

Wednesday, 4 June 2008 - Brussels

2006 Annual report on the CFSP - Annual report on the implementation of the European Security Strategy and ESDP (continuation of debate)

Ana Maria Gomes (PSE). - (PT) I should like to congratulate Mr Kuhne on his excellent report and in particular for the insistence on introducing the Human Security concept in combination with the principle of the responsibility to protect - a concept which Mr Solana has also upheld here.

These have to be the twin pillars behind a European approach to crisis management missions. On the one hand, deciding to intervene in a country under the ESDP must be based on an interpretation of the UN Charter that emphasises the responsibility to protect: the obligation to prevent genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity.

On the other hand, if the Union finds itself involved in a crisis requiring the use of military means, it is essential for the use of force to be guided by the doctrine of human security. This would mean that European troops would have to focus their efforts on setting up safe havens for non-combatant civilian populations, much more than on destroying the enemy with a view to military victory.

These two principles provide Europe with a coherent crisis management strategy at the beginning of the 21st century. Amendment 1 by the Socialist Group in the European Parliament therefore reflects the moral, legal and operational demands we are facing in Afghanistan, Chad and Lebanon and that we will face in the future.

For these reasons, I find it regrettable that the Group of the European People's Party (Christian Democrats) and European Democrats and the Confederal Group of the European United Left/Nordic Green Left rejected this amendment. This reactionary alliance insists on turning a blind eye to the primacy of human rights - a concept that would reinforce the legitimacy of and popular support for ESDP missions.