

Redner: **Moratinos, Miguel Angel**
Funktion: **Minister of Foreign Affairs, Madrid**
Land / Organisation: **Spain**

Good morning,

I want to thank our host, Wolfgang Ischinger, for his invitation and his kind words of introduction. It is a pleasure and an honour for me to share this panel with two distinguished speakers, President Ivanov and my colleague and friend Minister Sikorski.

I am sure our countries' different historical backgrounds and geographical locations, within a shared European experience, will contribute to enrich today's discussion on "the Future of European and Global Security" because we symbolize how much European security can only be approached as a joint endeavour of all European countries.

The title of this discussion seems very appropriate. We should indeed avoid a narrow perspective on European security, which today cannot be discussed in isolation from the global challenges of our time --"global" not just geographically, but also because of the broad range of interconnected issues those challenges involve.

We are going through a difficult and complex period of political and economic transformations of global proportions. The current financial crisis is a particularly painful example. This changing environment presents crucial challenges for the international and transatlantic security agenda. We need to make important decisions that will shape our common future. We cannot relinquish such responsibilities.

How can we respond better to those challenges? If only for the sake of our discussion, allow me to mention some of the things that I think we need:

First, we need more global governance.

As the Spanish Prime Minister stated in his speech at the UN General Assembly last September, this has not been "the first crisis of globalization". Rather, it has been the first crisis of global governance; the crisis of a globalization without the rules and means to govern it.

We need global Governance for global challenges, from a true collective effort, with joint responsibilities and burden sharing, and the instruments needed for well-coordinated political action in a multilateral framework.

We cannot achieve economic and social development in the absence of adequate conditions of peace and security for our countries and citizens. And neither can we build durable peace and security without sustainable economic and social development.

Our mission in Afghanistan illustrates with extreme clarity this mutual dependence between security and development. Other examples abound:

From Yemen to the present situation in Haiti. From the fight against hunger and extreme poverty; climate change; energy crisis; the fight against organized crime, terrorism or piracy, to a traditional case of state aggression.

We have to improve our ability to "manage instability". And we should do so in a multilateral and cooperative way.

Second, we need more Europe.

Allow me to underline this, not just as a European currently assuming the rotating Presidency of the European Union, but also because I am truly convinced that we need the European Union as a global actor, if we want global governance to work effectively.

European countries, my own country, need the Union as a platform for a common and more effective contribution to international efforts in an increasing number of fields. This includes trade, monetary, development or environmental issues, together with foreign, security and defense policy. The current implementation of the EU's Lisbon Treaty will provide the Union with better instruments to contribute to European and global security, in cooperation with other partners.

The new High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, in the person of

Catherine Ashton, plays a key role in that respect, with the full support of the Spanish Presidency of the Council. I am very glad Catherine has spoken in the first part of today's discussion, in order to present the views of the Union.

The immediate task is to ensure transition to the Lisbon institutions, including on the Union's representation abroad. High in our agenda: a Common Security and Defense Policy, mature enough after 10 years in the making, with the necessary military and civilian crisis management capabilities, and a strategic vision.

Third, we need more transatlantic cooperation.

More Europe means, and will always mean, a stronger and healthier transatlantic link. The new Europe still needs the US, and the US will always have in Europe its most reliable and capable partner.

The EU still has a long way to go. But there is work in progress, and the implementation of the Lisbon Treaty is good proof of that.

As the US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton said on 29th January in her Paris Speech on European Security, "we need European leadership in the 21st century". In fact, as she further stated, "much of what we hope to accomplish globally depends on [the US] working together with Europe".

I welcome Mrs Clinton's approach on cooperation with a strong and unified Europe, which is very much in harmony with the European Security

Strategy. Our partnership is solidly based on history, deeply shared values, and common interests. We should continue to work together, in the EU-US, NATO, OSCE, and other multilateral and bilateral frameworks.

Fourth, we need a renewed NATO.

The Atlantic Alliance remains essential, as an embodiment of the transatlantic link, together with the direct EU-US relationship. But we need to renew NATO and continue its transformation to deal with the requirements of the 21st Century.

