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**Introduction**

Security itself is not only a diplomatic, military, technical or intellectual exercise. Although today we will discuss a lot of the diplomatic achievements and technical improvements in the history of the EU, as well as the problems encountered, we must not forget that the origins of war begin in the mind and heart of the human person. The ability to achieve security, depends not only on the physical ability to secure land and property, or defending the rights of citizens, but includes protecting the basic values on which the European Union was founded. Fundamentally, these are the Judeo-Christian roots of our society. So, security itself has a strong moral dimension that differs from the needed technical and logistic capacities but in many instances plays a key underlying role in the success of our security policies and their execution.

***Military Ordinariate***

Over the past 3 years, I have been privileged to work closely with a part of society for whom security is not only a preoccupation, but also a vocation. These are the men and women who serve in the Lithuanian military. As the Military Ordinary for Lithuania, the questions of peace and security are constant concerns, but also require continuously reviewing the ethical and moral basis of this work. In the Sermon on the Mount Jesus taught “Blessed are the peacemakers”. It is important to note that peacemakers are not pacifists, they work to establish and maintain peace. They work to ensure the security of their homeland and of Europe, which often means engaging in military operations far from European soil.

***International Military Pilgrimage***

In my work as the Military Ordinary, I also became acquainted with a peace building tradition that serves as a present day reminder of the roots of the European project for peace. About the time the architects of modern Europe were beginning their plans in a post war Europe to ensure peace through economic integration, the military began its own work of reconciliation and peace building with a pilgrimage to Lourdes. On December 10, 1944, French and Russian soldiers (including soldiers wounded during the war), as well as military representatives from the British, Belgian and U.S. Armies, gathered in Lourdes for a Mass in the Rosary Basilica. In 1947, a German military chaplain, who had been a prisoner of war in France since 1944, was invited to participate discretely in a military pilgrimage held in September of that year. German and Belgian veterans of the war participated in larger numbers for the first time in 1948 and many other countries soon followed. Troops that not long before had been fighting each other, were now gathering to pray together, in pursuit of the healing and reconciliation that a new, healthy and secure Europe would require. The official International Military Pilgrimage (IMP) was born in 1958, the year of the 100th anniversary of the apparitions. Until 1990, the military pilgrims were primarily from Western European countries and NATO member countries. From 1991 these pilgrimages now include troops from Central and Eastern Europe, as well as smaller delegations from Asian, African and South American countries. This is a sight to be seen, where top military officials and soldiers, including the wounded, from around the world gather each year to pray for peace, to pray for the injured and the fallen, and to build bonds for peace and security in Europe and beyond. This event serves as a constant and poignant reminder that peace building is not simply about the statistics of military technology and personnel, but at its base requires a constant return to our core values.

***Lithuania as a border country of the EU / History***

The other perspective that I bring to today’s discussion is that of Lithuania, which has one of the longer external borders in the European Union and the eastern border of my archdiocese makes up a significant part of that distance. This keeps the issue of security ever before us, one could say from the perspective of looking directly over the border. Whether it is the proximity of Russian-Belarus joint military exercises or the Belorussian plans to build a nuclear reactor just on the other side of our border, that is 50 km from Vilnius, our capital and largest metropolis, our nation’s history and geographic location keep security a primary concern.

***Current EU presidency - Eastern Partnership Summit***

The current presidency of the EU has allowed Lithuania to bring to the forefront the importance of security, not only with regard to defensive preparedness, but in the wider perspective of maintaining and expanding the Eastern Partnership program and returning to the initial European vision of using trade and interstate community building to insure peace and security.

I would join many national leaders and political commentators in assessing the recently concluded Eastern Partnership Summit in Vilnius as a success, despite the fact that Ukraine did not sign the partnership agreement, as it not only provided clear progress for expansion for Georgia, Moldova and Azerbaijan, but also moved the discussion out into the open. The Eastern partnership has progressed a great deal and the doors are not closed. The future expansion continues to be on the table. Our prayers are with those who have gathered in the streets of Kiev and with the government leaders of both sides, that a peaceful and democratic solution will be found for the common good of the people. We must continue to keep in the forefront of our minds, the vision of the EU, where the common markets and free movement of peoples are used as instruments to provide peace and stability.

