



Converging and conflicting ethical values in the
internal/external security continuum in Europe

European Commission, 7th Framework Programme

Milestone report 6.1: Status of the Barcelona processes in terms of security

**Milestone report submitted February 2010 in fulfillment of requirements of the
FP7 Project, Converging and Conflicting Ethical Values in the Internal/External
Security Continuum in Europe (INEX)**

 PRIO	International Peace Research Institute, Oslo	PO Box 9229 Grønland NO-0134 Oslo, Norway	T: +47 22 54 77 00 F: +47 22 54 77 01	www.inexproject.eu
---	---	--	--	--

Table of contents

Summary	4
1. Introduction	5
2. Findings	5
2.1 The Barcelona process and its security approach	6
2.2 Conflict resolution	7
2.3 The fight against terrorism	8
2.4 Civil protection	10
3. Conclusions	11
References	

SUMMARY

This milestone report underlines the academic findings from the research conducted by *WP6* and presents some of the aims and objectives on which the forthcoming work within the *WP6* will aim to pursue. This milestone report will analyze the assets and drawbacks of the treatment given to the security agenda in the Barcelona Process. Particular emphasis will be placed on conflict resolution, fight against terrorism and civil protection. To put it in a nutshell, the report states that although cooperation in security matters was a priority since the inception of the Barcelona Process, the results are quite poor due both to a very complicate context and to the EU's hierarchy of priorities.

More specifically, *WP6* has identified the following findings that will be further elaborated:

- 1) The EU's security policies and cooperation agreements have been unable to contribute to regional conflict resolutions.
- 2) To agree on a definition of terrorism has proved impossible given divergence of approaches, threats and security concerns among the Euro-Mediterranean countries.
- 3) Until a definition is not set, it will not be possible to build a common response to the threats challenging the Mediterranean area.
- 3) Solving regional conflicts is to be given priority in order to tackle terrorism and to pursue stability and growth in the Mediterranean.
- 4) EU's short-term security concerns have jeopardized the promotion of democracy and the protection of human rights, contradicting the spirit of the Barcelona Process.
- 5) More flexible frameworks and cooperation in less sensible issues such as have been promoted in order to evade regional conflicts, such as civil protection, which can increase cooperation and have a positive impact on security and defence.

1. INTRODUCTION

The Mediterranean is highly vulnerable to multiple security challenges requiring suitable responses that must be sufficiently flexible and adaptable to the particular circumstances of each place. Threats to the security in countries in the Southern and Eastern Mediterranean can rapidly become security threats for the European Union (EU) as a whole, and can particularly affect countries of Southern Europe. The Euro-Mediterranean Partnership was born in the light of these challenges, to cope with security embracing multilateral cooperation. In fact, before the first Euro-Mediterranean Conference of 1995, many voices had already been raised to call for greater cooperation on this issue; being the most famous the Italian-Spanish proposal to hold a Conference on Security and Cooperation in the Mediterranean (CSCM).

The Barcelona Process vowed to enhance and area of peace and stability. For the very first time, political, economic and social dialogue was activated in an institutionalized and structured way. Nevertheless, despite this mutual concern for concentrating efforts on regional cooperation, the construction of a Euro-Mediterranean area of cooperation and security has proved difficult and complex. A process with a changing context and different responses on the part of the countries, a process that it is still being defined and evolving into different dynamic and frameworks of cooperation (being the last attempt the Union for the Mediterranean), and a process that has not managed to fulfil the initial commitments regarding political and security issues.

The report will analyse the status of security in the Barcelona Process, its objectives and results achieved from 1995 until 2008. It will be given special importance to regional-conflict resolution, the fight against terrorism and civil protection. Next, following the findings, this milestone will present conclusions and will indicate the path for the future work WP6 will pursue.

2. FINDINGS

2.1 THE BARCELONA PROCESS AND ITS SECURITY APPROACH

The Barcelona Process arose in a context marked by the end of the Cold War, by the relative optimism about the Middle East (Madrid peace conference, the Oslo accords of 1993), by the drama of Algeria and by the EU's will to be more present in the international arena. The Mediterranean has always been central among the European priorities and in a context marked by the end of the Cold War, Mediterranean cooperation initiatives started to proliferate, the Europeans were concerned about the evolution of the Mediterranean, which could become its new frontier.

