transform!
europe

Sofian Philip Naceur

Security and the Left in Europe
Towards a New Left Concept of Security

Report on the 2020 workshop series organised by *transform! europe* and the Rosa-Luxemburg-Stiftung Brussels Office

Sofian Philip Naceur

Security and the Left in Europe
Towards a New Left Concept of Security
Report on the 2020 workshop series organised by *transform! europe* and the Rosa-Luxemburg-Stiftung Brussels Office

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Sofian Philip Naceur is a journalist based in Tunis. He mostly reports on Egypt, Tunisia, Algeria, border regimes and EU border externalization policies in North Africa and was based in Cairo between 2012 and 2018. www.sofiannaceur.de

In cooperation with the

ROSA LUXEMBURG STIFTUNG
BRUSSELS OFFICE

IMPRINT

Layout: sanja.at e.U.

Cover illustration: © www.flickr.com/photos/ronan_shenhav

Preface

by **Katerina Anastasiou** (transform! europe) and **Axel Ruppert** (Rosa-Luxemburg-Stiftung Brussels Office)

The drafting and development of a new comprehensive Leftist concept on security is long overdue, though unambiguously possible and feasible as the 2020 workshop series Towards A New Concept of Security, organised by the Rosa-Luxemburg-Stiftung Brussels Office and transform! europe, has clearly illustrated: Leftist movements, political parties, grassroots collectives, NGOs and activists across Europe and beyond are set to further expand collaboration and coordination across borders, backgrounds and political affiliations. They share common grounds, perceptions and goals regarding an alternative concept on security, featuring a human-centred and non-militarised understanding of security.

The COVID-19 pandemic and the emergencies caused by it highlight the need for a concept of security that caters for the actual security needs of everyday life in contrast to those focused on military spending and action, policing, oppression and surveillance. Predominant security policies, deriving from a Cold War logic, focus on military reactions to threats while neglecting environmental degradation, large-scale environmental or infrastructure disasters, pandemics, food security and social security, among others. This deficiency has become all too apparent during the pandemic. Years of austerity have hollowed out public infrastructure, resulting in inadequate health and social welfare structures that were not able to secure the lives of millions of Europeans.

The measures introduced by European governments to contain the pandemic have had a sobering effect on our private lives and the cultural and educational sectors. State repression has manifested in the restriction of fundamental rights and the use of disproportionate police violence, while the expansion of existing and creation of new tools of surveillance in cooperation with private tech giants has occurred in varying degrees across Europe. Although the vast majority of epidemiologists advised the temporary closure of production facilities and factories, European governments have opted for the past year to secure capital interests rather than workers' health. This highlighted the distorted understanding of actual health security needs of people living in Europe and diverted attention away from

measures to tackle the pandemic that would have been more painful for capital. As this report is being written, one of the supposedly richest parts of the world now mourns hundreds of thousands of lives and the pandemic has not ended yet.

In today's world, security has been commodified. This commodification has made security a tradeable service, thus transforming a basic need into a lucrative market. The profiteers of the dominant security discourse are those who are trading on this market, namely the actors of the military-industrial complex. The paradox of today in a nutshell is that those who create the instruments of repression and war—the arms industry—are the very ones that promise to reinstate security through their merchandise. To be able to continue doing so, and to constantly increase their profit margins, these actors expend substantial amounts of money and effort on shaping the political discourse that serves their interests.

Current debates on security are mostly hegemonised by the political Right, while repressive and discriminating policies are justified in the name of security. This ranges from foreign policy decisions to law and order practices within the European Union (EU). The term "security" is closely tied to nationalism and often framed in terms of protecting the nation against the "other". Referring to security can be toxic and thus requires careful attention about when and how to address it.

At the same time, security is a basic need and an urgent necessity for those affected by war, violent conflict, police brutality, hate crimes or domestic violence. Providing security also means preventing the devastation caused by the climate crisis and offering protection from its consequences, ensuring access to quality food, water, housing, healthcare, education, etc. and enabling prospects for a liveable future. The United Nations "human security" concept is also working in this direction, yet with a silk glove towards the systemic causes rooted in capitalist modes of production.

The EU's leadership has been advancing the militarisation and securitisation of the bloc, based on the notion that the

European project is under threat and that a "stronger and autonomous Europe" is needed on the global stage (Global Strategy for the European Union's Foreign and Security Policy, 2016). The development of joint military capabilities is fostered, commitments to increase military spending are being made and calls for the EU to make use of its military weight are getting louder. As further social or economic EU integration is rejected or blocked by Member States, the aim of this strategy seems to be to demonstrate the EU's ability to act, to integrate right-wing populist actors and thus to forge a new consensus for Europe. These ongoing developments appear as an attempt to counter the ongoing disintegration crisis facing the Union and force a European identity into existence by "uniting in arms against the common enemy". However, the discursive, structural and financial shift to military priorities will neither ensure peace nor be able to contain the structural causes of the conflicts to be fought, which have been and will continue to be fuelled not least by the exploitative economy of a neoliberal EU.

This is why a security concept developed by Europe's Left and progressive forces is greatly needed, in order to address the root causes of insecurity and safeguard peace: a political strategy that is innovative, intersectional and unapologetically anti-capitalist.

The Workshop Series

In order to stimulate this debate and contribute to the development of a security concept from the Left[1], we designed and facilitated a workshop series, which took place in the second half of 2020, organised by transform! europe and the Rosa-Luxemburg-Stiftung Brussels Office. Over the course of five workshops, activists of Left and progressive parties, NGOs and grassroots movements came together to discuss security, its conception and use in contemporary politics.

This series of workshops aimed to foster an intersectional and transnational discussion on peace and security through the lens of today's challenges and movements (feminist, anti-racist, ecological, digital rights and peace movements). Therefore, each workshop had a focus topic, examining security in relation to 1) militarisation and con-

flict prevention, 2) the climate crisis and climate justice, 3) migration and anti-racism and 4) democracy and fundamental rights. In order to encourage participation, the topics were decided together with the participants during the introductory workshop. The following questions were discussed among the participants throughout the series: What does security mean in relation to these challenges and movements? What can be learnt from activists, scholars and members of Left parties? How is security debated in different regions of Europe? What are the possibilities for synergies among progressive civil society actors when it comes to promoting a Left security concept?

Taking into consideration the diversity of European socio-political and economic realities and the ambivalence of positions on relevant and contested debates, such as migration, ecology, care work and the relations between the EU and Russia, China, the US and NATO, etc., the workshops were designed not only to sketch the lines of current conflicting perceptions of security in the Left landscape, but also to go beyond them to achieve a synthesis that reflects the complexity of our times.

In order to offer a safe space allowing participants to constructively disagree and to openly discuss contesting positions, participation was based on a personal invitation via the networks of transform! europe and the Rosa-Luxemburg-Stiftung Brussels Office. The workshops were attended by around 50 people in total, with an average of 20 taking part in each workshop. Participants from 18 countries took part in the series, mainly from countries in Western and Southern Europe. Left and progressive institutes and foundations, peace, ecology and anti-racist movements, and Left and progressive parties were the main target groups represented at the five workshops.

In this publication, we seek to document the workshops and their results, to reflect intersectional approaches, contradictions and shortcomings in the positions, and to set out considerations and further questions for the development of a security concept of and from the Left. In the following pages, Sofian Philip Naceur has taken on the task of providing readers with an insight into the debates we hosted.

---

1   In this publication, when referring to "the Left" in Europe, we refer to Leftists who are organised in social movements, NGOs, trade unions, collectives and left political parties and not "the Left" political group in the European Parliament.

This publication is aimed at members of social movements, activists and political decision-makers alike, in the hope of providing a basis for ideas and suggestions on how to meaningfully approach the question of security by Left and progressive forces in Europe, drawing on what emerged from the workshops' exchanges and discussions. Left security policies should offer alternatives to repression and surveillance, armament and militarisation. This publication seeks to contribute to shaping these alternatives and to stimulate the debate on a topic that we cannot afford to be hegemonised by our political opponents.

We would like to thank all who made this workshop series possible through their contributions and who provided input and feedback for this report. We hope you enjoy reading it!

1. TOWARDS A NEW CONCEPT OF SECURITY: THE 2020 WORKSHOP SERIES IN A NUTSHELL

The drafting and development of a new comprehensive Leftist concept on security is long overdue, though unambiguously possible and feasible as the 2020 workshop series *Towards A New Concept of Security*, organised by the **Rosa-Luxemburg-Stiftung Brussels Office** and **transform! europe**, has clearly illustrated. Leftist movements, political parties, grassroots collectives, NGOs and activists across Europe and beyond are set to further expand collaboration and coordination across borders, backgrounds and political affiliations. They share common grounds, perceptions and goals regarding an alternative concept on security, featuring a human-centred and non-militarised understanding of security.

Conflicting perceptions as well as challenging contradictions and shortcomings in political positions remain evident among Leftist movements and parties. However, the COVID-19 pandemic and its political, social and economic repercussions are an opportunity to embrace these differences and bridge them by initiating, stimulating and maintaining a constructive debate among the Left. Such debate should evolve into the concrete drafting of a sustainable concept on security that reflects the complexity of our times, relates to the actual security needs of people, and reclaims the term "security" amid the narrowly defined understanding of security in the European mainstream

discourse, pushed forward by right-wing and neoliberal currents, the establishment and corporate-controlled mass media.

The Left is set to take up the challenge of countering the reactionary narratives on security currently dominating the wider European and international public by developing and promoting an alternative vision on security that builds on interlinking the transnational struggles for climate, social and racial justice as well as peace, global economic equality, non-militarised foreign policy, gender equality and free movement for all. In order to achieve this goal, the Left needs to expand its intersectional and transnational collaboration. We must identify today's major security-related challenges and the flaws of current discourses and policies, and increasingly exchange on best practices and possible future areas of engagement. The 2020 series aimed at providing exactly this kind of forum to agree and disagree, share experiences from different countries and contexts, and lay out the foundation for a new Left concept on security.

Common Struggles and Challenges among Movements and across Countries

The fundamental basis for countering the present security-related narratives, discourses and policies from a Leftist perspective is an analysis of what is going wrong today and why. The 2020 workshop series facilitated precisely this kind of comprehensive exchange on and mapping of struggles and challenges to be addressed within the framework of an alternative and feasible vision of human-centred security by the Left. The most important matters raised during the workshops and deemed as key for any progressive attempt to counter today's security discourses and policies cluster around three main areas:

1) **The power of law enforcement agencies and the military-industrial complex**
   - Accountability and public control of police and intelligence authorities
   - Terrorist attacks and counter-terrorism measures as a threat to democracy and freedoms
   - Political power and lobbying activities of the military-industrial complex

2) Capitalism and colonialism as root causes of conflict, climate change and global injustice

- Economic exploitation and neocolonial power structures are a major cause of conflict
- COVID-19 exposes social inequalities and challenges the political priorities of the elites
- Highlighting the correlation between climate change and capitalist modes of production

3) Need for the fragmented Left to bridge gaps between countries, movements and approaches

- Bridging the gap between the Left in and outside parliament is crucial for building alliances
- Strategical and ideological differences of the Left in different countries hinder unity
- Climate movements need to be politicised and interlinked with peace movements

Countering Dominant Narratives: Successful Campaigns and Best Practices

Also important for the Left when addressing the challenges outlined above is an exchange on successful campaigns and best practices in order to learn from each other by highlighting those campaigns, actions and strategies that actually succeeded in raising awareness among a wider public or had a significant impact on the ground. The most prominent and promising examples of such practices flagged during the workshop series consist of concrete actions and cooperation between movements, exemplifying successful strategic approaches:

- The Austrian Left party's 2020 election campaign calling for abandoned buildings to be used by refugees and homeless people alike, thus advocating for open borders and social justice at the same time
- The attempts of parts of the British Left to formulate an alternative vision of security after Jeremy Corbyn was elected leader of the Labour Party in 2015
- The Gastivists' approach of interlinking struggles by combining environmental activism with the monitoring of securitisation and militarisation of fossil gas extraction
- Transnational Migrants Coordination's approach of connecting migrant and precarious workers to foster a common struggle for workers' rights and against racism
- Rheinmetall Entwaffnen as an example of a local struggle that connects anti-capitalist resistance to the arms

trade with ecological struggles featuring an emphasis on feminism
- Strategic alliances with non-political actors such as the #schickteinschiff campaign (German for "send a ship"), a cooperation between Seebrücke and the German Protestant Church

Potential Strategies and Approaches for Joint Actions and Campaigns

These examples of best practices clearly illustrate that there is more scope for raising awareness and campaigning successfully for an alternative approach towards security, while outspoken support for Leftist narratives and policy proposals regarding security exists in society even beyond the traditional home turf of the Left. In order to increase the impact of such actions and best practices, possible and promising future areas of engagement, campaigning and action need to be identified and comprehensively addressed by the Left. Suggestions along these lines were repeatedly flagged during the 2020 workshop series. Those highlighted below predominantly cluster around the vulnerability of the globalised capitalist system, further illustrated by the COVID-19 crisis and its repercussions:

- Struggles for peace and demilitarisation can be and are already linked to social movements and the struggles of unions, demanding a genuine redistribution of wealth, social security and the strengthening of public sectors, including the health sector
- Climate and peace activists can and are already joining forces to oppose fossil fuel and gas extraction projects that are linked to securitisation and militarisation processes
- Migrant workers and local workers across Europe are gradually uniting to fight together for labour rights and against low wages and structural racism
- Those who stand up for data protection and privacy rights and against state and corporate surveillance share a lot with those advocating for the rights of ethnic and religious minorities who are worst affected by policies undermining fundamental rights in the name of counter-terrorism measures and legislation

Future engagement must undoubtedly identify and address the current conditions and repercussions of the COVID-19 pandemic as the health emergency poses an unprecedented threat to societal and socio-economic security,

triggering an even further accelerated social segregation, societal and state surveillance as well as border control and externalisation policies. However, lessons from recent popular struggles and movements across the globe and the increasingly transnational collaboration amid the pandemic clearly show that the momentum in times of crisis can be effectively used to challenge the status quo.

