

Switzerland

# For an autonomous and independent security policy – Yes to the neutrality initiative!

by René Roca\*



René Roca. (Picture ma)

Switzerland should finally formulate an autonomous and independent security policy. This has been necessary for some time, but it is being put off. Apparently, an increasing integration with NATO is more important (e.g. Sky Shield).

## Constitutional mandate and necessary addition to the constitution

The Swiss Federal Constitution very clearly describes the political responsibilities for a realistic security policy that includes a clear commitment to neutrality and a militia army. In the preamble, it states, among other things, that “The Swiss People and the Cantons [...] conscious of their common achievements and their responsibility towards future generations, are adopting this constitution. One of these achievements is neutrality. With the current erosion of neutrality, where is the responsibility towards future generations?

Regarding the armed forces, the constitution is clear (Art. 58 BV):

<sup>1</sup> Switzerland shall have armed forces. In principle, the armed forces shall be organised as a militia.

<sup>2</sup> The armed forces serve to prevent war and to maintain peace; they defend the country and its population.”

Right now, our army is totally incapable of fulfilling this mission. The Federal Department of Defence, Civil Protection and Sport (DDPS) is so dysfunctional that only the revision of the *Army 21* and all subsequent reform steps can remedy the situation. The newly elected head of the

## Die Neutralitätsinitiative



DDPS, *Martin Pfister*, faces a Herculean task in this regard.

The tasks and powers of the Federal Assembly are also clearly set out in the Federal Constitution (Art. 173 BV):

“1 The Federal Assembly has the following additional duties and powers:

a Taking measures to safeguard external security and the independence and neutrality of Switzerland.”

The same applies to the Federal Council (Art. 185). The question arises as to why our elected representatives, all of whom are “servants of the people”, no longer fulfil this clear constitutional mandate. Like all NATO countries, Switzerland is now a loyal vassal of the USA. In this sense, our country is becoming more and more integrated. On the one hand through the planned Framework Agreement 2.0 into the supranational structures of the European Union (EU) and on the other hand into the military war alliance of NATO.

The neutrality initiative was launched because of this continued blatant disregard for the Swiss Federal Constitution – and not only because of the war in Ukraine. It is intended to clearly anchor Swiss neutrality in the constitution, thus ensuring a comprehensive peace policy and the strengthening of humanitarian traditions (ICRC). In particular, the Federal Council needs guidelines for its foreign policy so that the endless manoeuvring stops, and its sometimes-unbearable silence can be broken. The new article on Swiss neutrality

\* *René Roca* is a grammar school teacher and historian with a doctorate in history. He founded and heads the *Research Institute for Direct Democracy* ([www.fidd.ch](http://www.fidd.ch)). He is a member of the committee of the Neutrality Initiative.

should not remain a dead letter after the adoption of the initiative but is a clear mandate for the Federal Council and Parliament!

After the initiative was submitted last year, it is now being discussed intensively in the parliamentary commissions. A direct counterproposal to extract important parts of the initiative text is within the realm of possibility. The vote is expected to take place on 8 March 2026.

### **Switzerland is engaging in endless ingratiating**

Instead of developing a long-term strategy for its national security, the DDPS commissioned a report from 21 people comprising the "Security Policy Study Commission". Apart from a few token politicians, most of the commission members were handpicked by the *Amherd* department, which led to a very one-sided approach. The results were foreseeable. The report makes statements without providing the necessary historical context.

For example, geopolitical situation analyses are parroted as we know them from the media. Page 22 of the report states: "Only if the West succeeds in restoring Ukraine's territorial integrity will a rules-based order be preserved in which international law is enforced, and rule-breakers are punished. Otherwise, this order will remain in tatters and especially Europe will be threatened by Russia."

Speaking of "territorial integrity" is right in itself. However, a "rules-based order" in Europe, if it ever existed, has not existed since the Kosovo war in 1999. This NATO war was a violation of international law, the rule-breakers were not punished, and Serbia's territorial integrity has still not been restored. The uranium ammunition used in the war continues to radiate and is a public health disaster. And the NATO countries called this a "humanitarian intervention". Switzerland had nothing better to do than to support the nonsensical KFOR exercise with its own soldiers to this day. The claim that Europe is being threatened by Russia, as the quote continues, is simply absurd, but it is now triggering an unbridled military build-up. The global industrial-military complex is laughing up its sleeve. However, rearmament and bloc-building, as well as a forced alliance policy, inevitably point the way to war, as they did before the First World War. The "Neue Zürcher Zeitung" is already considering a "modern Triple En-

tente" (see 10 March 2025), a special kind of warmongering from the transatlantic echo chamber.

Now the Federal Council's message on the neutrality initiative is also available. As expected, it proposes that it be rejected. According to the Federal Council, the initiative would enshrine a "rigid understanding of neutrality" in the constitution and would overly restrict its foreign policy leeway. However, this is precisely what is now required and very important.

The Federal Council wants to maintain its "flexibility" in the application of neutrality. But a country that handles its neutrality flexible is no longer reliable at all. Such relativism is nothing more than cherry-picking, and, as we can see now, credibility of such a country is dwindling dramatically.

A second argument of the Federal Council against the initiative is that it wants to continue to impose sanctions against belligerent states outside the UN. Studies clearly show, however, that such sanctions are ineffective (see Russia today), affect innocent civilians and prevent a normal dialogue for a long time.

### **Switzerland as the architect of a new European security policy**

Particularly in today's delicate world political situation, the great opportunity for neutral and non-aligned countries lies in promoting peace and cooperation as self-confident nation states. Switzerland's perpetual armed neutrality, strengthened by the new article in the constitution, could create the basis for entering dialogue with all parties and building a new European security structure by developing a self-defence capability that is as autonomous as possible. Switzerland must work with other peace-loving countries as an architect here.

In this context, the process of the *Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe* (CSCE) should be recalled, which Switzerland actively promoted, and which ultimately ended the Cold War. For the USA, neutrality has always been something "immoral". We do not have to worry about that. During the Second World War and for a certain period afterwards, Switzerland was a "diplomatic superpower". It must take up exactly this and consistently serve peace again with its good offices.

(Translation "Swiss Standpoint")