The Barcelona Process was articulated in three baskets¹. The first basket was for political and security issues and from the very beginning it has evolved in a double dynamic. On the one hand, this framework has been affected by the escalations of the conflict in the Middle East, which did not block the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership but prevented substantial progresses in many spheres of the cooperation and especially in the field of security. On the other hand, there have been attempts to revitalize, strengthen and even reinvent a framework, which despite its enormous virtues, did not manage to cope with objectives initially established.

The second basket attempted to achieve a better economic performance in the countries from the South of the Mediterranean and to establish a shared area of prosperity through a gradual liberalisation of trade between the EU and its Southern partners. As far as the third basket is concerned, it relates to culture, enhancing the mutual understanding of the countries and the development of a strong civil society².

¹ It should be noted, however, that from 2005 a fourth basket on issues of Justice and Home Affairs was added, dealing mainly with migration issues

² Despite the subsequent shift towards Security issues, General Rolando Mosca Moschini, President of the Military Committee of the European Union (EUMC) in : "La política exterior y de seguridad común (PESC) y la política europea de seguridad y defensa (PESD), desde una perspectiva mediterránea". IV Seminario Internacional en Seguridad y Defensa en el Mediterráneo, Diez Años del Proceso de Barcelona: resultados y nuevos objetivos. Barcelona: CIDOB (2004). P. 19-30, claimed that "the inclusion of these three baskets acknowledges the importance attached for the EU to the political, securitarian, economic and cultural questions, which should not be tackled in isolation"

However, the economic growth was given a central place. It was considered that trade liberalization, together with accompanying measures, would result in progress and development, which would pave the path of political openness in the Southern and Eastern Mediterranean countries. Those future democratic governments would give up violence as a tool to settle differences. Thus, tracing a causal chain whose starting point was the economic dimension, the practice of the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership overlooked the fact that Barcelona Process had been designed in a way to achieve harmonious development of the political, economic and social agenda. Moreover, the growing emphasis placed on security, has led to sacrifice the promotion of democracy in the Mediterranean for the sake of region's stability. This means reinforcing authoritarian regimes, questioning the aims of the Barcelona Process, sacrificing a significant dimension of the Barcelona Declaration, and not enforcing the measures foreseen in cases of serious human rights violations in the light of the association agreements signed with Mediterranean countries.

This reliance on the economic basket and the focus on security have not contributed to foster neither the democratization process in the Southern countries of the Mediterranean nor the resolution of regional conflicts, which was the major unresolved issue that Euro-Mediterranean partners had.

2.2 CONFLICT RESOLUTION

Despite the optimism about peace spreading over the Mediterranean, the EMP did not intend to get involved in the Middle East peace. The EMP did not seek to replace but complement a process that had already started its journey. Nor had it been set among its objectives to resolve other problems, such as the division of Cyprus or the Western Sahara conflict. The EMP was content to contribute to creating an environment more prone to regional peace and stability without fully enter into conflict resolution or into the concept of security.

The EuroMeSCo report (2005) distinguished three phases regarding ambition and prospects involving security cooperation in the Barcelona Process. During the first years, various efforts were made to develop confidence-building measures and to approach hard security problems. Hence, it was set the goal of a Middle East free of Weapons of Mass

Destruction³. The worsening of the situation in Palestine will lead to a second phase characterized by reflection and the conception of the relevant actions envisaged to strengthen the Barcelona Process; being a good example of it the creation of the EuroMeSCo network, with an undeniable impact on the field of security and defence. Very often, these issues are object of debate within both EuroMeSCo network of international research institutes and the seminar organized in Malta for young diplomats from the Euro-Mediterranean area.

Moreover, efforts were concentrated on the agreement of a Euro-Mediterranean Charter for Peace and Stability⁴. Nevertheless, the deterioration of the situation in the Middle East in the late 1990s watered down the initial expectations and following the second Intifada, Euro-Mediterranean countries had different perceptions and requirements of security and cooperation and proved unable to agree on the aforementioned charter during the French EU Presidency, in the year 2000. Therefore, the weak involvement of the Barcelona process in the conflict resolution, together with the disappointment at not being able to sign the Euro-Mediterranean Charter for Peace and Stability, led the partners of the Barcelona Process to enter a third phase and to lower its expectations, opting for combining action with a more pragmatic approach.