2. THE 2020 WORKSHOP SERIES: TRANSFORMING THE SECURITY DISCOURSE

As right-wing dominated security discourses and policies have gradually evolved into the political mainstream across Europe and beyond over the past decades, the lack of powerful alternative narratives and concepts from the Left remains evident today. To comprehensively address this gap, the **Rosa-Luxemburg-Stiftung Brussels Office** and **transform! europe** designed and conducted this series of workshops to facilitate a safe space for a continuous intersectional and transnational dialogue and exchange among activists from social movements, Left parties, NGOs, grassroots collectives, trade unions and research institutes. The series aimed at fostering debates on peace and security through the lens of today's political, societal and economic challenges, uncovering and embracing common grounds and intersections regarding political positions, struggles, strategic approaches and demands of feminist, environmental, anti-racist and migration movements.

The core goal of the series was to discuss, draft and develop a new Leftist concept on security and peace, and to stimulate collaboration and coordination among Leftist movements, political parties and activists. The aim is not to create party positions or duplicate what is already discussed in Leftist parties across Europe, but to provide a basis for further debates and lay out strategies on how the highly sensitive security discourse could be effectively challenged by progressive political and societal forces. This report sums up the debates and results of the five workshops and highlights key conclusions and considerations regarding the development and drafting of a Leftist concept on security. The following chapter provides a summary of each workshop and outlines the main theses of the speakers, crucial matters and topics raised during the workshop's discussions as well as the results of the Mentimeter exercise,

a brainstorming tool aimed at substantiating concrete proposals about what such a concept should or could entail.

2.1 INTRODUCTORY WORKSHOP

Prior to the four thematic workshops held between September and November 2020, the series was kicked off by an introductory workshop in July 2020, aimed at laying the ground for the following events. Featuring three speakers and almost two dozen participants affiliated to or working with social movements, NGOs, Left political parties, activists' collectives, academia and research institutes, the workshop facilitated an initial exchange on security-related matters among activists from Poland, Austria, the UK, Romania, Finland, Germany, France, the Netherlands, Belgium and Spain. Why should Leftist parties and movements urgently address the security debate and how are security-related issues discussed in different countries and movements across Europe and beyond? How can we reclaim, reframe or redefine the term "security" from a Leftist perspective and how do we develop a different understanding of security based on and embracing human-centred concepts of security and taking environmental and social matters into account, and, at the same time, enabling the Left to challenge right-wing narratives on the subject?

Major topics relevant for the security debate had been already raised in the introductory workshop, including the intersections between peace and environmental movements, the threats imposed by fossil gas extraction or the importance of building mass movements and transnational alliances to enable Leftist currents to counter the militaristic approach of current security narratives. While the interdependence of struggles and challenges such as climate change, migration and violent conflict is increasingly evident on a global scale, powerful entities such as the EU are clearly pursuing policies effectively turning Europe into a "golden cage for the rich" by substantially dismantling the welfare state, imposing austerity measures and militarising the EU's external borders. Against this background, this first workshop of the 2020 series already and unambiguously illustrated the importance for the Left of proactively addressing the security debate and stepping up efforts to empower transnational relations between movements, organisations and individuals fighting for social justice and conflict prevention.

Kate Hudson (Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament)
Prominent anti-nuclear and anti-war activist and the General Secretary of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND) based in the UK. She is also a member of *transform! europe* and Left Unity, a radical Leftist party in Britain.

Walter Baier (transform! europe)
Founder, political director and board member of *transform! europe*, a network of 35 European organisations from 22 countries active in the field of political education and scientific analysis, and the political foundation linked to the Party of the European Left.

Sara Prestianni (EuroMed Rights)
Long-time migration researcher and Programme Officer for Migration and Asylum at EuroMed Rights, a regional network of 65 human rights organisations promoting human rights and democracy for all. She was formerly affiliated to the Italian NGO Associazione Ricreativa Culturale Italiana (ARCI).

In the workshop's first intervention, **Kate Hudson (Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament)** summarised some of the major challenges for the Left across Europe and beyond in addressing the security debate, and additionally outlined how COVID-19 has already affected the perception of "security" in European societies. In her presentation, Hudson focused on relevant developments and political dynamics in Britain over the past few decades, though her analyses and conclusions on the topic clearly mirror the general trends in European and international politics and in mainstream debates, and are, hence, key for the Left to adequately tackle the security debate from a progressive perspective.

"When the UK government talks about security, it is almost entirely referring to military factors. In the UK, this mainly translates into talking about nuclear weapons, NATO membership, the size of the armed forces, UK military bases and overseas territories. This framework also includes the UK's military adventures and neocolonial activities as well as the protection of UK assets and so-called 'interests'," Hudson explained. "Nowadays, you can find some government analysis that features a more complex understanding of the security threats the UK is facing. These new understandings of security include cyber warfare, terrorism, climate change, pandemics and population movements." But

the problem, according to Hudson, is that "only very few resources are allocated to these very real challenges" as we have witnessed since the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic. "The government appears to have understood what security means in the broader sense, but they haven't adjusted their thinking to put resources away from the solely military framework" which is set to make these security problems worse.

"In the UK and across Europe in general, progressive Leftist and civil society campaigns, in which I include to some extent faith-based groups and trade unions, are continuously addressing these real security issues," she said, pointing towards campaigns against poverty, anti-nuclear and anti-war initiatives and campaigns promoting sustainable development. These progressive organisations not only oppose policies and narratives, but actually "present very clear and often sophisticated alternative visions". "In society, there is now a widespread understanding, in particular following the pandemic, that security cannot only be seen in military terms. Food security, for instance, has become a very common term in public debates as we see today so many people being forced to rely on food banks," Hudson elaborated.

"The problem lies with the political and economic system in which we live: economic expansion, industrial development, agribusinesses, expansion of national interests and resource wars," she added, referring to the situation in Britain where these issues are underpinned by a so-called sense of "national identity". "National myths and self-identities are very important as the status as a 'nation' has been used to justify the possession of nuclear weapons. This is the framework of the establishment and the ruling class which goes largely unchallenged across the political structures of Britain, even by the Labour Party under its former leader Jeremy Corbyn," Hudson explained, adding that she considers Labour as a historically "pro-imperialist party". The problem with the Labour Party is a real problem in the UK today, unlike in many other European countries where the radical Left is a significant factor, the anti-war activist pointed out.

She also called on the Left to put forward a different vision of what international relations could look like, and highlighted crucial issues to be integrated in a Left concept on security, which should address matters such as global jus-

tice, equality, even and sustainable development, and the planning and redistribution of resources on a global scale. "The problem we face all the time within our movements in Britain is that we already have that vision. It is well articulated and it is very widely shared. But how do we make that vision actually become a reality?" she said. "We know what needs to be done differently but getting a change in policy from parties in government is an enormous challenge. There are smaller parties in parliament that have good political positions in these things, but they are not likely to form a government. The changes we are proposing seem unobjectionable and realisable if we take them as single issues, but when you take them together they actually challenge the fundamentals of the system," Hudson said, summarising a major problem for Leftist ideas on security and other relevant issues.

"We have plenty of organisations in the UK that send briefings to government or MPs about why the government should spend more on healthcare or aid and less on the military. And of course we should continue to do this and to expose the failures of the current approach, but while power in the world is determined by the size of economies and the capacity to intimidate and destroy, these things are not going to have much impact," she went on, outlining an everyday problem regarding what the Left can actually do within the current political framework. "Of course, we build unity across movements and fight together for the kind of society we wish to see," but what is even more fundamental, according to Hudson, is to build a mass movement that is less easy to ignore than a few expert voices stemming from think tanks. In order to achieve that, the Left needs to continue expanding alliances, link them to each other and promote the best possible research underpinning the alternatives the Left is presenting. "We cannot expect to reason with those in power and get a positive outcome. We should not stop trying, but we should not have false expectations either," she emphasised.

In the following intervention, **Walter Baier (transform! europe)** elaborated on the impact of EU foreign policies and military spending for the Left and its ability to counter the establishment's framing of security. He highlighted the importance and future of European integration amid the Brexit crisis since 2017, pointing to the EU's attempts to respond to the challenges posed by Brexit. "The most prominent answer that the EU was able to agree on was the

PESCO agreement (Permanent Structured Cooperation) signed by 25 EU Member States in 2017. The agreement contains the commitment of the signatory states to regularly enhance their military spending in the medium term to 2 percent of GDP," Baier explained, further contextualising the €500 billion allocated to the defence fund with the €750 billion that had been agreed upon to respond to the COVID-19 crisis in 2020. While PESCO is presented as an attempt to create a "gradual operational independence of the EU from the NATO and indirectly from the US", whether the fund is actually efficient in achieving its goals remains a controversial question. However, the scheme doubtlessly has a layer of "big money and big businesses" and builds on political considerations regarding the future of the EU and its identity.

To illustrate this key matter for understanding the current state of affairs, Baier referred to the Sorbonne speech of French President Emmanuel Macron in November 2017, in which he outlined "the necessity to re-found Europe as a sovereign, united and democratic entity". He admitted that "free markets" are the real spirit of European integration. However, security is regarded as the first key and the foundation of any political community. Baier quoted some of the key sentences of Macron's speech and highlighted that Macron considers military strength and defence as the heart of European "security", a framing that endorses a narrowly defined understanding which has to be countered by the Left.

Additionally, Baier elaborated on how the Left should deal with violent conflicts, war and tensions between states as "we live in a world of imperialism and imperialist rivalries between the EU and Russia, between the EU and the US, China, Turkey, Saudi Arabia, Iran and within the EU as well". He called on the Left to "avoid choosing sides in these conflicts, but to better understand their dynamics". He identified three major dimensions of the EU's current foreign policy; the tug-of-war for power and influence between Western governments in Africa, the conflict with Russia and the contradictory relationship with China. "Regarding Russia and China, there exists the risk of a military confrontation. China is an emerging global power with increasing influence even in Europe and within the European integration process. For this reason, a Left position must aim at downsizing these confrontations through the demilitarisation of conflicts," Baier argued, adding that the Left

must thus "oppose the deployment of nuclear intermediate-range missiles" and explain to the public the importance of maintaining the strategic arms reduction treaties and the Non-Proliferation Treaty on nuclear weapons. "This can only be achieved through the strengthening of international law and the institutional architecture which embraces the EU, but requires a much broader view stretching beyond Europe," he explained.

Next, the workshop's third and last speaker **Sara Prestianni (EuroMed Rights**) elucidated why and when the EU has "decided to not protect people on the move, but borders" and thereby contextualised the massive "increase of militarising border management inside and outside Europe by EU Member States and EU institutions". Prestianni identified the year 2015 as a moment when a significant increase in securitisation of border management and border control materialised, while she also elaborated on the internal and external dimension of the EU border regime. "The internal dimension of migration and asylum consists of the introduction of biometric systems, as facial and voice recognition equipment is now being used for asylum procedures. EU Member States use this technique now and no longer listen to the history of people, to understand why they are fleeing war and conflict," she said, additionally outlining recent policies of Italy's government in tackling migration and asylum through security legislation.