***December EU summit***

The upcoming EU security summit in December will also be a moment in which these realities will be discussed once again and an opportunity to make major and needed advances will be available to the leadership of the EU. The Lithuanian Minister of Defence Juozas Olekas recently told the Foreign, Security and Defence MEPs that the summit should initiate a review of the European Security Strategy to update it with respect to the major changes that have developed over the past 10 years. Among the needed changes, there should also be more attention given to greater cooperation with our Eastern partners in the area of security cooperation and defence.

**Current situation**

These events are unfolding in a world that as a whole faces increased volatility, complexity and uncertainty. A multipolar and interconnected international system is changing the nature of power. The distinction between internal and external security is breaking down. Complex layers of governance and new patterns of interdependence empower new players and give rise to new challenges. As a result, state power is becoming more fragile.

Classic military encounters, such as the armed conflicts in Afghanistan and the Middle East continue to this day. There are more and more “asymmetric” intrastate conflicts and they are spreading beyond national borders (as with the Arab Spring). The so-called “frozen” conflicts remain unsolved. Western Balkans are still “unfinished business”, the security situation in Africa remains unstable despite the various peace-building missions. The situation of failed states is deteriorating, contributing to an increase in international organized crime. One can predict so-called environmental conflicts (fights for water and energy) in the forthcoming future.

Yet there are also other areas, where the lines between war and peace have become very blurred. The differences between living in peace and being at war today have all but disappeared, except for the more obvious aforementioned armed conflicts that are still seen through press reports. The plethora of new types of weapons (or “weapons”), albeit often more modern forms of ancient methods of war appear to take on a life of their own. David Rothkopf in a Foreign Policy article at the beginning of 2013 coined the term: “From cold war to cool war” describing a tendency where states like China, Iran and the US confront each other 24 hours a day via computer networks. The areas of personal privacy are often sacrificed under the cover of national security to a degree that several decades ago were still unimaginable. Albeit the NSA’s PRISM program and other recently revealed programs have made much news, I think that this is only the tip of the iceberg, as little has been revealed or discussed regarding Russia’s and China’s programs or those of various other extra European technologically developed powers.

The current situation of European security is rather complex. The EU of the center and of the south continues to look inward and remains caught in the process of resolving the economic and financial crisis. The financial crisis has added to a sharp decrease in security consciousness and the weakened social structures do not add any stability to the broader security situation.

The perspective on security from the Eastern borders of the EU can be very enlightening. Lithuania, even during its presidency of the EU, remains the target of an onslaught of aggressive actions that are targeted to diminish its security and in this respect the security of Europe. It is in seeing these actions for what they are, that we can better understand the threats to our security and the pressure that is being placed on our Eastern Partners as they look for ways to enhance their own peace and security.

The information war does not limit itself to breaking into computer networks, but can be more readily understood as a continuous attempt to infiltrate the mindset of the nation, by stealthily bombarding the information space with continuous, but often very subtle propaganda campaigns. These include clearly organized comments in the Lithuanian internet space, constantly demeaning the government, military, as well as Church institutions. The topics that are brought into question both here and in the wider media include Lithuania’s history (proposing such things as the Slavic roots of previous dynasties, or calling into question the authenticity of Lithuania’s most recent struggle for independence), questioning the capabilities and insinuating on the past history of Lithuania’s current leaders.

The methods also include using the areas of sports and culture to create the appearance of Lithuania belonging to the Russian-led grouping of ex-Soviet States. Among the subtle forms of propagating this message are major Russian music and cultural performers, strategically scheduling large concerts and performances specifically on Lithuanian national holidays, such as the days marking Lithuanian independence. The most recent was a grand performance of Swan Lake, by the Belarus National ballet, with leading roles by stars of Moscow’s Grand Theater, that took place in front of the lake of Trakai Castle, on the eve of Lithuania taking over the Presidency of the EU. Sporting leagues are being organized to include teams from all areas of the former USSR, as well as various attempts to organize meetings and conventions with the same span of participation. Although these events individually would seem harmless, but tracking the trends and their timing one can see clearly the very subtle but coordinated effort to alter the mentality of a people.