Bilateral cooperation was given priority in the framework of the *European Security and Defence Policy* (ESDP). Further cooperation with Southern partners in the ESDP framework was not ruled out, but it was pointed out that this cooperation would be progressive, individually and more important, voluntarily⁵. The bet of the ESDP attempted to avoid the suspicion that the launch in 1994 of the European Maritime Force (EUROMARFOR) and the rapid operational Euroforces (EUFOR) had caused among some Mediterranean partners. Thus, major efforts have been concentrated to open up the ESDP to the participation of its Mediterranean partners.

³ The EuroMeSCo report (2005) “welcomes the inclusion of Non-Proliferation of WMD clauses in the latest agreements and action plans; points out that such measures must be implemented by all the partner countries without exception with a view to declaring the Mediterranean a WMD-free area; calls for further involvement of partner countries in the ESDP; with that aim in view, calls on the Council to envisage the possibility of consulting our Mediterranean partners, whenever they are concerned, on CFSP issues on the agenda, by involving them whenever necessary in meetings of the General Affairs and External Relations Council”

⁴ See ORTEGA, Martín (ed.). “The future of the Euro-Mediterranean Security Dialogue”. Occasional paper, No14, WEU Institute

⁵ *Five-Year Work Programme*, Brussels, 28 November 2005, 15074/05 (Press release 327)

So far, the Euro-Mediterranean Dialogue on ESDP has focused on dialogue and transparency. Its main purpose is to enhance confidence among its members, to create a space where different approaches on security and defence can be debated and to dispel the climate of misunderstanding and misgivings. To boost dialogue and transparency, regular contacts and seminars have been promoted. In addition to these initiatives, there are specific areas of cooperation on which progress has been made. This is the example of Morocco and its participation in the framework of Operation *Althea*. It is worth mentioning that although this agreement it is not signed under the Barcelona Process, it does have an effect on the Euro-Mediterranean dialogue on security and defence.

In the multilateral field, cooperation and dialogue has focused on the aspects that are halfway between domestic and external security such as the anti-terrorism fight, and less sensitive political issues such as civil protection. Simultaneously, sub-regional frameworks, such as the 5+5, have been more active from the fact that they are less vulnerable to the escalate of regional conflicts. Southern Mediterranean officials, and particularly those working on security matters, feel at ease in more informal and flexible formats, where smaller and more pragmatic projects are implemented and where its members are in equal footing.

2.3 THE FIGHT AGAINST TERRORISM

Cooperation in fighting terrorism has always been a complicated issue in the Mediterranean context and, already in the process of drafting the 1995 Barcelona Declaration, it became one of the points that sparked more controversy. The attacks by the GIA in France in the summer of 1995, or the attacks by radical Islamists that spattered Algeria from 1993 to 1995, made violent episodes a reality already threatening the Euro-Mediterranean space. Nevertheless, since the attacks of September 11 and similar events (bombings in Madrid, London, Amman, Sharm al Sheik, Istanbul, Djerba, Casablanca, etc.), combating international terrorism has become one of the top concerns in the Mediterranean.

Once again, as in other fields of cooperation, difficulties arise among the EMP when it comes to giving a response in the fight against terrorism. The variety of approaches also hampers the cooperation on this framework and often, European's vision of the

preconditions encouraging international terrorism is not necessarily shared by elites and populations in the South. There is an excessive emphasis on security in order to counter terrorism, which automatically leads to neglect the promotion of democracy, the protection of human rights and resolution of regional conflicts.

In this sense, it was expected that concrete steps were taken during the Euro-Mediterranean summit (2005) towards greater cooperation and agreement in the fight against terrorism. Finally, a code of conduct for fighting terrorism was adopted⁶, in an area that had provoked most controversy since the inception of the Barcelona Process. There were strong disagreements on how to define a terrorist action. The only agreement the parties reached was to complete the “General Convention on International Terrorism” before the 60th session of the United Nations General Assembly in 2005 that contains a legal definition of terrorist acts.