"Regarding the external dimension, the use of drones and radars to control the Mediterranean Sea is increasingly common, while the role of Frontex has become more crucial than ever before," Prestianni argued. "Frontex is now using Israeli drones—not to identify people in distress and then search for and rescue them, but to pass on information about people in distress to the so-called Libyan Coast Guards to facilitate pushbacks to the Libyan war." The result of using these systems is an outright increase in pushbacks, with around 60,000 women, children and men pushed back illegally to Libya with the support of drones in the Mediterranean since 2014 alone. Furthermore, she pointed to Italy's military engagement in Niger and Libya and highlighted that the Sahel military mission clearly overlaps with security measures designed to support the G5 Sahel force in the area of border management, aimed at stopping migrants from reaching Libya. Additional aspects relevant for the external dimension of the EU border regime raised by Prestianni are the increased bilateral co-

operation of Italy and other EU Member States with Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia and Libya, the planned expansion of collaboration between Europol and Afripol, the increase in Frontex's powers—the agency is now allowed to purchase its own equipment and hire its own personnel—and the EU military mission IRINI, which is officially designed to monitor the arms embargo in Libya, but actually facilitates even more illegal pushbacks of people to the Libyan war.

Her last key argument concerned the substantial economic interest of the security industry in maintaining and even expanding the current approach to border management within the EU border control and externalisation policy. "Migration has become a major new market for the security industry, which develops, offers and sells drones, radars and other equipment for border management," Prestianni highlighted. The EU's new Pact on Migration and Asylum also features a massive increase in the budget for migration management, while reception and asylum projects remain systematically underfunded. Meanwhile, the EU Trust Fund for Africa (EUTF), set up after the EU summit in Malta's capital Valletta in 2015, clearly illustrates the increasing importance of the nexus between migration and development.

2.2 MILITARISATION AND CONFLICT PREVENTION

The second workshop of the 2020 series immediately plunged into one of the key issues of past and current security debates, facilitating a transnational exchange on militarisation and conflict prevention. The event aimed to discuss how the militarisation of European societies and violent conflicts are impacting the actual security of people in Europe and beyond. How does the Left act and position itself amid violent conflicts, political violence, militarisation and geopolitical tensions? How and to what extent can Left parties, civil society organisations and grassroots collectives argue and campaign for non-militarised concepts of security and what might an alternative and comprehensive concept on security look like? The workshop, held in September 2020, featured three speakers and 21 participants from Finland, Austria, France, Greece, Belgium, Spain, the Netherlands, Germany, Italy and Romania, affiliated to or stemming from political parties, social movements, NGOs, research institutes and trade unions.

Heidi Meinzolt (WILPF)
Long-time activist in the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF). Since 2018, she has been a member of WILPF's International Board for Europe in close cooperation with the WILPF MENA region. She is also coordinator of the Working Group on Women and Gender Realities in the OSCE Region at the Civic Solidarity Platform (CSP).

Giorgos Katrougalos (Syriza)
Former Member of the European Parliament (MEP) for the Greek Syriza party and a law professor at the University of Thrace in Greece. Between 2015 and 2019, he held several ministerial positions in the government of Prime Minister Alexis Tsipras, including as Minister of Labour and Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Daniel Seiffert (Rheinmetall Entwaffnen)
Activist and member of the Rheinmetall Entwaffnen alliance, a grassroots collective that campaigns against arms and weapons exports by the leading German arms manufacturer Rheinmetall.

In her intervention, **Heidi Meinzolt (WILPF)**, elaborated on the history of WILPF, explaining that the league has been highlighting the "root causes of violence and conflict" since its establishment in 1915. More than 100 years ago, the movement had already identified the economy and profit-making capitalism as major root causes of violent conflict, with a major focus on the situation of women as victims and agents of change. Ever since, the league has been countering nationalism and advocating multilateralism as a tool for conflict prevention. Campaigning for disarmament was and still is a precondition to prevent war and violent conflict. Meinzolt considers the promotion of disarmament as an important "early stage in countering and fighting violent extremism and hate speech". Campaigns and actions to this end remain a core element of any Leftist concept of security, she stressed. She also emphasised the importance of feminist discourses and movements for these struggles, as peace agreements are only successful and sustainable if women participate on an "equal level at all negotiation tables and in decision-making".

Meinzolt also referred to the COVID-19 crisis, noting that the pandemic "clearly illustrated where today's real needs of societies" are. The pandemic is a "magnifying glass for all the problems we are facing in the world today" as the need to facilitate "access to healthcare (including sexual and reproductive health and rights), education, culture and a decent life has become even more visible" amid the ongoing health emergency. Against this background, WILPF published an open letter in 2020 ("Now is the time to strengthen EUROPE's peacebuilding capacities!"), aimed at promoting intersectional reflections and debates within the Left and beyond on a "transformative agenda" and a "new deal" which, according to her, needs to be a "green deal" (though not in line with the agenda of Green parties in Europe) and a "care deal".

As a former member of the Greek government, **Giorgos Katrougalos (Syriza)** recounted his party's experiences in the Greek government after 2015. In his presentation, he elaborated on how Syriza attempted to avoid compromising on the party's principles when exercising executive power. "We tried to follow a multidimensional peace-seeking policy when we were in government," Katrougalos said. There is a necessity to protect and promote multilateralism and the institutional framework of the UN, which reflects the balance of forces after World War II, although this "institutional system is far from perfect", he stressed. It is the responsibility of the Left to protect multilateralism, build global alliances and democratise the UN.

Furthermore, he argued that "national answers" to matters such as inequality, taxation of multinational companies or migration should be complementary to multinational responses. These and other key issues cannot be tackled on a national level as they are interconnected to, for example, climate change. The global economic order and climate change are root causes of the displacement of millions of people who are pushed to leave their countries. Against this background, "the only possible solutions to solve international differences are dialogue, respect for international law and multidimensional policy approaches", Katrougalos stressed, highlighting that Syriza had sought to improve relations with Russia and China, and turn Greece into a "bridge between Europe and Asia". The ex-MEP also elucidated on the political and economic conflicts in the Eastern Mediterranean region and how a Left foreign policy could bring together peace and security by bridging the often proclaimed antagonism between a non-militarised foreign policy and ensuring stability and safety.

Daniel Seiffert (Rheinmetall Entwaffnen), the workshop's third and last speaker, elaborated on the activist movement Rheinmetall Entwaffnen (German for "Disarm Rheinmetall"), a grassroots collective that campaigns against the leading German arms and weapons manufacturer Rheinmetall, and the arms industry's strategies for circumventing national arms export restrictions. According to opinion polls, 60 to 80 percent of the German public oppose arms exports, Seiffert said. However, this political position is reflected neither in parliaments nor on the streets, in contrast to the anti-war movement's peak in the 1980s. Seiffert stressed the importance of renewing and reviving peace movements, opening them up for youth and creating intersectional alliances in line with contemporary modern protest culture. Hence, Rheinmetall Entwaffnen seeks to create "a political articulation or expression of an existing political stance that represents a majority in society".

Seiffert also referred to the solidarity of anti-war collectives with Kurdish movements and autonomous self-administration in the Kurdish region and emphasised that Rheinmetall Entwaffnen had called for a halt to weapons exports to Turkey and promoted a "healthcare not warfare" campaign amid the pandemic. However, he pointed to the issue of partiality in violent conflicts and the dilemma facing peace movements in this regard, especially those featuring radical pacifists, as Kurdish forces defend themselves with weapons. Meanwhile, Seiffert also elaborated on the arms industry's strategies for protecting its interests amid hostile public opinions on arms exports by bypassing national export restrictions. Export restrictions on arms and weapons in Germany prompted Rheinmetall to become a multinational company, establishing subsidiaries and joint ventures in the US, Switzerland, Italy and South Africa, aimed at internationalising its business model in order to bypass export restrictions. This, however, clearly illustrates that such regulations at a national level are not an effective way to restrict arms and weapons exports, as the industry is still able to circumvent national regulations.

Following these diverse presentations, the **workshop discussion** was equally varied and controversial. A key issue raised during this exchange was the conflict between peace movements outside parliament and Leftist forces in parliament, something that becomes even more pressing when the Left is part of a government. It was pointed out that "political positions of Left forces in parliament

and movements outside parliament have to be different", though they need to feature the same tendency. A major weakness of the Left, especially in Germany and Greece, is that it has not yet found a way to "define common goals and act from their respective positions—as MPs or activists—towards this joint goal". A key example discussed in this regard was how Leftist forces should position themselves vis-à-vis the idea of a European army. Left parties in Europe as well as The Left (former GUE/NGL) group in the EU Parliament are divided over the matter, further illustrating cleavages between Left forces in and outside parliament. The necessity for Left parties to consistently stick to a disarmament agenda and political positions against militarisation was repeatedly stressed.

Additionally, the intersectional connection between colonisation and energy issues such as gas extraction featured prominently in the discussion. Energy-related considerations are a major reason for conflict and war in many countries, a participant pointed out, referring to the link between the French army's activities in the Sahel and the interests of the French oil and gas company TOTAL in the region. Thus, today's challenge is to connect and interlink movements against climate change and peace movements. However, Leftist stances towards energy-related matters are strongly disparate across Europe. The trilateral dialogue in the Eastern Mediterranean on regional cooperation on gas extraction and distribution was mentioned as a key example of how regional or national policies, aimed at fostering peace, can contradict climate-related matters. The trilateral dialogue is based on the narrative that gas exploitation could facilitate peace and better diplomatic relations in a region that has increasingly turned into a geopolitical battleground. While regional cooperation on gas could improve relations between states in the short term, such cooperation based on fossil gas creates other conflicts linked to the devastating effects of gas extraction. Syriza's position in this regard was the subject of heated discussion during the workshop as the party's definition of security is disconnected from environmental safety and food security, a participant argued, even framing Syriza as an example of "a left with no vision and no definition of security that is in any respect different from a security term predominantly relating to military security".

Meanwhile, the debate also addressed the general understanding of the term "security" in the context of COVID-19.

The pandemic made "the EU's flawed framing of security very obvious", a participant said, highlighting the shortcomings on social protection within the government's crisis responses. A crucial reason for this is the corporate lobbying of the arms industry and its privileged access to governments, as political priorities are not centred around humans. To counter the power of the arms lobby, a mass movement that frames security as something that actually serves public interests—healthcare in particular—is urgently needed. Therefore, the term "security" should be redefined and incorporate "social protection", including an "improved distribution of services, mutual support and a production model which is environmentally friendly and responsible". A participant suggested that "a new internationalist impulse" is needed, whereas the Left will have to make huge efforts to place the "well-being of people" and "human security policies" at the heart of the political debate and thereby counter narratives that, for example, frame immigration as a threat. It is crucial for the Left in this regard to present "concrete proposals" that mirror the "real human security needs".

While the pandemic demonstrated that the arms industry can convert, as it suddenly proved possible for the companies concerned to produce civilian goods such as ventilators, the implementation of a universal basic income and regularisation campaigns for undocumented migrants (as pushed forward in Portugal, Italy and other countries) appeared to be possible in several countries amid the COVID-19 crisis. Nevertheless, it was highlighted during the workshop that the current boom in armament and rearmament seems to be "the beginning of a new cycle" in militarising societies and borders. After the Cold War, there was a reason for the arms industry to engage in a debate about conversion strategies. Today, however, there is no reason for those companies to join in such discourses, or even consider participating in them.

Mentimeter Exercise

Following the speakers' interventions and the discussion, the workshop concluded with the Mentimeter exercise, a brainstorming tool designed to substantiate and gather concrete proposals, in this case on how the Left could or should tackle the key matters outlined in the workshop summary above. Participants were asked to imagine a European Parliament with a Left majority and proper legis-

lative power, and to formulate suggestions about which priorities should be put on the political agenda regarding security. A core demand repeatedly mentioned in the exercise was to set human security as a top priority, additionally addressing the need to ensure social and economic justice, access to resources for everyone and the redistribution and democratisation of resources. Also prominently highlighted was the demand to abolish Frontex and defund the police, the military and the arms industry, while the latter should be forced to stop producing weapons and join conversion schemes.

Mentimeter Results
WHAT SHOULD BE THE MAIN PRIORITIES ON EUROPEAN SECURITY POLICIES FROM THE LEFT?