To achieve this, we should work hard to complete the current work on a new Strategic Concept by the Lisbon Summit next November. We have to define our level of ambition while preserving the consensus progressively built in the past.

The current Concept, adopted 10 years ago, remains essentially valid, and NATO's core functions and principles have to be validated (and understood by our public opinions).

We have to preserve the valuable *acquis* the Alliance has achieved in the definition of its common values, principles and tasks, including a firm commitment to collective defense, the openness for crisis management action, and the partnership approach in its cooperation with others. In fact, we should reject any suggestion to *bring the clock back* in these important issues.

But a lot of things have happened since 1999. We need to assess these strategic changes, in order to update the scenario of both the "threats" and the broader "risks" to our security. Only in this way will we be able to develop appropriate responses in the security field, always keeping in mind that they are part of a multifaceted effort of global governance; and that we should strive to prevent risks from becoming threats, rather than wait until a crisis explodes.

Fifth, we need more cooperation against terrorism.

In fact, the most significant new event NATO has to take account of in its new Concept is the irruption of international terrorism since 11 September 2001 as a global security threat of unprecedented scale. Spain, which had already been fighting terrorism for a long time, experienced this new dimension of the terrorist danger in the Madrid attacks of 11 March 2004.

We need a more determined international cooperation against this global threat of terrorism. Our engagement in Afghanistan is to a good extent motivated by this response to the terrorist threat after September 11. But Al Qaeda terrorism reaches out to other countries, from the Asian Subcontinent to the Middle East, Northern Africa, the Sahel or the Horn of Africa. We should help these countries to fight this menace.

We are in the face of a strategic threat. We need a strategic, political, answer that deals with the root causes, with the process of ideological radicalization. We have to prevent the danger of countries becoming failed States, where terrorist groups and organized crime can take hold or use them as

safe havens. The breakdown of governance, poverty aggravated by economic crises or by climate change, ignorance and radicalism, terrorism, piracy, trafficking with drugs and people - these and other problems tend to reinforce each other, and require therefore a comprehensive response by all national and international actors.

We must jointly focus on averting the risk of nuclear terrorism, preventing the access to weapons of mass destruction by non State actors by strengthening nuclear security and taking resolute action to tackle the risks to nuclear proliferation posed by the intention of some States to develop nuclear weapons.

And this brings us to,

Sixth, we need more efforts against nuclear proliferation.

In this context, I want to stress the importance of achieving a satisfactory result at next May's review conference of the Non Proliferation Treaty in New York, and to celebrate the improved prospects for progress in nuclear arms talks between the United States and Russia. As the two leading nuclear powers, they bear the burden of the disarmament efforts. Their engagement, along with the other three nuclear-weapons States, will be crucial for ensuring a substantive outcome at the NPT Review Conference.

The NPT is the only regime we have to manage proliferation crises and their impact on global and regional stability. The only way ahead is to validate and improve this regime, in its three pillars: nuclear disarmament, non proliferation, and peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

I welcome the current US approach as reflected in President Obama's Prague speech last April, including his view of a world free of nuclear weapons. His proposals promote multilateral approaches and look for new international consensus and agreements. It is an ambitious goal, but we have to be ambitious and be driven by strategic visions.

The Iranian nuclear issue is a test for the international community. Its repercussions in the stability and security of the wider Middle East region could be devastating. While the opportunity for negotiations and for a diplomatic solution is still there, the international community cannot be kept waiting indefinitely or accept the lack of compliance with United Nations Security Council resolutions. We must reaffirm our determination to work for a Middle East free of all nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction.

Seventh, we need to adapt to a multipolar world.

Indeed, the world has changed. Geopolitics is back. We see a new "multipolar world", with the emergence of new powers looking for international recognition. China, India, Brazil have emerged as economic and increasingly also political and military powerhouses. There are more regional groups, and more aspirants to regional leadership. And, yes, Russia is back, with important -and potentially positive- repercussions for European and international security.

