms of organised crime, including the use of advanced technology, training, intelligence sharing and so on, with integrated approaches that deal with the issues from source to destination.

8) Energy should no longer be considered a national security issue by Russia and the EU. The more energy is dealt with in commercial terms (and this not only includes prices and contracts, but also issues like the need to prevent dominant positions, unfair competition or asymmetrical agreements), and the less political are energy deals, the better the chance for EU-Russia energy interdependence to evolve from a vicious circle of securitisation, politicisation and threats into a virtuous one of complementarity and sustainability. A reinvigorated ECT process should be based on universal access to energy, efficiency and diversification and take into account new issues such as climate change and transparency.

9) Globally, Russia and the EU are often closer in their security approaches and concerns than they seem to realise. Following successful experiences in Chad and in the Indian Ocean, global

cooperation could focus on the ability to make joint contributions in conflict areas, and in particular on developing capacities to protect populations through a human security focus. But it should also address the big global challenges such as how to deal with the security implications of fresh water scarcity and other adverse effects of climate change, non-proliferation of WMD, the risk of failure or capture of weak states (or large parts of their territories) by criminal networks – whether they are terrorists, pirates or drug cartels.

These recommendations are not just idealistic hopes. They are urgent necessities. The very existence of the EU and Russia could be pulled apart by the failure to address the deep insecurities associated with economic and ecological crisis, as well as persistent and spreading conflict. If our political arrangements are to be adjusted to twenty-first century realities, we need a far reaching discussion across and within our societies.

Members of the EU-Russia Human Security Study Group

Carmen Claudín
Christine Chinkin
Michael Cox
José-Luis Herrero
Mary Kaldor (convenor)
Irina Kobrinskaya
Andrey Kuvshinov
Mark Leonard
Sonja Licht
Margot Light
Fyodor Lukyanov
Andrey Makarychev
Sergey Markedonov
Mary Martin
Victoria Panova
Yahia Said
Geneviève Schméder
Pavel Seifter
Narcís Serra
Robert Skidelsky
Javier Solana
Ekaterina Stepanova
Dmitri Trenin
Jordi Vaquer i Fanés
Gert Weisskirchen

Acknowledgements

The EU-Russia Study Group is jointly organised by LSE Global Governance and Centre d'Estudis i Documentació Internacionals a Barcelona (CIDOB). This report was based on papers presented and discussed at two meetings: 'Rethinking European Security - Towards a shared European Security Agenda' Madrid 23-24 November, 2009; and 'EU-Russia Security Dialogue', London, 18-19 March 2010. A list of papers is attached.

We are very grateful to all the participants in those meetings who contributed ideas and insights.

We would also like to thank:

Javier Solana who initiated the project and has actively participated

Carmen Claudín whose knowledge and understanding of Russia was indispensable in planning the project;

Valeriya Shamray, Agnieszka Nowak, and Maria Ribera, who helped to organise and take minutes of the Madrid meeting.

Marika Theros and Stefan Bauchowitz who have acted as coordinators of the group and who organised the London meeting and helped with the preparation of the report:

Margot Light and Mary Martin who helped with the planning and the drafting of the report; and

Mark Sleboda, Anna Sargsyan, Armand Steinmeyer, and Laura Bullon-Cassis who took notes on the London meeting.

Finally, we would like to thank the Spanish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Spanish Ministry of Defence, the Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, and the Open Society Institute for financial support.

Mary Kaldor, LSE Global Governance
Jordi Vaquer i Fanés, CIDOB

Background Papers

Irina Kobrinskaya: *The New European Security Architecture. Russian Initiative: Rationale and Perspectives.*

Andrey Kuvshinov: *Human Security, Human Rights and Civil Society in Russia*

Fyodor Lukyanov: *Russia and the European Union: Global Context of Interaction*

Andrey Makarychev: *Russian Security Discourses: Explaining the Variety of Approaches*

Sergey Markedonov: *The New European and Global Architecture Lines: View through the prism of the USSR dissolution and the Crisis of Yalta-Potsdam World*

Victoria Panova: *Russia – EU common space: energy security in modern realities*

Geneviève Schméder: *Russia and financial crisis*

Ekaterina Stepanova: *'New' threats and human security issues: drivers for Russia–EU cooperation?*

Dmitri Trenin: *The EU and Russia: Toward a Pan-European Strategy*

Jordi Vaquer i Fanés: *One answer may not be enough: responding to Russia's proposals for the European Security Architecture*