▶ Human security as a priority, ensure access to resources for everyone, peace building measures to prevent conflict, tackle inequalities.

▶ Abolish Frontex, disarmament, expropriation of the weapons industry, pay reparations to former colonies, make technology globally open source, make knowledge production a common, de-growth, redistribution and democratisation of resources.

▶ Education, funding peace movements and activities, solidarity.

▶ End access to decision-making by the arms industry, defund the arms industry, universal basic income, arms conversion to socially useful tech (renewable energy, health equipment), abolish Frontex, decriminalise migrants, stop arms exports.

▶ Criminalising and dismantling corporations that profit from war, real energy security, local community run & owned renewable energy projects, public health & access to healthcare.

▶ Funding peacebuilding, using peacebuilding principles, removing security from an "elite" group, climate security, funding social and community projects, defunding and demilitarising police, decolonising aid and military interventions.

▶ Reforming police and cutting military spending, stopping all arms exports and arms production.

▶ Progressively demilitarise and decentralise power to increase cooperation at local level.

▶ Reform NATO and other global security mechanisms and approaches.

▶ Human security, food, climate, social and economic justice, exposing the arms industry and the real damage they cause, transforming EU CSDP missions into peace-building policies.

▶ Multilateralism, conversion of weapon industry, common initiatives of disarmament on a global scale, demilitarisation of borders, strengthening the health care system.

▶ Progressive and objective approach of de-escalating CEE EU member states frozen historical conflicts with Russia (former USSR) and bilateral frozen historical conflicts over disputed territories.

▶ Disarm and divest the military, no European army, sign the nuclear ban treaty, develop a new Green and Care deal, trust in left politics depends on disarmament and non-violence.

2.3 CLIMATE CRISIS AND CLIMATE JUSTICE

The series' third workshop, held in October 2020, addressed the intersection of struggles for peace and climate justice, tackling matters such as root causes of climate change, their impact on human security, ecological collapse linked to capitalist means of production and how today's climate change is connected to the history of colonisation. The workshop featured three speakers and 19 participants from Germany, Austria, Tunisia, Cyprus, Finland, Belgium, France, the UK, Spain, Switzerland, Mozambique, Serbia, the Netherlands, Romania and Israel, working with or affiliated to social movements, NGOs, Left and Green parties, grassroots collectives, trade unions and research institutes. A topic repeatedly brought up during the event was the EastMed pipeline, the struggles against the project and its

ecological repercussions for the region. The workshop also explored strategies to address the nexus of climate change and the securitisation and militarisation of the gas industry and fossil fuel extraction. Furthermore, participants discussed what could be learnt from struggles for energy security regarding the threats posed by ecological breakdowns, and how to counter the imminent ecological collapse and global inequalities.

Tatiana Gavito (Wretched of the Earth)
Activist with Wretched of the Earth, a UK-based grassroots collective for indigenous, black, brown and diaspora groups and individuals, struggling for climate justice in the UK and the Global South.

Natasa Ioannou (Friends of the Earth Cyprus)
Project coordinator at Friends of the Earth Cyprus, a non-profit NGO established in 1980, based in Limassol and affiliated to the European and international section of Friends of the Earth, working on local, regional and international issues related to the environment and climate change.

Naomi Kreitman (Gastivists network)
Activist with the Gastivists network, a collective that strives to mobilise for a just energy transition and fights fossil gas infrastructure projects including the EastMed pipeline.

Before the workshop turned to the specific issue of fossil gas exploitation, the event's first speaker **Tatiana Gavito**, an activist with the **Wretched of the Earth** collective, elaborated on more general considerations regarding climate change and social injustices stemming from capitalist modes of production. To illustrate how struggles against the destruction of livelihoods can force governments and corporate businesses to step back, Gavito recounted the successful mobilisation against South America's biggest gold mine in Cajamarca in Colombia in the 2010s. The crucial first step by residents had been the establishment of local collectives who fought the project and were eventually able to push back a powerful multinational company. However, similar struggles continue across Colombia and all over the world, as multinational corporations align themselves to governments and paramilitary forces in Colombia and elsewhere "to make sure that this economic model of imperialism" can strive and continue.

Gavito emphasised that climate change did not evolve due to "small missteps", as powerful forces had built the structures of societies as we know them today, and the economic models designed to exploit and distribute the resources of the entire planet. Those structures and economic models are based on slavery, a system whose "sole purpose has been the pursuit of profit and domination", she argued, also referring to racism, classicism and sexism as necessary preconditions for the survival of this system. Against this background, Gavito stressed that a key problem related to climate change is "the lack of understanding of how we got here", while marginalised people in the Global South and North, as well as the Global South in general, are always those who are hit first by the repercussions of climate change. Thus, Gavito called on all countries in the Global North to acknowledge their historic and current responsibility for fuelling the displacement of communities and people as "climate justice cannot be achieved without migrant and racial justice".

In the second intervention, **Natasa Ioannou (Friends of the Earth Cyprus)** turned the workshop's attention toward the EastMed pipeline, a deep-sea project aimed at connecting the Levantine Basin offshore gas fields to Cyprus and Greece. The project clearly demonstrates how gas extraction and militarisation are interlinked as the pipeline facilitates an intensified military cooperation between Israel, Cyprus and Greece, who have been conducting regular joint military exercises in the Eastern Mediterranean ever since the project was launched. Ioannou also highlighted that the US is actively promoting the project, even lifting an embargo on arms sales to Cyprus which had been in place for more than 10 years. In so doing, the US is actively fuelling tensions and the militarisation of the entire region. While the Cypriot government argues that the project will end the country's isolation regarding energy security and connect Cyprus to the EU gas market, the state is not promoting solar infrastructure and has a very low percentage of renewable energy. Meanwhile, grassroots peacebuilding between Turkish and Greek communities in Cyprus had been negatively affected after the discovery of gas, Ioannou pointed out.

Naomi Kreitman (Gastivists network), the workshop's last speaker, further elaborated on the gas industry, its impact on climate change and the often—and falsely—proclaimed necessity to expand gas exploitation to safeguard energy security. While there is consensus in Europe on moving away from oil and coal, gas is considered a lifeline and framed as a solution to replace oil and coal as primary sources of energy. However, fossil gas is just as damaging to the climate as oil and coal, if not more so. A significant amount of CO_2 is emitted when gas is burnt, and methane (a greenhouse gas 86 times more powerful than CO_2) leaks into the atmosphere when gas is extracted, transported and used. More and more gas infrastructure is being planned and built around the world, even though there is enough such infrastructure already, and despite the fact that building new fossil gas projects is totally incompatible with the internationally agreed Paris climate accord. Europe has a "not-in-my-backyard approach" that spares European citizens the local repercussions of gas exploitation, but fuels them elsewhere in the world, "often in a colonial manner", Kreitman argued.

The consequences of gas exploitation are just as, if not more, disastrous for local communities and the environment as those of oil and coal, causing the displacement of people, increasing risks of earthquakes and corruption, and impacting health. The current discourses about energy security and the importance of new gas projects are flawed as energy security cannot be built on centralised and extraction-based systems, the activist stressed. If we want to ensure real energy security, "we have to ask who owns the energy systems, who manages and controls them and how is energy distributed?" Kreitman emphasised that energy security should be composed of democratic, renewable and decentralised models and principles. She urged consistent use of the term "fossil gas" instead of "natural gas", as the latter is misleading. It is a result of elaborate industry marketing campaigns to make us associate positive things with fossil gas. Burning gas is just as natural as burning oil or coal.

Following the three interventions, a lively exchange between the workshop's participants developed during the **final plenary discussion**, focusing on the intersection of fossil fuel extraction and militarisation. It was repeatedly highlighted that fossil fuel extraction and militarisation are often interlinked, which paves the way to bring together peace movements working on disarmament and arms trade, and environmental movements addressing the energy and climate crisis. As there are already examples of

successful collaboration between these movements, joint actions and campaigns should be actively encouraged.

Regarding the involvement of the military in climate-related conflicts, a participant elaborated on attempts by leading military staff to promote military engagements in such conflicts, aimed at preventing climate-related migration movements towards Europe. Conflicts of this kind could also be used to justify foreign military interventions in regions hit by climate-related disasters, violence or instability. In this context, the overlapping of such positions or narratives with environmental groups or movements such as Extinction Rebellion was stressed, and it was emphasised that a significant part of the climate movement is not rooted in Leftist currents and "lacks a political vision" that actively endorses and tackles the intersection between climate change and the economy's production model. Meanwhile, non-political sections of the climate movement are partly advocating for green-washing "solutions" to tackle the climate crisis, such as shifting from oil and coal towards gas, often driven by corporate businesses and political elites. However, these so-called solutions are not really solutions at all and are simply damaging the environment further as they continue to drive us closer to ecological collapse, climate breakdowns and the further destruction of livelihoods.

However, approaches and debates aimed at politicising climate movements need to move away from individualised solutions and acknowledge the roots of climate change, while always navigating carefully the calls for changing our way of life in order to avoid blaming the poor for individual choices. One participant summarised some core questions yet to be addressed: "How to explain to people that they have to change their way of life? And how to do so without ending up in an elitist situation where the poorest are once again blamed for what is going on with our planet?" Meanwhile, people fleeing the devastating effects of climate change are framed as a threat for Europe, while the real threats of climate change for human security are not taken into account by dominant narratives and are effectively side-lined and even silenced.

Against this background, several concrete examples were cited during the discussions, such as the fact that French military interventions in Mali, Mozambique or elsewhere are framed as peacebuilding or anti-terror operations al-

though they appear to be connected to France's interest in the exploitation of fossil resources. In this regard, the involvement and role of development aid projects and companies in countries targeted by foreign military interventions was prominently mentioned, while one participant made a passionate appeal to "expose the role of the military" as a tool to defend economic models based on the extraction of fossil energy resources.

A key part of politicising and strengthening climate movements is redefining relevant narratives and discourses, as "we cannot talk about climate change without emphasising how we got here". Climate change needs to be more outspokenly linked to the history of colonialism and capitalism, but also—in more concrete terms—to the role of agriculture, agribusinesses, land grabbing, the use of pesticides, free trade agreements and their social and ecological repercussions, as well as the power and lobbying activities of corporate businesses. "Our planet and the current system we live in is the result of Western industrialised colonial capitalism." While the persecution and murder of landowners, rights' defenders and environmental activists in, for example, South America remain widespread and linked to "the systemic root causes of climate change" due to a predominant impunity of corporates and governments, the role of the military in protecting exploitation sites for fossil resources makes corporates and governments instantly complicit in climate change and repression.

Mentimeter Exercise

In the Mentimeter exercise following the third workshop, participants were asked to name priorities for addressing the systemic causes of climate change and ecological collapse that threaten the security of people globally. Major demands outlined in the exercise were to "make companies accountable for their destructive activities" and tackle and uncover "the links between military interventions of EU countries and gas and oil extraction". Besides more general calls to challenge and abandon growth- and consumption-based economic models and to "tackle the root causes of climate change", the importance of framing "climate change and ecological collapse as the direct result of historical and ongoing colonial capitalism and extractivism" was also highlighted.

Mentimeter Results
PRIORITIES TO ADDRESS THE SYSTEMIC CAUSES OF CLIMATE CHANGE AND ECOLOGICAL COLLAPSE THREATENING THE SECURITY OF PEOPLE GLOBALLY:

▶ There should be legislative change to hold companies accountable and restrict their destructive activities.

▶ No to militarisation of the responses to climate threats, stop arms companies from greenwashing, include the military in carbon emissions data; explore the links between military interventions of EU countries and gas & oil extraction.

▶ Talk to people in common language: our lives are threatened by climate emergency, link to security of our lives and people, introduce campaigns about what is hidden in the reality by companies, ask for change to the system by reduction of consumption.

▶ Framing climate change and ecological collapse as the direct result of historical and ongoing colonial capitalism and extractivism. Not taking solutions from the fossil fuel or arms industry. Tackling the root causes of climate change.

▶ Work in close collaboration with the people impacted by extractivism & with local communities pushing forward intersectional solutions.

▶ Real decarbonisation, massive public investments in renewables and infrastructure, massive public investments in re-education of workers of industries that have to be shut down, democratic governance of resources.

▶ Linking struggles in different sectors to maximise own knowledge and resources.

▶ More actively involve the youth, raise awareness of people against the threats of the industrial-military complex involving government complicity. Having a more active human-centred policy.

▶ Ensure that the popular classes, the primary sector and those who suffer most from the effects of the climate crisis understand the fight against climate change as the only way out, not as another burden on their shoulders.