These methods are described in the academic literature as well. Professor Aleksandr Selivanov described the control of a territory using the methods of an information war as creating the conditions for what he called a “non-traditional occupation”. That would be the type of occupation that creates the possibility of controlling a conquered territory and using its resources without being physically present in that countries territory.

In light of these methods, it seems that the mission of these types of information operations, instead of being aimed to “win minds and hearts” as the ISAF mission stated in Afghanistan, would more accurately be described as aimed at “occupying minds and hearts” of the target nations.

The trade and energy sectors are two other instruments that have a strong influence on European security. Trade restrictions have been used as an instrument against Lithuania from the very first steps of its most recent independence. This includes the most recent restrictions against the import of Lithuanian dairy products by Russia, waged during the period of our presidency of the EU. President Grybauskaite mentioned this in her address to the General Assembly of the United Nations this year, referring especially to the struggle of our Eastern partners. She said:

*It was not easy for these countries to decide which course to take….they were facing trade restrictions, bans on goods, price manipulation for energy supplies, the use of pressure and open disrespect displayed in information space.*

*European Eastern Partnership countries are not the only ones. Even Lithuania, who holds the Presidency of the Council of the European Union and who has successfully consolidated its course of development, is under similar pressure.*

*Barriers to travelling, unreasonable delays of cargo transportation, the milk war - these are just a few "hot" examples. For nations, the decision is really difficult to make when free choice means receiving threats to raise gas prices or block trade, instead of getting support or advice.*

*Under such pressures it is hard to implement reforms that empower members of society and open up opportunities to engage in the state-building process.*

And I would add, that under these pressures, it is difficult to talk about security for our Eastern partners, and in the long-term for the security of Europe. These are only a few of the examples of this more subtle form of war.

These types of attacks make it clear that security today requires a much broader approach and more vigilance regarding where threats can come from. Information that at first may seem harmless can eventually change the mentality of the citizens to such a degree that they would be manipulated to surrender not only their property, but their rights and core values. This can happen not only to individuals, but to society as a whole. Weapons and defence forces do not suffice here, the strong moral determination of a peoples committed to the core values of the European project will be needed for true security.

Within this context, challenges in the classic defence strategy remain as well. Europe must assume greater responsibility for its own security and that of its neighbourhood. European citizens and the international community will judge Europe first on how it performs in the neighbourhood. Recent military operations have demonstrated that Europeans lack some of the necessary capabilities, in particular in terms of strategic enablers such as air-to-air fuelling, strategic airlift, intelligence and surveillance. In addition, the financial crisis continues to squeeze defence budgets while elsewhere defence spending is increasing. According to a recent report by the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, global defence spending is shifting "from the West to the rest". Europe needs to develop the full range of its instruments, including its security and defence posture, in the light of its interests and these geostrategic developments.

At the same time, the European defence market remains fragmented in terms of demand and budgetary realities. In sum, Europe faces rising security challenges within a changing strategic context while the financial crisis is increasingly affecting its security and defence capability. A strategic debate among Heads of State and Government will take place at the upcoming summit, where an update of the current European Security and Defence policy should be discussed.

**European Security and Defence policy**

The background of the current policy was the Maastricht Treaty (1992) establishing in its second pillar Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) of the EU. In 1999 after an historical agreement between France and Britain (Saint Malo declaration) CSDP became ESDP.

The EU is committed to foster “a secure Europe in a better world” (title of the European Security Strategy (ESS) from 2003. A reference document, which identifies various threats, including transnational terrorism, weapons of mass destruction, failed states, regional conflicts, as well as organized crime and presents the instruments to deal with them.

Since 2003 the EU has launched more than 20 military and civilian missions in different regions of the world: Africa, Balkans, South Caucasus, Middle East and Southeast Asia.

Aside from its long-time commitment with NATO in Afghanistan and several other NATO led operations, the Lithuanian military has taken an active role in several joint EU-led military operations – in the EUTM in Mali and in EUNAVFOR ATALANTA off the coast of Somalia in the Indian Ocean. These are conducted under the auspices of ATHENA (which along with a special committee as the main decision-making body makes decisions on common costs of EU Military operations).

