



Around Europe

Quaker Council for European Affairs

No. 326 October 2010

Stronghold Europe: the European Security Research Programme

The European Security Research Programme (ESRP) is part of the Seventh Framework Programme (FP7) of the EU which covers projects between 2007 and 2013. The FP7 is the EU research scheme to shape the EU as the 'most dynamic competitive knowledge-based economy in the world'. It has an overall budget of over 50.5 billion euro, of which 1.4 billion have been allocated to the ESRP. The main goal of the ESRP is to increase the security of European citizens by financing the technological advancement of the European security industry.

The ESRP also has an economic scope since it aims to enhance the competitiveness of the European companies in the security sector. This is a matter of concern for European civil society. Addressing security for profit could transform the way in which democratic states are governed by favouring elites that use technology to control society in an undemocratic manner. Furthermore, an advertising industry that fosters human fears could emerge and people's privacy could be put in danger.

The establishment of the ESRP was informally decided upon by the Commissioner for Enterprise and Industry in 2003. Lacking any official legal act, proposal or consultation process by European and national parliaments - as is customary when a new budget is established - in 2004 the Commission decided to appoint a Group of Personalities (GOP) to address research requirements 'to meet the EU's foreign, security and defence policy objectives'. This undemocratic process and the further development of the programme has been criticized by a number of organizations, including QCEA, for its close cooperation with Europe's defence industry.

Indeed although the FP7 is for civilian research only, the ESRP also funds projects in which there is a major involvement of the military industry. The ESRP includes the development of dual use technology. Dual use technology are innovations that can be used for both military and civilian purposes because they are envisioned to bring longer-term benefits to society; the involvement of the defence industry in this research blurs the lines, thus running the risk of EU funds being used for military purposes, contrary to the

EU treaties.

Some projects funded by the ESRP have the explicit intent of developing technology widely criticized for their deadly effects in conflict areas. This is the case for the unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) recently used during wars in Gaza, Afghanistan and Pakistan. The unmanned aerial vehicles are also known as drones and consist of aircraft piloted remotely without a human crew on board. UAVs can perform both reconnaissance and attack missions. Although they are supposed to be a very precise weapon they have caused civilian casualties. UAVs are banned from the EU skies because of the risks they pose to civilian air traffic. This notwithstanding, studies on their use for internal security purposes are promoted by the EU Institutions under the ESRP.

Under the Third Country Agreements, non-EU Member States can participate in the FP7. Such States have become Associated Countries thanks to agreements signed with the Union, and legal entities from those countries are thus "eligible for funding on the same footing as legal entities from the Member States". Israel is such an Associated Country. The EU's FP7 is currently the second largest financier of academic research in Israel, after the Israel Science Foundation, and in per capita terms, no non-EU country has received more EU funding than Israel. Israel stands out in the security cooperation scheme. The European Commission has signed off several contracts to the Israeli military industries which supply the Israeli army and make profits from the occupation and aggression against the occupied Palestinian territories. Among them the Israel Aerospace Industries, a state-owned manufacturer of drones; Motorola Israel, a producer of virtual fences around the settlements; and Elbit Systems, one of Israel's largest private military technology firms involved in the construction of the Separation Wall. Recently awarded contracts include: a nine million euro project to deliver "field-derived data" to "crisis managers" in "command-and-control centres" and an 8.99 million euro project to develop airport security systems. Both projects are led by Verint Systems, an Israeli company producing intelligence products.

(See page 2)



QCEA has published a more detailed briefing paper on the ESRP which can be found on our website. We will be developing an action pack to support our advocacy work on this issue.

Stefano D'Errico

Introducing our new Programme Assistants...

Following on from last month's issue, QCEA is pleased to welcome two new programme assistants for the upcoming year. They introduce themselves below.

I took up one of the Programme Assistant positions at QCEA at the beginning of October, and am looking forward to a challenging and fulfilling year. The position will give me my first experience of career-related work, having completed my master's degree in Global Political Economy at the University of Sussex in September. Prior to that, I obtained an undergraduate degree in economics from the University of York in 2009. I hope



to gain some direct knowledge of the European Institutions during my time at QCEA, with the aim of working in and around them in the future.