▶ Abandon the development model that focuses on the aggregate growth of the GDP, promote public institutions, production, consumption and investment policies that take into account ecological limits, the care crisis and transform agriculture.

2.4 MIGRATION AND (ANTI-)RACISM

The fourth workshop, held in October 2020, aimed to address the nexus between migration, anti-racism and security through the lens of today's discourses on immigration and the EU border regime. When security, human security and migration-related issues are discussed today across Europe, discourses tend to mainly mirror the perspective of citizens and exclude migrants, people of colour and marginalised communities. How are immigrants framed and included—or excluded—in public discourses and what terminologies are used when addressing migration-related matters? What role do EU agencies such as Frontex or the military and security industry play in the externalisation of EU borders and the expansion of border control policies inside and outside Europe? And what can grassroots movements do and call for to effectively counter hate speech, racism and violence at Europe's external borders? This workshop featured two speakers and 11 participants from Austria, Finland, Germany, Belgium, France, the UK and Spain, who are affiliated to or work with Leftist political parties, grassroots collectives, NGOs and research institutes.

Mark Akkerman (Stop Wapenhandel/Transnational Institute)
Researcher at Stop Wapenhandel (Dutch Campaign Against Arms Trade) and additionally involved in the Transnational Institute's research on border militarisation.

Anna Nasser (Transnational Migrants Coordination)
Activist working with the Transnational Migrants Coordination, a transnational grassroots initiative that involves migrants, refugees, asylum seekers and groups and individuals from several European and African countries.

In their presentation, **Mark Akkerman (Stop Wapenhandel/ Transnational Institute)** summarised how the EU border regime and border control measures inside and outside Europe have been expanded in the past decade, and how the gradual militarisation of borders and the increasing use of military personnel and equipment at borders aims at stopping migration. "This policy dates back a long time, but the Schengen agreement in the 1990s was a defining turning point" as the treaty facilitated opening up Europe's internal borders for citizens and residents and, at the same time, boosted control measures at the external borders. After the collapse of Yugoslavia in the 1990s, the Arab Spring in 2011 and the 2015 Summer of Migration further accelerated the EU's efforts to "keep undocumented migrants out of the EU territory".

"Underpinning this policy is a narrative that increasingly frames migrants as a security problem and a threat. Migrants are commonly turned into scapegoats to be blamed for and deflect from the disastrous consequences of capitalism within Europe, such as shortages in housing," Akkerman stressed. Such narratives "did not come out of the blue", but are actively fuelled by right-wing politicians and organisations representing the military and security industry, which uses and pushes for "an alarmist language and a military-style rhetoric" and terminologies that are already prominently mirrored in official EU documents. While the EU expanded its funding schemes to tackle the so-called root causes of irregular migration, most of the money spent as part of the EU Trust Fund for Africa (EUTF) is bound for stopping migration. Meanwhile, the real reasons why people are forced to flee, such as unfair trade relations, arms exports, military support for authoritarian regimes or land grabbing, are not being properly addressed.

EU border control policies actually force many people to flee, Akkerman said, referring to the EU border externalisation, which in part involves exporting certain policy approaches and underlying security narratives to neighbouring countries. These countries and their representatives are "bribed and blackmailed"—e.g. they are promised better trade relations or threatened to not be considered for development aid funds—in order to make them abide by European border control policies and standards. Security equipment delivered to these countries is used not only for border control and surveillance but also for internal repression, while the countries concerned are forced to spend their own financial means on border control, which means

that their governments are less able to increase or maintain social spending. Akkerman pointed to specific projects such as a €50 million grant for the French company CIVIPOL to set up fingerprint databases of the entire population in Mali and Senegal, mainly aimed at enabling European authorities to identify and immediately deport people from these countries when arriving at EU borders irregularly.

While the EU has greatly expanded its spending on border security measures (e.g. for fences, deploying armed forces, purchasing drones, introducing and interlinking databases and funding the externalisation of asylum systems to third countries), the EU border guard agency Frontex has been significantly upgraded and is now allowed to buy its own equipment and build up its own standing border guard corps. All these measures and policies are partly driven by the substantial lobbying of the military and security industry, Akkerman highlighted, explicitly mentioning some of the big players in this field such as Airbus, Leonardo and Thales, but also powerful lobby organisations such as the European Organisation for Security, the AeroSpace and Defence Industries Association of Europe and the European Association for Biometrics.

Anna Nasser (Transnational Migrants Coordination and Precarious (dis)Connections), the workshop's second speaker, shifted the event's discussion towards precarious labour for migrants and citizens alike, racism and discrimination, and the questions of how transnational networks and collectives are contributing to the struggles against the border regime and racialised security discourses. She gave an insight into the history and goals of the Transnational Migrants Coordination, which involves migrant organisations from France, Spain, Italy, Greece, Slovenia, Turkey, Lebanon and Morocco, and aims at "connecting local struggles to identify the links between them and to break out of the isolation of these struggles". The network attempts to "build structures designed to connect different challenges, struggles and contexts by developing somewhat of a common struggle", though "without falling back on specific local demands which could fragment the processes of organisation", Nasser explained, referring to the issue of how to engage trade unions in migrants' struggles and in trying to move away from a national level to a transnational level.

Nasser also pointed to the new EU Pact on Migration and Asylum as a symbol of how migrants are "no longer consid-

ered a matter of emergency but as something that needs to be managed" based on "the economic needs and priorities of EU Member States". Against this background, she framed the calls for freedom of movement and unconditional residency permits as the only way to fight this exploitative system that is built and based on discrimination, precarious labour and exploitation. "We identified residency permits as a political tool used to strengthen racism and the economic exploitation of migrants in Europe and beyond. Therefore, the Transnational Migrants Coordination formulated a common demand to overturn this system of control and exploitation. Residency permits should not be linked to work, employment contracts, income levels or family status. Hence, we are calling for an unconditional and unlimited European residency permit," Nasser said. With such a demand, the network was able to connect and channel different struggles in order to challenge the transnational dimension of migrant exploitation by fighting this system across borders.

After these interventions, the **final plenary discussion** addressed several key issues related to activist struggles against the border regime and racism, highlighting how certain intersectional and transnational alliances could foster the impact of civic resistance against the status quo. Several participants raised the question of how to deal with churches and their engagement for refugees and people on the move, emphasising that recent joint campaigns with the Protestant Church in Germany had been very successful in terms of raising public awareness and collecting donations to fund a new rescue ship (SeaWatch4). While the churches' involvement effectively entails a humanitarian approach without a clear political vision, any cooperation with such institutions can still help in building alliances, even if churches are not addressing the roots of flight and displacement from a political and economic perspective.

Meanwhile, the massive global attention generated by the Black Lives Matter movement was deemed significant during the workshop exchanges. The Black Lives Matter protests had created more space for publicly stating that "the police is a racist institution" and "racism is institutionalised" and, thereby, mainstreamed such arguments, a participant argued, suggesting that the momentum from this be harnessed to launch similar initiatives, such as highlighting the violence at Europe's external borders ("borders are institutionalised racism too") and possibly campaigns for the abolition of Frontex.

However, the core issues discussed in the workshop's plenary revolved around the question of how to comprehensively address global inequalities in a comprehensible way to create a broader public awareness, but also shift discourses toward the root causes of flight, in particular towards economic inequalities. "The key point today is to understand that the fear for the future is justified, but this fear is epitomised by the people who arrive at our borders," one participant said. "There is a big misunderstanding among Europeans, as many believe that the problem is how to integrate 3 or 4 million people in Europe, whereas the real problem is how to integrate 500 million Europeans into a world that will be soon inhabited by 10 billion people. In this regard, racism is somehow the legitimisation of a colonialist lifestyle as people believe that they have the right to maintain a standard of living which differs extremely from the standard of living in other parts of the world," the participant went on. Therefore, migration needs to be put into a global perspective, a task that should be urgently tackled by the Left. However, "the Left has so far failed to develop a vision of the future that incorporates the dramatic change taking place in our lives as regards ecology, the growth model and production- and consumption-based economies". Thus, "the Left needs to formulate a picture of a future" that is sustainable and fair on a global scale, and that makes a significant number of people understand that "this future is possible and feasible".

Furthermore, the role of undocumented migrants in the economy and the way corporate businesses use nationalistic discourses to dismantle workers' rights and downgrade working conditions needs to be more prominently addressed. In this context, a participant framed the current state of affairs as a period in which neoliberalism is increasingly incorporating nationalist elements and turning towards authoritarianism. Nationalism is, in this regard, "incredibly useful as the welfare state is systematically attacked, with huge amounts of money being redirected from the welfare system towards the security apparatus". This, however, "leads to a climate in European states in which nationalism is increasingly used to allow neoliberal players, policies and discourses to undermine democracy" in a considerable set of domains. Additional relevant topics raised during the discussion included the role of unions in "using migration and immigration as a scarecrow for poor working conditions", but also free trade agreements, which were framed as a symbol for the "continuation of history"

with regard to colonialism, imperialism and the economic exploitation of entire countries and regions by the West. The role played by industrialised Western countries in this context needs to be more outspokenly addressed, a participant vehemently stressed.

Nevertheless, also raised during the workshop were positive examples of how to mobilise against nationalist narratives on migration, illustrating that simple campaigns can actually address the need for narratives to overcome simplistic discourses and narratives that blame immigrants for the consequences of capitalist modes of production. During the municipal election campaign in Austria in autumn 2020, the newly established Left party LINKS launched a campaign in which party supporters painted on streets and pavements in front of abandoned buildings how many people could live there if they were made available, calling for these buildings to be used not only for refugees stuck in Greek refugee camps, in particular Moria, but also for homeless people in Austria. "This approach worked, people understood the message that marginalised people in Austria and refugees who are forced to leave their homes, seeking refuge in Europe or elsewhere, share similar challenges as they both pay a hefty price for the globalised economic and political model we live in today," a participant emphasised, adding that the paint used for the action was environmentally friendly as it was made out of water and flour.

Mentimeter Exercise

The third workshop also concluded with a Mentimeter brainstorming exercise in which the event's participants were asked to formulate condensed suggestions on how to radically enforce an anti-racism agenda and how to dismantle colonial power structures. An overwhelming majority of participants mentioned the urgent need to facilitate "freedom of movement" as well as to advocate and introduce a "general residency permit" or similar schemes, aimed at granting citizenship status "to all those living and/ or working in the EU regardless of their place of origin". Equal rights should be granted to every individual, while collective rights should be ensured for any community. Several participants highlighted the importance of safeguarding or extending labour rights and the crucial need to "build broad coalitions" and alliances in favour of ensuring equal rights for all, regardless of one's origin.

Mentimeter Results
HOW TO RADICALLY ENFORCE AN ANTIRACISM AGENDA AND DISMANTLE COLONIAL POWER STRUCTURES?

▶ Decolonise aid, establish universal basic income, strengthen labour rights, provide general residency permit to migrants, demilitarise borders and police, defund the police in favour of community projects.

▶ Ensure freedom of movement, abolish police and other repressive structures, introduce a concept of shared security, based on a global approach to meet human needs and labour rights for all.

▶ Defend and extend "Citizenship of the European Union", grant this status to all those living and/or working in the EU regardless of their place of origin.

▶ Decolonize our organizations and networks and build broad coalitions that defend equal rights for all of us, independent from our origins.

▶ Apart from the socio-economic aspects; we have to acknowledge the multinational and multicultural character of our societies, meaning granting equal rights to every individual and collective rights to the communities.

▶ Abolish borders, free movement for all, reparations to former colonies, public education on historical responsibility, study and name colonialism and how it continues today, defund the police, close detention centres and camps.

▶ Extend labour rights and assure freedom of movement by redefining the concept of security in order to include migrant communities and communities of colour.

▶ Educational reform that emphasizes on critical history studies, cultural studies and colonial history, reparations to former colonies, end of the border regime - establish legal migratory routes, expropriate the weapon industry and ecosocial transformation of industry.

▶ Representation of people affected by racism and (neo)colonialism in positions of power, education about history, open borders, access to basic human rights for all.

▶ Critique of the Western modernity as a civilizing project.

▶ Abolish the current EU migration pact and demilitarise borders, establish a real multilateral approach.