Formal codification of the ESDP is found in the Lisbon Treaty (art. 43.1) describing: joint disarmament operations, humanitarian and rescue tasks, military advice and assistance tasks, conflict prevention and peace-keeping tasks, tasks of combat force in crisis management, including peace-making and post-conflict stabilization. There is also a solidarity clause (art 222TFEU) and a mutual assistance clause in case of military attack against a member state (Art 42, 7). It may be said that the legal foundations exist for the Union playing a role at the global stage as an independent actor.

The reality is different however, as immediately we can see the disparity between the challenges of being a global player and the necessary military expenditure to accomplish this goal. While China has doubled expenditure every five years, India increased defence spending by 14% in 2013 and Russia vowed to raise the defence budget to 6% GDP, EU defence spending has shrunk from €251 billion to €194 in the past decade. Between 2005 and 2010 R&D budgets fell to €9 billion. The US alone spends seven times more than all 28 EU member states together.

**Therefore and in view of December summit:**

As the summit is around the corner, preparations are well underway and various proposals have already been put forth. The EU Commision in July emphasized the need for strengthening the internal defence market, creating a more competitive industry, connecting space and defence, applying EU energy policy and strengthening the international dimension of cooperation in this area.

In a contribution to the forthcoming summit the High representative of the Union Mrs. Ashton set out on 15 October 4 priority sectors: development of drones, common satellite communication systems, cyber defence, and aerial refuelling capacities. She also recommended to consolidate the European defence industry which employs 730000 people and generates €172 billion.

The European Parliament has also put forth its annual report on CFSP in mid-October, calling for a more comprehensive approach to the EU’s foreign policy, including the priority of establishing concentric circles of peace, security and socio-economic development. There have been calls for a White Book on Defence, which would list the current threats to security and based on these the EU would develop a new strategy. Last week the European Parliament adopted two further reports on the CFSP. In these reports it requested decisions from the forthcoming European Council to make full use of the existing legal basis in order to allow the European Union to assume its responsibility for international security. MEPs also regretted the current fragmentation of the European defence industry.

The Lithuanian Minister of Defence Mr. Olekas proposed that the summit could initiate an update of the 2003 Security Strategy on the occasion of its 10th anniversary, in order to update it with respect to the new situation of Europe and the world, which has changed greatly over the past 10 years.

**Modest Responses**

Aside from the work of the Summit itself, there are actions that the member countries can take individually and collectively to increase security both within Europe and worldwide.

The proposal to expand drone technology in Europe requires also a renewal of the moral and ethical debate of new defence systems. Although the continued development of weapons systems is essential for security, it always needs to be accompanied by a discussion on the moral and ethical questions that these new systems pose. New weapons require new ethical thinking, therefore there should be a pledge for civil society dialogue on “drones”. Although they can provide military benefit and advantage, there remain many questions about the possible use and misuse of drones, such as the possibility of future development of “swarm drones” that in terrorist hands could do indiscriminate damage to the population of whole cities, similarly to the well understood dangers of chemical and biological weapons today.

Work should continue to minimize the unnecessary traumas of armed conflict around the world. European security requires us all to work for international peace. One excellent measure is found in the landmark Arms Trade Treaty (ATT), adopted by the UN General Assembly on April 2, 2013, regulating the international trade in conventional arms, from small arms to battle tanks, combat aircraft and warships. The treaty will foster peace and security by putting a stop to destabilizing arms flows to conflict regions. It will prevent human rights abusers and violators of the law of war from being supplied with arms. And it will help keep warlords, pirates, and gangs from acquiring these deadly tools. This treaty, adopted by the UN General Assembly on April 2 has been signed by 114 countries, including the United States, and ratified by eight. The International community must build on this and continue to pursue rapid entry-into-force and full implementation, The ATT is the first such multilateral treaty. It aims to create a level playing field for the international arms trade by requiring all states to establish and abide by common standards in the international transfer of conventional arms. It will enter into force 90 days after 50 countries deposit their instruments of ratification with the UN. The EU and its member state should rapidly ratify this treaty.