During my time here, I will be contributing to QCEA's advocacy work for peace in the Middle East, focusing on arms trade and security cooperation between EU Member States and Israel and the economic role of

the EU more broadly in the region. I am excited to be participating in the upcoming QCEA-QPSW Conference on this topic, and hope the ideas from Friends it generates will provide inspiration for QCEA's subsequent work.

I will also act as the EMEYF secretary for the year and hope this will give me a chance to see some familiar faces and meet new ones. I have been attending Quaker meetings since childhood and am a member of West Kent Area Meeting as well as Young Friends General Meeting. I aim to communicate some of my experiences over the year amongst Friends I have contact with in the UK and elsewhere.

Having the opportunity to live and work in Brussels for a year is really exciting for me, and I hope to make the most of it! I aim to improve my French, pick up some Flemish and experience some of the local culture, music, and other things the city has to offer. If you would like to get in touch with queries, suggestions, or anything else my email is jnicholls@qcea.org. Hope to hear from you!

John Nicholls

I'll be arriving in Brussels at the beginning of November, from the enchanting city of Edinburgh, which has been my home for the last four and a half years. I finished studying Philosophy and Politics at Edinburgh University in May, my academic years being interspersed with vibrant summers spent working at the Edinburgh Festival Fringe administrative office. Since graduating I have been working as a researcher on access to environmental justice for Friends of the Earth Scotland.

Although Edinburgh has a way of getting hold of one's heart, I'm very happy to be embarking on a new adventure in Brussels, and excited about starting as a Programme Assistant with QCEA. I'll be focusing on Sustainable Energy Security, including EU policies on, and research into, reducing demand for energy. Having found QCEA's work and advocacy to so closely reflect my interest areas and passions, I am very much looking forward to engaging with the programme and people in full.

Whilst in Belgium, I hope to explore the country and its neighbours, and make the most of its unique juxtaposition of languages and cultures, right at the heart of Europe. If anyone has any suggestions on how best to do this, or wishes to correspond on any aspect of the work I'll be undertaking, I'd be very happy to hear from you. My email address is rtansey@qcea.org.



Rachel Tansey



EU Funding for 2014 to 2020 - Discussions Begin

The European Union manages its finances in the medium term through Multi-annual Financial Frameworks (MFF). The current framework runs to the end of 2013. When the current MFF was decided in 2005, Member States agreed that the EU Budget should undergo a thorough review before the next MFF needed to be agreed. The review has taken place. The European Commission has just published a paper on the review. Generally, the view is that this will not lead to any major changes in the EU's finances. That is not to say that the next MFF won't look very different from the last one; but for different reasons. The 'financial crisis' has occurred and has led to significant pressure on national budgets. The Lisbon Treaty has been implemented; with it, the EU has a range of policy issues to deal with now that it did not have before. Energy Security and Climate Change are among them; the European External Action Service is another.

In March 2010, the European Commission published the EU2020 strategy. This is a document which is intended to frame the work of the EU for the medium-term future. In the words of the document itself:

*'We need a strategy to help us come out stronger from the crisis and turn the EU into a smart, sustainable and inclusive economy delivering high levels of employment, productivity and social cohesion.'*¹

The strategy sets out three priorities with seven flagship initiatives which are aimed at achieving this. An assessment of the degree to which the **2011 EU draft budget** (framed under the current MFF) contributes to these priorities and initiatives shows that there is a significant mismatch: only 43 per cent of the expenditure foreseen in 2011 is allocated to priorities which fit within the seven flagships. So there will have to be significant changes.

Equally important is the fact that the European Commission, in making proposals for the next MFF, will have to take account of the fact that the Member States are all making cuts in their national budgets. An EU budget proposal which is not also showing significant cuts will not be acceptable to the Member States. But is that the right approach? At present, the EU budget is limited to just over one per cent of the Gross National Income of the Member States. That works out at less than 300 euro per person. So any major cut is not going to save much per person.

The EU has, essentially, three different ways of working: it passes legislation which has to be implemented in the Member States and which, if it causes expenditure, is more likely than not, going to impact on the national budgets; but of course, not all

legislation leads to government spending; it coordinates policy among the Member States; that costs minimal spending of an essentially administrative nature; and it spends money on programmes which it implements.