A more multipolar world is by definition more unpredictable. It is also more competitive, especially when searching for scarce resources, such as energy or water. They have already been the motivations for systemic conflicts in the past, as we have seen in the Middle East, or in Darfur and other African crises.

The key is to transform the individual energies of geopolitical competition into collective efforts of global governance.

These efforts should take also into account another key feature of today's globalized world, which is the increasing influence of non-State actors. This includes the constructive work of multinational corporations and NGO's, but also the destabilizing actions of international terrorist and criminal networks.

This adds to the unpredictability which is another characteristic feature of the new strategic environment. This has very practical consequences for NATO and the EU. Collective defense remains a core task, specifically for the Alliance, but the paradigm has shifted from "defense organizations" to "security providers". NATO, and the EU through its ESDP, are increasingly seen by their members and by the International Community as providers of security.

Eighth, we need more focus on crisis prevention

In the new strategic environment, attention has shifted from the classic concept of “deterrence“ to the modern notion of the “prevention“ of crises. We have to be more focused and pro-active, in order to prevent crises from becoming conflicts. Even better, we should try to work at the root causes of the crises in order to defuse them altogether, with a comprehensive approach to security involving political, economic, humanitarian or military instruments needed in each case.

The international and Euro-Atlantic security context has seen both positive and negative developments in the last decade. There has been a huge improvement in the Western Balkans, new hopes and frustrations in the Middle East, challenges and opportunities in our strategic relationship with Russia, new tragedies but also an increasing international commitment in Africa, the emergence of new political and economic powers, the risk of regional arms races increased by nuclear and missile proliferation, the race also for energy resources, etc.

Most of those issues do not present imminent threats to the security of our countries, but they could develop into tangible risks in a context of instability, or in case of a limited but open conflict.

We should be aware of the increasing expectations of the International Community about the role of NATO, and of the EU’s Common Security and Defense Policy, as multilateral frameworks for crisis management whenever a military capability is required to deal with a crisis. Both organizations have become examples of effective multilateralism in the security field, acting anywhere in the world, under UN mandate and in synergy with other international actors, as we have seen in the operations in the Balkans or in Afghanistan, but also by supporting the development of African or Afghan capabilities.

To be clear, there is no requirement for a “global policeman“. But the new strategic environment demands generosity from our relatively resourceful States, by helping to the stability and to the economic and institutional development of less fortunate countries. In the long term, this will strengthen our own security.

Ninth, we need more partnership.

We need to be able to work together with as many countries as possible for crisis prevention and the management of today’s challenges. The US, NATO and the EU can obviously not do everything alone, neither should they try. Dealing with difficult issues in cooperation and partnership with others enhances the effectiveness and legitimacy of our efforts. True dialogue and consultation on joint challenges increase also mutual confidence and understanding between the partners themselves. I want to mention six important but very different examples of where we need more partnership efforts: Russia; Central Asia; the Mediterranean; the relationship between civilizations; the Middle East Peace Process; and local ownership in areas of crisis.

The new strategic environment is an opportunity to patiently develop a more cooperative and constructive relationship between the Western countries and the resurgent Russia, to make it a strong partner against common global threats. We do not always agree on everything (the Georgia crisis has been and is a poignant test), and sometimes there are different security perceptions on issues such as NATO enlargement and the Treaty on Conventional Forces in Europe. But the response to that should be more dialogue and consultation.

In this context, Spain welcomes President Medvedev’s calls to improve pan-European security, and the active and open discussion we are undertaking in the OSCE, in the framework of the Corfu process. We all share the principles of the indivisibility of security, the sovereignty of States and territorial integrity, as some of the founding principles we are committed to within OSCE. The OSCE is the main expression of our sense of cooperative security: where its military, economic and human rights dimensions are interconnected, and as such it has been a force of stability and transformation in Europe. Russia is a key pillar of the new European security architecture, and we want Moscow to feel comfortable in it.

The increased political role of NATO and of the EU should be instrumental in developing a cooperative security framework for the whole of the European continent. The NATO-Russia and EU-Russia relationships are of particular importance for stability and common security, and for facing together the shared threats of terrorism, proliferation or failed States.