2.5 DEMOCRACY AND FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS

The last event of the 2020 workshop cycle, held in November, aimed to discuss the nexus between political participation, counter-terrorism, surveillance, democracy and fundamental rights. How is the notion of "security" used to undermine democratic processes and systems as well as fundamental rights and hollow out what we understand today by the term "democracy"? To what extent are people willing to sacrifice their freedoms to ensure personal and societal security? And, above all, how should the Left position itself in this highly sensitive debate, taking into account the need for actually safeguarding security without merely mirroring narrowly defined mainstream narratives on the matter? During the workshop, two speakers and nine participants from Austria, the UK, France, Germany, Spain and Belgium, affiliated to Leftist parties, NGOs and research institutes, discussed and exchanged ideas on the increasingly detrimental effects of corporate and state surveillance on privacy, media freedom, democracy and everyday life as well as the impact of policing and counter-terrorism strategies on ethnic and religious minorities. A core issue discussed during the workshop was how discriminatory discourses on security are used by governments, state actors and right-wing currents to restrict fundamental rights and freedoms.

Angelika Adensamer (VICESSE/LINKS)
Legal and criminology researcher at the Vienna Centre for Societal Security (VICESSE) and co-founder of the newly established Austrian Leftist party LINKS, which ran in the municipal elections in Vienna in October 2020.

Narzanin Massoumi (University of Exeter)
Lecturer in sociology and criminology at the University of Exeter and co-author of the report *Leaving the War on*

Terror – A Progressive Alternative to Counter-Terrorism Policy. She works on the impact of policing and counter-terrorism strategies on ethnic and religious minorities and the higher education system in the United Kingdom.

Angelika Adensamer (VICESSE/LINKS), the workshop's first speaker, shared her thoughts about the frequently proclaimed dichotomy of security and liberties, and highlighted the need for drafting a Left concept on security that actually caters for people's safety by redefining the term "security". She also elaborated on recent events and debates related to security in Austria and the restrictions of liberties imposed by the Austrian government in the context of anti-terrorism legislation.

Adensamer stressed that the dichotomy of security and liberties does not hold as all matters related to security should be discussed in a broader framework that goes beyond terrorism and counter-terrorism. Echoing similar statements made at other workshops of the 2020 series, she also raised the question whether the term "security" could be redefined to incorporate factors such as "social security" or "access to public health" in view of the COVID-19 crisis. According to her, fundamental freedoms are part of a "true security" in the sense of "security of rights", as a certain level of liberty and the right to exercise fundamental freedoms must be guaranteed. Adensamer linked this argument to the issue of "security" or "protection" from the state, referring to the historical meaning of the term "security" in the sense of "rule of law" and the conception of a modern nation state with a monopoly on the use of force. Hence, the rule of law and "all constitutions were originally set up to restrict the power of the state", Adensamer pointed out. One of the most pressing issues in this regard today, according to her, is the provision of "meaningful" mechanisms to file complaints about police misconduct, police violence and other violations committed by law enforcement bodies.

While initiatives aimed at setting up such complaint procedures in Austria have been delayed in recent years, anti-terrorism measures are often phrased in an extremely vague manner and thereby threaten the exercise of fundamental rights, as laws in Austria and countless other countries grant authorities the right to use preventive tools involving detention or surveillance practices. After the terror attacks in Vienna in November 2020, the government pushed for

a new anti-terrorism package in line with similar initiatives already adopted in other countries, consisting of an "authoritarian response" to the attack, Adensamer argued. The package included measures to keep people convicted of terrorism-related offenses in detention even after they have completed their sentences if they are not deemed "de-radicalised". "This is a severe infringement" as prolonged detention is now based on a "future-based judgement of dangerousness". Under the rule of law, people should be convicted based solely on evidence regarding an act a person has actually committed. However, this basic principle is heavily contested by anti-terrorism measures.

In the context of countering Islamist extremism, political positions related to religious convictions are turned into criminal offences, according to Adensamer. Thus, criminal procedures are effectively moving away from prosecuting acts people have actually committed. "The whole field of terrorism" features many ways of putting people on trial for taking part in, preparing or financing terrorist organisations, while the relevant legal stipulations are regularly and outspokenly protested for being vague and "seldomly related to actual terrorist acts".

Adensamer also pointed to the issue of accountability of police and intelligence agencies as a key matter to be addressed in any security-related debate. For her, the major questions to be raised in this regard are: Are there institutions or mechanisms in place to hold security forces accountable, and how can we democratically control intelligence services? Regarding the latter, she highlighted that "if one agrees that we need intelligence services and that they need to do their work in secret, we end up in a paradoxical situation as you cannot publicly control something that is supposed to be done in secret". However, Adensamer argued that it is impossible to leave these agencies to work freely and without any public scrutiny as they can be exploited for political gains, referring to recent scandals about the political exploitation of intelligence services in Austria.

The workshop's second speaker, **Narzanin Massoumi (University of Exeter)**, elaborated, above all, on the impact of terrorism-related security polices in the UK for ethnic and religious minorities, in particular Muslims, and how the security debate and corresponding measures are undermining democracy and fundamental rights. She also comment-

ed on the dynamics in the British Left after Jeremy Corbyn had taken over as leader of the Labour Party, which had fuelled substantial debates and actions on security and other matters among Leftist political currents in Britain.

During her intervention, Massoumi repeatedly alluded to the vibrant debates in the British Left after Jeremy Corbyn was elected leader of the Labour Party in 2015. Leftist activists outside of the Labour Party used the momentum to formulate alternative policy approaches and tried to reframe narratives and discourses on security when "a government led by Corbyn seemed to be possible". In these debates, they were discussing "a more compatible perspective" on security and had striven to formulate an "alternative language and policy framework which the Left could get behind". Matters of security were a huge challenge for a Corbyn-led Labour Party, she stressed. Therefore, these activists tried to outline a political position on the matter. In 2017, it appeared evident that alternative approaches on security were appealing for many people in the UK. Prior to the 2017 general election, a terrorist attack occurred in Manchester. The Left initially thought that this attack would "kill the elections" as the topic of security was always considered the "terrain of the right". However, in a public speech after the attack, Corbyn outspokenly condemned the government's war on terror and foreign policy. Following the speech, the Labour Party seemed to make significant gains in the polls, indicating that there was a "real appetite" in society for a critical discourse about current counter-terrorism policies, Massoumi said. Although the wider public appeared to reject a "militarised conception of security", the organisational space for the Left in the UK currently remains weak.

Nevertheless, she framed the government's "war on terror" as a "catastrophic failure" in terms of actually safeguarding people's security, referring to the increasing number of civilian casualties caused by political violence. The war on terror even made things worse, she claimed, calling on the UK to immediately end its involvement in unilateral actions related to the war on terror and counter-terrorism policies. However, Massoumi emphasised that the UK has "a leading role in spreading and promoting counter-terrorism policies across Europe" as laws and measures similar to the ones adopted in the UK have already been implemented in many other countries.

A key issue Massoumi raised in this regard is that these policies disproportionately target ethnic and religious minorities as much of the exceptional legislation that has been adopted in the context of counter-terrorism policies is effectively used by authorities to expand surveillance, detention without charges, extradition or citizenship removal targeting immigrant communities in the UK. The anti-terrorism acts include draconian measures such as stop-and-search procedures at borders without any reasonable suspicion. "If you are of Pakistani heritage, you are 150 times more likely to be stopped than if you are a white person. Stop-and-search figures of the British police indicate that Asian-looking people or people of colour are six to 10 times more likely to be searched," according to Massoumi. In addition to this, "counter-terrorism policies go beyond the traditional security and intelligence apparatus" as more and more civic institutions and areas of public life are affected.

The British government forced public institutions and areas of certain services to get involved in the Prevent counter-terrorism programme, aimed at preventing people from sliding into extremism. This had a severe impact on those institutions and services and effectively restricted the access of ethnic and religious minorities to such services (e.g. doctors or mental health workers can now report a person for alleged signs of radicalisation). The UK's educational sector has been strongly affected by this programme. In some universities, research on sensitive topics related to security is now only permitted within the framework of official registers, while such data can be shared with law enforcement agencies. Organising political events on campus has become much more difficult as applicants have to go through very long bureaucratic procedures, which in practice have led to a shrinking political space on campus. "The democratic and civil society space on campus is increasingly undermined," Massoumi stressed. Meanwhile, "self-censorship is spreading strongly in all sorts of educational institutions. Muslim students are afraid of talking about certain topics as their parents tell them to not talk about certain issues out of fear of being pulled out by Prevent officers," she explained.

In Massoumi's view, a major reason for framing the Prevent counter-terrorism programme as authoritarian is that the associated polices often contained a significant expansion of the definition of who is considered a "target". Whereas Prevent policy approaches initially targeted only "violent extremism", the definition was widened to include "non-violent extremism". The ever-expanding targets of counter-extremism policies have made democratic participation increasingly difficult for Muslims due to the loosely defined notions of "extremism" and "radicalisation". In the UK, non-violent groups such as the environmental campaign group Extinction Rebellion, and other peaceful groups, have recently been added to government lists of "extremists". This effectively undermines democracy, Massoumi warned.

In order to counter security policies fuelled by right-wing narratives that are watering down democratic systems, Massoumi stressed the need to develop more democratic approaches regarding security and counter-terrorism. The Left should push for a substantial expansion of the involvement of the public in these debates, which should "go beyond the narrowly defined conception of national security or national interests". Massoumi favours a holistic approach that tackles the issue under a wider conception and framework of social and societal well-being, including issues such as "protection against racism, poverty or domestic violence". This should materialise on a local level and take transparency and accountability of security agencies into account.

The **workshop's discussion** focused on the question of whether and how it might be possible to find a consensus within the Left on the security debate and develop alternative policy approaches, while the need for drafting a Left long-term strategy on the nexus of terrorism, counter-terrorism and fundamental rights and freedoms was repeatedly stressed. A major goal of such an alternative approach should be to counter current "security discourses that normalise violence" (e.g. at Europe's external borders). Meanwhile, participants highlighted the importance of the workshop and its exchange for spreading awareness among Leftist currents on relevant debates on security and counter-terrorism policies across Europe, as similarities in terms of legislation (e.g. attempts by the Spanish and French governments to ban filming of police officers during protests) or the justification of legislation (e.g. in Austria, the government pushed for a new anti-terrorism package in 2020 although all instruments to prevent the November 2020 attacks were already in place) appear to be evident in various European countries.

In addition, the discussion among participants also reflected on structural constraints regarding the problem of transpar-

ency and accountability of the police. Whereas the history of collusion between intelligence and police agencies and those who use "political violence" (an alternative term possibly to be used instead of "terrorism") was mentioned (referring to the NSU scandal in Germany, the trial against the far-right party Golden Dawn in Greece, the history of British policing policies in Northern Ireland, but also attempts by security agencies to prevent the Communist Party in Italy in the 1970s from joining a coalition government), other participants pointed to the difficulty of democratising security agencies. "Those institutions cannot be democratised unless you have a change in the political and social orientation of the government, and unless you have democrats in the state's institutions. The state is fundamentally the state of the ruling class and high ranks of the police; the political police and the secret services are the last ones to be democratised if there is any development towards democratic socialism," a participant pointed out.

Mentimeter Exercise

Following the speakers' interventions and the discussion, the workshop concluded with the Mentimeter exercise. Participants were asked to outline the necessary steps to protect democracy and democratic processes and to guarantee the right to privacy and freedom for all. Several replies given during this exercise had already been mentioned in earlier workshops, including calls for defunding the police and Frontex as well as ensuring the accountability of the police by creating independent institutions or agencies to monitor security bodies. Additionally, participants called for inclusive consultations about security-related matters across Europe and highlighted the need for peacebuilding efforts addressing and including local communities, women, minorities and youth.

Mentimeter Results
WHAT WOULD BE THE NECESSARY STEPS IN ORDER TO PROTECT DEMOCRACY AND DEMOCRATIC PROCESSES AND TO GUARANTEE THE RIGHT TO PRIVACY AND FREEDOM FOR ALL?

▶ Defund the police, defund Frontex, create independent institutions/agencies to make the police accountable, strengthen democratic processes to hold politicians accountable, ensure participation of all minorities in decision-making processes.

▶ A facilitated Europe-wide consultation of what kind of security really serves people and a security council which excludes corporate actors and prioritises marginalised communities to develop policy.

▶ Using inclusive peacebuilding practices and learning in order to rebuild our security apparatus, making sure women, minorities, younger people are on the table.

▶ To invite emancipatory-solidarity actors outside the European Parliament to a forum that discusses and designs the necessary steps in order to protect democracy and democratic processes and to guarantee the right to privacy and freedom for all.

▶ Invest in peace building processes in communities, paying reparations for colonial crimes.