All EU action, including its spending, is subject to the principles of subsidiarity, proportionality and the concept of EU Added Value. That means, that the EU is intended to spend money only if there are economies of scale by doing something at EU level, that the policy area requires a critical mass to achieve its purpose, that there are common or shared preferences among the Member States that something should be done and paid for at EU level, and that there are low coordination costs. Of course, in each case, the discussion about whether these criteria are met is a political discussion; and the long process of agreeing the next MFF between the Commission (who proposes it), the Member State governments and the European Parliament will be difficult political discussions. But in the end, and if the criteria are applied effectively, there is a real chance that a well-constructed budget might improve life for EU citizens and others and save money at national level.

Sadly, the last MFF discussions showed that neither the Member State governments nor the press and the public were very interested in such sensible discussions: the discussion - in so far as it happened at all - was about net contributors, net recipients and 'what can I get out of this for my country?'

But the EU is intended to be a peace project based on principles which include solidarity among the people of its Member States. That is why it is right that some EU programmes, financed by all Member States, benefit some countries and regions more than others. We should not respond to this with horror; rather we should feel privileged because we can make a contribution to sustainable peace.

What is needed now is a willingness among citizens to engage in this process; to ask questions of our governments and our MEPs/MPs; to show that there are citizens who care about solidarity more than about short-term national interest. QCEA will continue to follow the debate, to produce briefing papers as the debate develops and to provide information to our readers about action that can be taken. If you are interested in being kept informed, please let us know by e-mailing mweitsch@qcea.org.

Martina Weitsch

¹Europe 2020, accessed 15 October 2010, available at:

<http://ec.europa.eu/eu2020/pdf/COMPLET%20EN%20BARROSO%20%20%20007%20-%20Europe%202020%20-%20EN%20version.pdf>, p. 3



Sustainable Energy Security and the Quaker role

Some thoughts from QCEA's new Advocacy/Policy Officer Paul Parrish

Energy choices are at the very heart of the environmental, economic and quality-of-life challenges we face. Unfortunately, current patterns of consumption and production are clearly unsustainable. We urgently need a new appreciation of our energy choices, reflecting the true social and environmental costs.

Communication is key. Quaker philosophy offers a profound vision of public ethics and political participation. To avoid further 'fantastic tricks before high heaven, As makes the angels weep', Quakers require a coherent and confident voice that can only be articulated at the national, or international, level.

With respect to Europe, and the recent ratification of the Lisbon Treaty, new powers and responsibilities were given to the European Parliament on energy issues, and that is where I hope to enter the discussion.

I'm delighted to have been appointed Advocacy/Policy Officer within the Sustainable Energy Security programme. We are certainly on the verge of a major

shift in the way we generate and use energy and it's brilliant that QCEA is demonstrating leadership with decision-makers on this important issue.

On a personal level, I will also be undergoing a major shift as I transition from being a professional scientist to advocating a Quaker response to the connections between energy security, climate change and conflict. The Quaker contribution to these problems, at a critical time for policy-making in Brussels, and in the national capitals around Europe, could prove invaluable.

I'd strongly encourage you to get in contact to help inform the advocacy I am bringing to decision-makers. As discussing energy security in the exceptional setting that is Brussels can often feel

disconnected from reality, it is important for me to keep informed of local initiatives in order to bring new understanding to the critical actions required for effective and sustainable peacebuilding.

Paul Parrish



Take out an annual *Around Europe* Subscription! 22€/£16 for hard copies, 15€/£10 for e-mailed copies. For information on how to subscribe to *Around Europe* or to become a QCEA Associate or Supporting Member please visit our website at: www.quaker.org/qcea, ring us on 0032 2 230 4935 or write to us. We look forward to hearing from you.



Around Europe

Quaker Council for European Affairs aisbl
Square Ambiorix 50, B-1000 Brussels, Belgium
Editeur responsable : Elizabeth Scurfield
No entreprise 0420.346.728
www.quaker.org/qcea - info@qcea.org