We should give more prominence to the fact that pan-European security encompasses also our Central Asian partners. The active role of Kazakhstan as Chairmanship-in-Office of the OSCE is helping us to understand better this dimension. President Nazarbayev has spoken of the need of a new concept of “Eurasian“ security, rather than just “European security“, as a way to take better into account the threats of terrorism and ethnic or religious conflict emanating from this region, and from neighbouring Afghanistan. The Afghan conflict, with its repercussions on terrorism, radicalism or drug-trafficking, affects negatively the stability and prosperity of Central Asia.

NATO and the EU should also lend more attention to the challenges and opportunities of our Southern neighbourhood in the Mediterranean. NATO’s Mediterranean Dialogue and the Union for the Mediterranean should be further developed to achieve mutual understanding and cooperation with those countries in a multilateral framework. This objective should be underlined in the new NATO Strategic Concept. This is particularly important because most NATO missions today take place in Muslim countries, including Afghanistan. We have to raise the political level of NATO’s Mediterranean Dialogue, including a new meeting at ministerial level which Spain has offered to host, as soon as circumstances allow.

We should strive to overcome the effects of wrong perceptions based on cultural and religious differences.

The UN-sponsored Alliance of Civilizations, based on a Spanish and Turkish proposal, is also working towards this very objective. We can still turn the wave of radicalism that threatens Moslem and other societies by developing a true dialogue of cultures and civilizations, and by promoting new frameworks of cooperation with our Southern neighbours.

We should intensify international efforts to bring forward the Middle East Peace Process. We should not lose yet another window of opportunity. The resolution of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is a prerequisite for lasting peace and security in the region and beyond, as this conflict has always had a decisive and very negative influence on other crises. It deepens the mistrust between the Muslim world, and it is used as justification for terrorism and proliferation. Moving forward in the peace process would be the best imaginable success in global crisis prevention. For this, we need the true efforts of everybody, not just the parties and the international Quartet partners, but also the contribution of other Arab and Muslim States.

A final partnership I want to underline is the one we need to have with the countries which receive assistance from the international community, in particular in the security field. This is called local ownership, and we need more. One key example is Afghanistan. The international community’s commitment there has always been one of assistance to the Afghan Government. I welcome very much the emphasis of the recent London International Conference on moving towards transition to Afghan leadership, including in the security field. The development and training of the Afghan security forces is essential for this to work, and a good part of NATO, and Spanish, efforts is aimed at helping the Afghans to achieve that objective. It is not a question of exit strategy, but of success strategy, since only with Afghan ownership can Afghanistan achieve a truly sustainable security.

Tenth, we need to strengthen aid efforts and food security.

A key task of global governance today is to prevent the effects of the current economic and financial crisis from weakening international aid efforts. Sustainable security is only achievable through economic and social development. Our countries’ budgets are tightening, but our long term priorities should remain clear. With the important exception of some emerging economies, developing countries feel even more than the developed world the effects of the recent succession of crises in energy, food or financial markets.

A key issue here is to achieve food security, which is threatened not just by underdevelopment, but also by regional conflicts, trade distortions, energy prices, or climate change. This is not just about emergency aid. The World Food Program and other humanitarian actors do a wonderful, sometimes in dangerous places like Somalia. But we need long-term solutions to food security. Spain supports

FAQ efforts in this area. It is in our own interest to deal with this problem, in order to prevent it from provoking State failure, local conflicts on resources and uncontrolled migrations. Our own security is at stake.

The “new frontier“ of the twenty-first century is to create a global governance system that will allow us to manage better than until now our common challenges. For the first time, we can do so without having gone previously through the traumatic experience of a major war.

We must take advantage of the window of opportunity that has now opened, with new economic and security challenges that make all of us aware of the need for developing global governance, with a new US Administration that shows new thinking in the fields of security and international relations, and with the prospect of stronger EU external action as the Lisbon Treaty is being implemented. But our efforts must be truly inclusive, involving other countries and organizations, in order to be acceptable for the whole International Community and to provide sustainable improvements for the entire world.

Thank you very much for your attention.

Es gilt das gesprochene Wort!