▶ Cut back police powers (of force and surveillance), ensure police accountability, find societal solutions for societal problems instead of police measures.

▶ Security is a social question: provide decent living to everybody, ensure democratic conviviality of different national communities, introduce a peaceful demilitarised and decolonising policy.

3. TOWARDS A NEW CONCEPT OF SECURITY: HOW TO STIMULATE A NEW SECURITY DISCOURSE?

This summary of the 2020 workshop series clearly illustrates once more that the development of a new Leftist concept on security is long overdue, but, at the same time, possible and feasible. The series' ongoing transnational exchange on security-related struggles, positions and considerations has unambiguously shown that Leftist movements, parties, grassroots collectives, NGOs and activists across Europe and beyond share common grounds and perceptions regarding possible features of an alternative concept on

security as well as the will to further expand collaboration and coordination across borders and political affiliations.

Although conflicting perceptions, contradictions and shortcomings in existing positions remain evident, the COVID-19 pandemic constitutes an opportunity to embrace these differences and bridge them by proactively stimulating a constructive debate among the Left. Such an exchange should aim at achieving a synthesis of struggles, positions and strategies that reflect the complexity of our times, relate to the actual security needs of people, and reclaim the term "security" amid a narrowly defined understanding of security among the wider European public, pushed forward by right-wing and neoliberal political currents and the political establishment.

The workshops showed that the challenge of discussing and developing new concepts on security, which question the present discourses and counter them with an alternative vision by interlinking the struggles for climate, social and racial justice as well as peace, global economic equality, non-militarised foreign policy, gender equality and free movement for all, is an endeavour worth undertaking for the Left. Hence, the following chapter summarises the main considerations and challenges regarding security identified during the 2020 workshop series, highlights examples of successful campaigns and actions, and outlines possible future areas and approaches of engagement and struggle against the status quo.

3.1 COMMON STRUGGLES AND CHALLENGES AMONG MOVEMENTS AND ACROSS COUNTRIES

Adequately countering security-related narratives and policies currently dominated by a militarised narration requires, in the first place, a comprehensive analysis and mapping of the current state of affairs and the different challenges and struggles across Europe and movements. Such analyses should be considered the fundamental basis of any attempt to reclaim "security" for all in the framework of an alternative concept of human-centred security. The 2020 workshop series featured precisely this kind of analytical debate, which is evidently necessary to identify key struggles and challenges to be addressed by a comprehensive Left vision on security that takes intersectional

and transnational considerations into account. The main challenges and struggles raised during the workshops, deemed as key for any progressive Left concept on security, cluster around three main areas:

1) **The power of law enforcement agencies and the military-industrial complex**
   - Accountability and public control of police and intelligence authorities
   - Terrorist attacks and counter-terrorism measures as a threat to democracy and freedoms
   - Political power and lobbying activities of the military-industrial complex

2) **Capitalism and colonialism as root causes of conflict, climate change and global injustice**
   - Economic exploitation and neocolonial power structures are a major cause of conflict
   - COVID-19 exposes social inequalities and challenges the political priorities of the elites
   - Highlighting the correlation between climate change and capitalist modes of production

3) **Need for the fragmented Left to bridge gaps between countries, movements and approaches**
   - Bridging the gap between the Left in and outside parliament is crucial for building alliances
   - Strategical and ideological differences of the Left in different countries hinder unity
   - Climate movements need to be politicised and interlinked with peace movements

Challenges and issues related to the first cluster should be considered core struggles as they were prominently raised in all five workshops, albeit from very different perspectives. **Accountability and public control of police and intelligence services** was referred to as a top priority to be tackled in numerous countries across Europe as participants and speakers alike shared similar experiences from their respective countries about the evident lack of public control over police and intelligence agencies. Thus, Angelika Adensamer framed the provision of "meaningful" mechanisms to file complaints about police misconduct, police violence and other violations committed by law enforcement agencies as one of the most pressing issues of our times.

Regarding the EU border regime and Europe's restrictive immigration policies, Mark Akkerman highlighted that **people on the move are increasingly framed as a "security problem"** and "turned into scapegoats to be blamed for and deflect from the disastrous consequences of capitalism". In fact, immigrants and minorities are mostly the first ones to be affected by policies and legislation that restrict civil liberties and freedoms under the pretext of anti-terrorism measures or policies drafted to safeguard "security" in a much broader sense. The notion of "security" is used to undermine democratic systems, fundamental rights and the rule of law, whereas the associated policies hollow out what we understand today by the term "democracy". As Narzanin Massoumi outlined, such **laws and regulations disproportionately target ethnic and religious minorities** as much of this exceptional counter-terrorism legislation is effectively used to expand surveillance, detention without charges, extradition or citizenship removal targeting immigrant communities.

Also repeatedly addressed during the workshops was the security industry's power and its lobbying activities. Giorgos Katrougalos argued that "national answers" to matters such as the taxation of multinational companies or migration-related issues should be complementary to multinational responses. Daniel Seiffert then elaborated on how the **arms industry bypasses national export restrictions** by establishing subsidiary companies and joint ventures abroad. By doing so, the industry effectively circumvents national export regulations, which clearly illustrates that arms export restrictions on a national level are not suitable to restrict arms exports. Meanwhile, the expansion of the EU border regime is considerably amplified by **the security industry's economic interests as "migration has become a major new market"** for manufacturers of security and surveillance equipment and arms, Sara Prestianni pointed out. The promotion of a culture of disarmament remains, nevertheless, a crucial "early stage to counter and fight violent extremism and hate speech", Heidi Meinzolt argued.

Meanwhile, the second cluster should be considered pivotal for stimulating progressive public discourses on security and reclaiming narratives about the root causes of violent conflict, climate change and global inequalities. During the workshops, participants and speakers repeatedly pointed to the **history and continuity of colonial exploitation as a major reason for war, displacement and social and eco-**

nomic inequalities. Already in the 1910s, the international women's rights movement had identified the economy and profit-making capitalism as a major root cause of violent conflicts and promoted multilateralism as a crucial tool for conflict prevention, Meinzolt said, adding that **the importance of feminist movements** for these struggles needs to be highlighted as peace agreements are only successful when women participate on an "equal level".

Walter Baier elaborated in this context on how the Left should deal with violent conflicts and war as "we live in a world of imperialism and imperialist rivalries". He called on the Left to "avoid choosing sides in these conflicts, but to better understand their dynamics". According to him, a Left position must aim at downsizing these confrontations through **the demilitarisation of conflicts**. Nationalist narratives and neoliberal policies, such as redirecting public funds from welfare state schemes towards the security apparatus are, in the meantime, fuelling violent conflict and war and thus serve the interests of the arms and security industry. This, however, "leads to a climate in European states in which nationalism is increasingly used to allow neoliberal players, policies and discourses to undermine democracy". Baier also highlighted that the current securitisation and militarisation of the EU should be considered as the elite's political response to Europe's disintegration crisis, further fuelled by nationalism and the 2008 financial crisis.

The COVID-19 pandemic has, in the meantime, exposed flaws of the current system in a considerable set of domains. The crisis has highlighted **the need to ensure access to public healthcare for the entire population** in order to protect societies as a whole, but also the necessity of providing citizens and residents alike with adequate housing, non-precarious work contracts and social insurances that cover, for example, income shortfalls. Amid the pandemic, **the term "security" should be redefined** in line with the real "social security" requirements of people.

Yet another crucial matter repeatedly raised during the workshops is the nexus of environmental and peace movements. Today's economic model is based on the extraction of fossil energy and natural resources, but also slavery and the exploitation of labour in the Global South which, over the centuries, unambiguously fuelled global inequalities and the destruction of environments. **Today's gradual ecological collapse is clearly linked to capitalist means of**

production, the history and continuity of colonialism and capitalism as well as unfair trade relations and the continuous economic, ecological and human exploitation of entire continents. Many of today's armed conflicts, wars and military interventions are directly or indirectly rooted in geopolitical struggles for control over fossil resources—a connection that needs to be highlighted and tackled by interlinking peace and environmental movements. Against this background, Tatiana Gavito argued that this global economic state of affairs is immediately intertwined with the continuity of racism, classicism and sexism as these and other matters are necessary preconditions for the survival of the current system. Therefore, "climate justice cannot be achieved without migrant and racial justice", she stressed.

However, converging climate and peace movements is not an easy task, most notably as significant parts of the environmental movement are not rooted in any Leftist current and "lack a political vision" that embraces the intersection between climate change and the economy's modes of production. As these non-political sections of climate movements often only call for "technical solutions", **climate movements need to be politicised and interlinked to anti-arms trade and peace movements** as violent conflicts, fossil fuel extraction and environmental degradation are unequivocally connected. This, however, appears challenging to achieve as Left positions on energy-related matters are strongly disparate across Europe, for instance in Greece and France.

The third key cluster identified during the workshop series relates to **the ideological disparities of the Left itself**. In this context, pivotal questions were raised about how to achieve unity across movements stemming from different backgrounds, struggles and countries. While some participants framed the conflict between Leftist forces in and outside of parliament as a major reason for the lack of unity among the European Left, it was also stressed that "political positions of Left forces in parliament and movements outside parliament have to be different", though they need to feature the same tendency. A major weakness of the Left in several countries is that it has not yet found a way to "define common goals and act from their respective positions—as MPs or activists—towards this joint goal".

However, Kate Hudson already addressed the issue of how to promote a Left concept of the future among the wider public amid the common allegation that the Left has no

alternative and feasible vision to offer. Numerous progressive Leftist organisations in the UK and elsewhere actually "present very clear and often sophisticated alternative visions", she emphasised, adding that the real challenge is not to develop a new Left vision on security or other matters as such a vision is already there, "well articulated" and "very widely shared". **Today's main challenge, according to Hudson, is to turn this vision into reality** by pushing the parties in power to substantially change track.

Meanwhile, a major obstacle for promoting unity among Leftist currents across Europe is **the divergence of political demands and on-the-ground approaches by Left movements in different countries**. For example, the contradiction between demanding an overall shutdown of the arms industry and solidarising with a party to violent armed conflict due to political sympathies. Although the German Left party DIE LINKE is outspokenly and consistently arguing against arms exports and the German arms industry's lobbying power, security-related matters are not yet addressed in a comprehensive manner by the party. But even more evident, according to the workshop's discussions, is the failure of the Left in Greece and France to provide a comprehensive vision of security, connecting different struggles and interlinking peace and climate movements. While the Greek Syriza party has actively contributed to the country's policy of expanding fossil gas extraction in the Eastern Mediterranean, the French Left was deemed incapable of comprehensively addressing the question of energy security as **even Leftist groups and movements promote the idea that French sovereignty is linked to the country's nuclear weapon arsenal**. While there is no political representation in the French partisan landscape for alternative positions on nuclear deterrence, weapon production and exports are not a major issue in the public debate.

3.2 COUNTERING DOMINANT NARRATIVES: SUCCESSFUL CAMPAIGNS AND BEST PRACTICES

Although the workshop series predominantly featured an exchange on the respective struggles, demands and political positions in numerous countries, providing an intersectional and transnational mapping of Leftist analyses and priorities, several examples of successful campaigns, actions and strategic approaches were flagged during the

debates. In order to effectively counter current dominant narratives and discourses on security and to stimulate further collaboration and exchange between Leftist movements, the most prominent examples of best practices and successful actions highlighted during the 2020 series are outlined below:

- The Austrian Left party's 2020 election campaign calling for abandoned buildings to be used by refugees and homeless people alike, thus advocating for open borders and social justice at the same time
- The attempts of parts of the British Left to formulate an alternative vision of security after Jeremy Corbyn was elected leader of the Labour Party in 2015
- The Gastivists' approach of interlinking struggles by combining environmental activism with the monitoring of securitisation and militarisation of the fossil gas industry
- Connecting migrant workers and precarious workers (Transnational Migrants Coordination)
- Rheinmetall Entwaffnen as an example of a local struggle that connects anti-capitalist resistance to the arms trade with ecological struggles featuring an emphasis on feminism
- Strategic alliances with non-political actors such as the #schickteinschiff campaign (German for "send a ship"), a cooperation between Seebrücke and the German Protestant Church

While participants and speakers identified the strategy of playing low-income segments of society and migrants—or ethnic and religious minorities—off against each other as a major tool by the establishment to divide social movements, the Austrian Left party LINKS successfully addressed this cleavage in the campaign for the 2020 municipal elections. The newly established party launched a street action in October 2020 in which party supporters painted slogans on streets and pavements in front of abandoned buildings, indicating how many people could live there if they were made available, and **called for these buildings to be used not only for people stuck in Greek refugee camps, but also for homeless people in Austria**. "This approach worked, people understood the message that marginalised people in Austria and refugees" both face similar challenges amid today's exploitative economic system. This action clearly illustrated how simple campaigns can effectively counter discriminatory and racist narratives which blame migrants or minorities for the distortions and consequences of capitalist modes of production.