As in the West after World War II, reconciliation and the healing of broken relations need to continue to be addressed. Church leaders could and should play a leading role, especially in those countries that have recently suffered from war or other types of oppression. This is another element of peace and security that does not receive enough attention in the security discussion. Perhaps a “European Reconciliation Corps” could be developed to assist peoples to move forward in the healing and development of their societies. This too must be handled very delicately, as reconciliation is not something to be imposed from the side, as much as the healing of memories fostered.

Development is also needed to foster security. Here a strong, secure Europe is one that has respect for the dignity and fosters the development of each human person. Various programs are already found within the EU to promote this dialogue. The religious communities could assist in this development as well, particularly with a stronger voice in the public square.

**Conclusion**

The Nobel Peace prize awarded to the EU in 2012 can be seen as an encouragement to the leaders of the EU not to digress from the fundamental values on which the Union was founded, notwithstanding the financial and security challenges that we currently face. But it should focus our minds once again on these core principles. The Church’s teaching of the roadmap to peace can assist in this reflection.

As we celebrate this year the 50th anniversary of *Pacem in Terris,* Pope John XXIII’s encyclical letter (and as we prepare for his canonization together with Pope John Paul II next spring)*,* it would behoove us to remember some of the fundamentals that he set out in this landmark document. Addressed to “all people of good will”, it was written during the first year of Vatican II, shortly after the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962 and the erection of the Berlin Wall, and during an early stage of the development of the European project. Departing from the importance of the human person, with universal and inviolable rights and duties, the encyclical addressed the relations between individuals and public authority, between states and a view of the world community as a whole. This document is as actual today, as it urges a joint endeavor fostering the common good. Peace that requires development for individuals and requires the building of trust.

The source of human security is first founded within the family, which introduces the child to a belief in God, from where the vast majority of the citizens of Europe find their fundamental source of security in their lives. The family, as a fundamental building block of society, should be protected and encouraged. Other values fostering security include a healthy patriotism – a love of one’s country that is based on the love of one’s neighbor, a freedom of religion that is not isolated to the private realm, but serves to actively unite people in a strong community. These will allow for a cohesive and not easily manipulated national and supranational society that can serve for the promotion of peace.

In summary, our current system of security and defence needs review and continued development. This development must take place on two distinct levels, both of which should be addressed during the upcoming European Security Summit.

First, a stronger and more effective security and defence program. The need for this has been addressed at various levels, from individual national leaders and throughout the various EU institutions. They include strengthening the European defence industry, building new defence and coordinated rapid response programs, addressing the emerging security challenges, such as cyber defence systems and energy security, as well as stronger cooperation between our partners in NATO and bringing our Eastern partners on board.

The second area is strengthening the foundation of our strategic values. The 2003 European Security Strategy approached the question of security primarily as a response to the dangers to our security as listed in the document and the proposed White Book on Defence seems to take the same strategy. A needed complementary view would be to base our security on the core values and interests that we need to maintain or seek to establish. This approach would yield a stronger defence and security policy for the EU. These core rights enunciated by the founders of the European Community are well reflected in *Pacem in Terris*, as well as in the later social teaching of the Church. It is founded on principles of the dignity of the human person, the joint promotion of the common good, global solidarity, development of peoples and the promotion of peace. A return to these principles would provide a proper foundation, so that in a time of great turbulence a security and defence program ensuring a stronger Europe would be firmly grounded in the fundamental principles needed to establish and maintain true peace.

The leaders meeting in the Security summit this December will be focused primarily on the first of these two areas. It is very important that the second area receive as much attention, and be included in the review of the primary goals and values of a European Security Strategy. When the fundamental understanding of the rights and responsibilities that the founder’s of Europe are reinterpreted in ways that were heretofore unimagined, when the Judeo-Christian values are relativized, there is always the danger that we have begun to drift off the firm foundation of the values that we were founded on and are more open to have pragmatic decisions leave us more exposed to the psychological manipulations that the new instruments of the information war provide. In short, at the heart of security in Europe is not simply technology, but a citizenry well formed and committed to the project of peace.