Some observers (especially Spanish diplomats) insisted that the code’s added value was not the definition but other aspects of the text. The code expresses a unanimous condemnation of terrorism in all its forms and manifestations, as well as a determination to eradicate it and to fight all those supporting it. The document contains a commitment to refuse political asylum to terrorists, condemns terrorism, and to not associate terrorism with any religion or culture⁷. Equally important is the document emphasizing that cooperation in this field must not be carried out at the expense of citizens fundamental rights, and that victims of terrorist actions should be given priority attention.

Terrorism is a phenomenon, but it also affects the security of states, whose main victims are ordinary citizens. The shift toward fighting terrorism in the Euro-Mediterranean agenda has served as a perfect excuse for those regimes unwilling to move towards reforms on democracy and human rights. Internal or external enemies that use terrorist methods have been cited to justify their slowly (or inexistent) achievements in the democratization

⁶ “Euro-Mediterranean Code of Conduct on Countering Terrorism”, Brussels, 28 November 2005, press release 328 (15075/05)

⁷ Jesús Núñez: “La Cooperación Euromediterránea contra la amenaza del terrorismo internacional: bases de partida”. VII Seminario Internacional en Seguridad y Defensa en el Mediterráneo: Conflictos regionales y estrategias de seguridad. Barcelona: CIDOB (2008). P. 189-221, claimed: “the main strength of the Code of 2005 is its mere existence, as it formally makes visible a common commitment to address a threat that is perceived as collective. Beyond that simple fact, while the conceptual problem of defining terrorism is not solved, and this does not seem feasible in the short term, it will be lacking a solid foundation on which to build a common response to the problem”.

process. Nevertheless, to counter terrorism, regional conflicts need to be tackled and internal tensions need to be relieved.

As far as other frameworks of dialogue and cooperation, such as NATO's Mediterranean Dialogue or the Group 5+5, have not succeeded in shaping regional dynamics and solving the existing conflicts. They have not succeeded in neither reducing the inequality gap, in promoting the emergency of a civil society in the Southern Mediterranean or boosting reforms towards democracy.

2.4 CIVIL PROTECTION

The Mediterranean countries are regularly affected by man-made and natural disasters (mainly drought, earthquakes, floods and fires), with demands for cooperation and assistance following afterwards. Civil protection is one of the areas in which there is growing cooperation between both shores and it is important to point out that its achievements can have a positive impact on other frameworks of cooperation on security and defence. Advances on civil protection have been made in a discreet but effective manner, with different goals and geographical scopes and not only seeking to push forward projects on a regional scale but in different and flexible multilateral frameworks⁸. It is an issue politically less sensitive and therefore, less affected by the Middle East conflict. Besides, governments have stronger incentives to cooperate as it is in their own interest to manage disasters efficiently.

The first project was launched in 1996 at the urging of Egypt and Italy for cooperation on the effects of natural disasters. Subsequently, Algeria, France, the European Commission, and the Council joined this initiative, known as the Bridge⁹ programme (2004-2008). The next step was to turn it into a regional framework with a Euro-Mediterranean scope. This initiative has been spreading over the Euro-Mediterranean space and, as in other cases, the EU and its Member States have combined actions at the multilateral and bilateral level.

⁸ For further information see: BREMBER, Niklas; DRISS, Ahmed; HORST, Jacob; SOLER I LECHA, Eduard y WERENFELS, Isabelle, "Flexible Multilateralism: Unlimited Opportunities? The Case of Civil Protection in the Mediterranean", EuroMeSCo paper, No80. febrero 2009

⁹ The actions carried out in this Project are detailed on: <<http://euromed-protection-civile.eu/>>

Such a system is entirely in harmony with Work Programme adopted at the Barcelona summit in 2005 for the following five years. This document established that the signatories would collaborate in “crisis management and activities as well as in the areas of civil protection and the prevention of natural disasters”. At a meeting in Porto on 24 October 2007, the chief executives for civil protection of the EuroMed programme and their European counterparts agreed on steps in this direction with the aim to develop such a fully-integrated Euro-Mediterranean system. The Euro-Mediterranean conference in Lisbon in November 2007 made further progress. Nevertheless, the Euro-Mediterranean cooperation in civil protection is faced with the fact that a real EU system on civil protection is missing.

The results obtained from this cooperation have been positive and have even expressed the belief that you can have a positive effect in promoting confidence and opening up other areas of cooperation in security. At the Barcelona Summit in 2005, it has been identified again as a priority line of action and its continuity has been maintained over time becoming one of the six key pillars of the Union for the Mediterranean.