Back in 2015, parts of the British Left had entered a temporary phase of vibrant debates after neoliberal and right-wing discourses on security had effectively side-lined the Left for more than 15 years. After the election of Jeremy Corbyn as leader of the Labour Party in 2015, **Leftist activists used the momentum to develop alternative narratives and policy proposals on security** when a Corbyn-led government seemed possible. Although Corbyn cannot be considered a radical Leftist figure, his rise to power in the party had paved the way for a diverse and progressive debate on security-related matters among Leftist activists about an "alternative language and policy framework which the Left could get behind". In 2017, it appeared evident that alternative approaches on security were appealing for many people in the UK as Corbyn's outspoken opposition towards the so-called war on terror and the UK government's foreign policy seemed to have led to significant gains for the Labour Party in the polls, illustrating **a "real appetite" in society for a critical discourse** about current security-related narratives.

Meanwhile, the importance of fostering transnational and intersectional exchange and joint action was repeatedly stressed during the workshop series. The Gastivists network's approach, for instance, illustrates how **struggles for environmental sustainability and peace are intertwined** as fuel and gas extraction projects are often accompanied by the militarisation and securitisation of regions or entire countries. While the Gastivists collective primarily addresses the dangers of fossil gas extraction and outspokenly argues against such extraction projects, it also monitors the links between the fossil energy industry and the militarisation and securitisation of the energy sector and, thereby, successfully combines two struggles identified as key matters during the 2020 workshop series.

The Transnational Migrants Coordination likewise pursues a distinct intersectional and transnational approach as the network successfully **connects migrant organisations across numerous countries, and interlinks the struggles of migrant workers and local workers for their rights**. As Anna Nasser outlined, the Transnational Migrants Coordination comprehensively addresses the precarious working conditions of migrant and local workers alike, but also tack-

les racism, discrimination and the EU border regime in the framework of its actions and campaigns. The network aims at "connecting local struggles to identify the links between them and to break out of the isolation of these struggles" and seeks to "build structures designed to connect different challenges, struggles and contexts by developing somewhat of a common struggle". The movement additionally tries to mobilise trade unions and connect them to migrants' struggles in order to connect migrant and local workers with each other and elevate the struggle for workers' rights from a national to a transnational level.

Also highlighted in this context was **the significance of local struggles and local activist collectives**, deemed pivotal for countering neoliberal policies, precarious labour, fossil fuel and gas extraction projects or the EU border regime. In this regard, Tatiana Gavito recounted the successful local mobilisation against a gold mine in Colombia in the 2010s, thereby illustrating how local struggles against environmental destruction and the exploitation of fossil resources can push back corporate businesses and even governments. The Rheinmetall Entwaffnen campaign is another example of **a local struggle with a distinct transnational and intersectional approach** that is interlinked to peace and anti-war movements and struggles against environmental destruction. However, Rheinmetall Entwaffnen and other initiatives or alliances addressing arms production and exports need to expand their awareness-raising efforts as the key challenge today is how to turn the significant opposition to arms exports in European societies into reality.

Another crucial factor in increasing the impact of civic resistance and of Leftist campaigns regarding global inequalities, climate change, labour rights or the EU border regime is to **build up and expand strategic alliances with movements and actors stemming from non-Leftist backgrounds**. The role of churches was mentioned in particular in this regard as participants repeatedly referred to the successful alliance of sea rescue NGOs with the German Protestant Church in recent years. Although the church lacks a political vision and pursues a humanitarian approach towards the EU border regime and migration movements in the Mediterranean, such tactical alliances and cooperation with non-political actors can, nevertheless, foster awareness-raising efforts among a wider public and significantly increase the impact of Leftist campaigns against the EU border regime.

3.3 POTENTIAL STRATEGIES AND APPROACHES FOR JOINT ACTIONS AND CAMPAIGNS

All these examples of successful campaigns, actions or collaborations illustrate that there is already an outspoken support for Leftist narratives and policy proposals on security in society beyond the traditional home turf of the Left. A consolidated or more institutionalised transnational exchange on such examples is therefore crucial for Leftist movements, parties or grassroots collectives to learn from each other and increase the impact of successful strategies and actions. However, questions remain about how to reclaim "security" from a Leftist perspective and how to push for a discourse on security that is based on and embraces human-centred concepts, takes environmental and social struggles into account, and, at the same time, enables the Left to challenge right-wing narratives. During the workshop series' interventions and discussions, several potential and promising areas of future engagement were flagged, predominantly clustering around the repercussions of the COVID-19 pandemic and the already existing alliances between peace and climate movements. Thus, outlined below are strategies that derive from the best practices highlighted above:

- Struggles for peace and demilitarisation can be and are already linked to social movements and the struggles of unions, demanding a genuine redistribution of wealth, social security and the strengthening of public sectors, including the health sector
- Climate and peace activists can and are already joining forces to oppose fossil fuel and gas extraction projects that are linked to securitisation and militarisation processes
- Migrant workers and local workers across Europe are gradually uniting to fight together for labour rights and against low wages and structural racism
- Those who stand up for data protection and privacy rights and against state and corporate surveillance share a lot with those advocating for the rights of ethnic and religious minorities who are worst affected by policies undermining fundamental rights in the name of counter-terrorism measures and legislation

In order to raise awareness about feasible Leftist visions of a human-centred understanding of security among a wider public, a more unified European Left featuring **great-**

er exchange and interaction across borders and across movements was deemed crucial to effectively counter the status quo. Hence, participants and speakers alike emphasised that the workshop series and its exchange should be considered a step in the right direction regarding the establishment of a more distinct and institutionalised exchange among Left movements stemming from different backgrounds and countries. Struggles for peace, demilitarisation, workers' rights, freedom of movement for all and social security are already linked to each other, but need to be increasingly interconnected in order to have an actual impact and counter the status quo. Meanwhile, **COVID-19 has unambiguously "illustrated where today's real needs of societies" are**, participants and speakers alike repeatedly stressed during the workshops, highlighting the political elites' partial but consistent prioritisation of military and police spending amid the ongoing health emergency. Thus, the Left needs to use this momentum and call for a "transformative agenda", a "new green and social deal"—though in clear opposition to the mainstreamed green policy approach pushed forward by Green parties in Europe—and a "care deal", Heidi Meinzolt stressed. The "well-being of people" and "human security" need to be placed at the heart of the political debate. Hence, it remains crucial for the Left to present concrete policy proposals, mirroring the "real human security needs" of today's societies.

Another key area for a future engagement is the **intersection of peace and climate movements**. The workshop series' discussions illustrated once again that real "energy security" cannot be built on centralised and extraction-based systems rather than a democratic, renewable and decentralised model as outlined by Naomi Kreitman. To expand and reinforce the impact of the fragmented and partly non-political climate movement, it needs to be comprehensively linked to anti-war and peace movements working on arms trade and disarmament. A powerful angle to politicise the climate movement and connect it to the peace movement is to "expose the role of the military" as a tool to defend economic models based on the extraction of fossil resources, but also to link climate change to the history of colonialism and capitalism, or in more concrete terms to the role of agriculture, agribusinesses, land grabbing, the use of pesticides and so-called "free trade" agreements.

Also repeatedly highlighted during the 2020 workshop series was the need to **unite the struggles of migrant workers and workers in general** in order to elevate the partly national struggles for workers' rights to a transnational level. In this way, the impact of such actions can be substantially increased, while a more united front consisting of national and international trade unions and representatives of migrant workers' communities remains crucial to counter the attempts by the far right and the political establishment to play local and migrant workers off against each other. Such a joint struggle would, additionally, not only be a powerful alliance to fight for workers' rights more effectively, but at the same time counter structural racism and discrimination and the attempts by corporate businesses and their political allies to lower wage levels.

Meanwhile, the substantial global attention generated by the Black Lives Matter protests in 2020 paved the way for significant public debates on institutionalised racism and discrimination against people on the move, migrants, and ethnic and religious minorities. The protests unambiguously illustrated once again that those who stand up for data protection and privacy rights and oppose the expansion of state and corporate surveillance share a lot with those advocating for the rights of ethnic and religious minorities. While the latter are the most affected by policies that undermine fundamental rights in the name of counter-terrorism measures, **alliances between civil rights movements and organisations or collectives that represent ethnic, religious or racial minorities** are crucial for any campaign or action in order to effectively counter structural racism and discrimination as well as policies that threaten fundamental liberties. As arguments about the institutionalised racism and discrimination against migrants or minorities have been successfully mainstreamed ever since the Black Lives Matter protests materialised, it was repeatedly suggested during the workshops to harness the momentum of such protests—or any other future movement, incident or campaign that creates a massive public outcry—to launch similar campaigns, for instance about the EU border regime and the possibility of abolishing the EU border guard agency Frontex, which could aim to denounce the institutionalised violence against people on the move at Europe's external borders.

Conclusion and Outlook

by **Katerina Anastasiou** (transform! europe) and **Axel Ruppert** (Rosa-Luxemburg-Stiftung Brussels Office)

We cannot fight climate change without tackling the military-industrial complex. We cannot fight for disarmament without arguing for humane living conditions for refugees and their right to flee war zones. We cannot fight social inequality without acknowledging the dangers that climate change poses to the lives of all, but mostly the people of the Global South. We cannot fight extractivism without dismantling colonial structures. Finally, we cannot envision a safe future in which everyone can develop themselves freely without envisioning a world beyond capitalism.

The COVID-19 pandemic and the resulting health crises have once more underlined that insufficient public infrastructure and services are a real threat for millions of people living in Europe and beyond. At the same time, the free global production and distribution of the life-saving COVID-19 vaccines seems like a far-fetched dream as EU leaders continue to ponder whether they should confront the capital interests of the pharmaceutical industry and waive vaccine patents. Almost USD 2 trillion was spent on the military worldwide in 2020.[2] What would our world look like if a fraction of that money was used to equip hospitals, health workers, workplaces and schools?

Yet dominant discourses on security are instrumentalised by those in power to justify repressive and discriminating policies and warmongering. From foreign policy decisions to law and order practices within the EU and at its borders, human rights are violated and lives are lost in the name of a "security" that safeguards profits and privileges rather than people. The actual security of human life and nature is a marketing by-product, the safety of the most vulnerable something to be sacrificed. In the name of security, our lives become more insecure as vital resources are allocated to militarisation processes, rather than to tackling global inequality and actual security threats facing us all, such as the climate and biodiversity crises.

Security—the right to safety in order to develop oneself—provides a platform for convergence in action for different contemporary struggles. The shortcomings and contradictions of the currently dominant security discourses were central to the exchanges throughout the workshop series. To be able to confront them, we need a common articulation and organisation. The dialogue throughout the series showed where synergies are possible and struggles interlinked. It became clear that our take on security will rely on linking and strengthening peace, environmental, feminist, anti-racist and privacy rights struggles, since it is in the name of security that militaristic, unsustainable, sexist and racist policies are enacted. Participants agreed to defend our language, to make clear that opposing current security policies does not imply opposing protection for those in need and that engaging in the debate on security requires us to speak out about whose security is being discussed and what kind of security matters in people's daily lives.

In publishing the workshop summaries of the first series, we hope to highlight some of the most important aspects and motivate social movements as well as Left and progressive parties to take on the task of developing a security concept that attends to the needs of the many. We hope that the workshops' results will serve as a basis, inspiration and food for thought for further elaboration.

Security is and will remain a central issue but it is also a contested issue among the Left. The experience of hosting these workshops has encouraged us to continue this work intersectionally and transnationally, and provided us with the basic mechanics in order to develop arguments and axioms that will finally constitute a truly Left—anti capitalist—concept of security and eventually lead to the preparation of relevant policy.

We will continue offering space for transnational and transdisciplinary dialogue on the topic of security and organise workshops in 2021 and beyond. We look forward to continuing this very challenging task.

---

2   SIPRI (2021): Press release: World military spending rises to almost $2 trillion in 2020. Available at:
     https://www.sipri.org/media/press-release/2021/world-military-spending-rises-almost-2-trillion-2020 (05.05.2021).

transform!
europe

www.transform-network.net