3. CONCLUSIONS

The Barcelona Process was initiated in 1995 in an atmosphere of enthusiasm and optimism, aiming at creating an area of peace and stability. There was a common awareness of the challenges facing the Mediterranean and that European security could not be tackled without considering the security of neighbouring countries, as these threats are interlinked. Thus, it was attached a strategic value to the protection of human rights, the promotion of democracy and conflict resolution. Fifteen years after the Barcelona Process was launched, it can be seen that the outcomes are not that promising. Some conclusions may be drawn from the findings: 1) the EU and its Member States have failed to address proper mechanisms to deal with regional conflicts and, moreover, these conflicts have affected Euro-Mediterranean cooperation as a whole as illustrated by the interference of the Arab-Israeli Process with the agenda of the Barcelona Process: 2) Especially after the 9/11 fighting terrorism has become a priority but the rule of consensus has impeded any practical result. Moreover, concern on security has overshadowed other priorities such as human rights and democracy. 3) In order to engage in a less politically sensitive issue, cooperation on civil protection has been boosted, becoming one of the six pillars of the UfM. This field can improved citizen’s security and may be suitable to develop multilateral and flexible projects. 4) The UfM attempts to revitalize the Euro-Mediterranean dialogue

and cooperation. For this, it has tried to focus on specific projects less affected by political controversies. Nevertheless, it has inherited the same problems hampering the Barcelona Process. 5) Sub-regional frameworks such as 5+5 and NATO's Mediterranean Dialogue might complement, facilitate and collaborate with the security initiatives developed within the EMP framework.

REFERENCES

-ALIBONI, Roberto. "Building Blocks for the Euro-Mediterranean Charter on Peace and Stability", *EuroMeSCo paper*, No. 7 (1999)

-BARBÉ, Esther. "The Barcelona Conference : Launching pad of a Process". *Mediterranean Politics*. Vol. 1, No1 (1996). P. 25-42

-BICCHI, Federica & MARTIN, Mary. "Talking Tough or Talking Together? European Security Discourses towards the Mediterranean". *Mediterranean Politics*. Vol. 11, No2 (2006). P. 189-207

-BISCOP, Sven. "Opening Up the ESDP to the South: A Comprehensive and Cooperative Approach to Euro-Mediterranean Security" en *Security Dialogue*, vol. 34, No2 (2003). P. 183-197

-COURELA, Pedro. "Civil Protection as a Euro-Mediterranean Project: The Case for Practical Co-operation", *EuroMeSCo paper*, No34 (2004)

-FELIU, Laura. "Human Rights and the Barcelona Process". En: ATTINÀ, Fulvio y STAVRIDIS, Stelios (eds.). *The Barcelona Process and the Euro-Mediterranean issues from Stuttgart to Marseille*. University of Catania: Pubblicazioni della faroltà di Scienze Politiche 11, 2001.

-GOMARIZ, Antonio. "El Proceso de definición y construcción del espacio euromediterráneo de cooperación y seguridad", en *Boletín de Información, CESEDEN*, No304 (2008). P. 85-112

-MOSCA, Rolando. "La política exterior y de seguridad común (PESC) y la política europea de seguridad y defensa (PESD), desde una perspectiva mediterránea". IV Seminario Internacional en Seguridad y Defensa en el Mediterráneo, Diez Años del Proceso de Barcelona: resultados y nuevos objetivos. Barcelona: CIDOB (2004). P. 19-30

-ORTEGA, Martín. "La Política Europea de Seguridad y Defensa y el Diálogo Euromediterráneo", en *Monografías del CESEDEN*, No92 (2007). P. 55-74

-REINARES, Fernando. "The Mediterranean Region and International Terrorism: A New Framework for Cooperation?". *Real Instituto Elcano*, No149 (2006)

-SOLER I LECHA, Eduard. "Seguridad, Prosperidad e Intercambio Cultural y Humano: Los grandes objetivos de las relaciones euromediterráneas". Cuadernos de Estrategia, "Del

Desencuentro entre culturas a la alianza de civilizaciones. Nuevas aportaciones para la seguridad en el Mediterráneo”. Ministerio de Defensa, No142 (2007). P. 83-106